social, environmental, and cultural inequities, have on health and health care. These inequities provide a medium in which poverty not only continues to exist but thrives.

Poverty is perhaps the most closely aligned determinate of ill health. It then should follow that the elimination of poverty would go a long way to eliminating the long-standing health care inequities that result in health care disparities for African Americans and other people of color that are the shame of this wealthy Nation.

It is my hope that this country, my country, will never forget Katrina and recognize that what was laid bare is only a fraction of what exists, particularly in the South but throughout this country.

As leaders, I hope my colleagues will join us to ensure that the infrastructure is put in place so that nowhere across the United States will such a preventable travesty ever happen again.

Part of that would be to pass our legislation to create health empowerment zones in communities such as those in which poverty and the concurrent ill health trapped their victims. This legislation would assist and empower them to address health care challenges and improve the public health infrastructure as well as mitigate the social, environmental, and economic determinants of health.

It is part of a larger legislative initiative for which we also ask your support, the Heal America Act of 2005, a comprehensive bill, a sort of Marshall Plan for health that would reverse the dynamics that lead to the disproportionate death, disease, and disability which people of color suffer.

Lastly, not allowing this to ever happen again includes not cutting Medicaid. Not only is it needed in this crisis, which has been described as in biblical proportions, but it is needed in the everyday crises that result in over 100,000 preventable premature deaths in people of color every year. My colleagues, this, too, is the annual unacknowledged catastrophe that we can and must prevent.

Mr. Speaker, let us honor the memory of the victims of Katrina and the suffering of the survivors by eradicating poverty, by creating a fair, equitable and just health care system and by building a better America where there is the guarantee of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

DOWNING STREET MEMOS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, today, the occupation of Iraq continues and we learn that another bomb blast, in fact a series of bomb blasts in Iraq have resulted in the loss of more than 100 lives. So far, the loss of American servicemen and women's lives is almost 2,000. We have lost almost 2,000 American servicemen and women in Iraq.

The American people are asking now with greater frequency a very significant question: Why did we invade Iraq and why are we continuing to occupy that country?

Today, the House Committee on International Relations defeated a Resolution of Inquiry, which I introduced, and that defeat came essentially along party lines. Every Democratic member of the House Committee on International Relations voted for the resolution; one Republican voted for it; one Republican did not oppose it. But the resolution lost by one vote because all of the other Republicans on the committee opposed it.

What this resolution asked was simply this. It asked the administration, the White House, and the Defense Department to provide to the Congress information with regard to that information which is contained in the so-called Downing Street memos.

The Downing Street memos are very interesting. They were first revealed by the Sunday Times of London on May 1, 2005. What these Downing Street memos are, are high-level communications between some of the most significant members of the British Government, including Prime Minister Tony Blair; Richard Dearlove, who was the head of British intelligence; Jack Straw, the foreign secretary; and others.

These Downing Street memos were communications between these high-ranking officials of the British Government. They reveal the essence of conversations which took place between members of the British Government and members of the Bush administration here in Washington, including Condoleezza Rice, Vice President CHENEY, Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld, and others.

What the Downing Street memos reveal is that, from the very beginning, the Bush administration was obsessed with Saddam Hussein and that they used the attack of September 11 not to go after the perpetrators of that attack, Osama bin Laden and the al Qaeda network, but to twist and distort the facts in order to justify an attack against Iraq, given the obsession that they had with Saddam Hussein.

So the resolution that I introduced today, and which was defeated by the House Committee on International Relations, called upon the executive branch of government, the White House and the Defense Department, to provide to the Congress information with regard to those conversations from the American perspective. All we have now is the British perspective. And the British perspective is quite damning indeed, damning of the intentions of the Bush administration and the way in which this ensuing occupation has been carried out.

The Downing Street memos make it clear that high-ranking members of the Bush administration were determined to twist and distort the intelligence and the facts to fit the policy which they had already decided to put into action; and that policy, of course, was to attack Iraq and to remove Saddam Hussein as the head of that government.

Many people across our country, including an increasing number of the House of Representatives, and I believe the Senate as well, are asking the question: How could that attack be justified when we now know that the ostensible justification, the justification which was set forth by the administration, was completely false?

First, that justification was that Iraq had something to do with the attack of September 11. Then the administration had to back off from that assertion when it became clear to almost everyone that there was no validity in that assertion whatsoever. Rapidly, the administration moved to an assertion that it was important for us to attack Iraq because Iraq possessed so-called weapons of mass destruction, biological and chemical weapons. And the suggestion was even made over and over and over again, by the highest ranking officials of the Bush administration, that the Iraqi government was acquiring nuclear weapons, that they had imported enriched uranium from Niger into Iraq in order to manufacture atomic bombs, and that we were in danger of having those nuclear weapons used against us. So, therefore, they sought in that way to justify an attack against Iraq.

It is now clear to almost everyone, even the most myopic of persons, that Iraq possessed no weapons of mass destruction program and was nowhere near the development of any nuclear weapons.

And as is made clear by the information that is possessed in these Downing Street memos, other countries were much more dangerous, including Libya, Iran, and North Korea, because they were much closer to developing nuclear weapons than was Iraq, which had essentially abandoned all of its large-scale weapons programs in 1991. That information had been made clear as a result of investigations which were carried out by the International Atomic Energy Agency and by weapons inspections teams, two of them in fact from the United States. They found no evidence of any weapons of mass destruction.

So information from the administration about these Downing Street memos is essential. Why the Committee on International Relations defeated that resolution today remains to be seen, but we will be back. We will be