If the gentleman will yield, there is some additional

information he may be interested in that I

have read in press accounts. Again, these are press accounts because

our government to date has not shared this information with the public;

but not only did this administration allow these people to leave

without being fully interrogated by the FBI but the press accounts that

we have read stated that while everybody else was grounded from

traveling, and we know how many people had to drive across America to

get home for a week or so after September 11, that this administration

actually cleared a special jet that flew around the country as one of

the only few planes flying in America at that time to pick up members

of the bin Laden family to shepherd them out of this country as soon as

possible. So not only did we not fully question these folks, we

actually accommodated them flying around while John Q. Citizen could

not fly himself to get from Dubuque back to Seattle.

Let me also indicate that to my knowledge, and again we do not have

full information from our administration to date, but to our knowledge

these people have never been interrogated by the FBI, even today, about

what happened. And now we have a war in Iraq, rather than adequate

research and interrogation of Saudi citizens today as to what happened

on September 11.

I feel very strongly that these are just some of the

questions that our government has a duty to answer. One of the reasons

I feel so strongly about that is that this afternoon, I had a very

painful discussion with a family in Bremerton, Washington, with whom I

have been working for about a week or two now whose son and husband has

been missing in Iraq, a soldier in Iraq. I have been working with this

family to try to do what we could to assuage their concerns and make

sure that we were doing everything we could to bring him home. Today I

had to talk with that family, and they found out this morning that

their son and husband would never be returning to them.

Unfortunately, all of us probably in every district have

had these tough times with families.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, because he is

bringing up moral authority, which is very important; and we were

talking about the families we have been working with who have lost

their sons and daughters in Iraq, and there is a moral obligation by

the United States Government to come forward and answer some of these

questions that we have been asking tonight. And the gentleman mentioned

something about reading and some folks may find some reading material

of interest. I want to refer to people about a moral question that our

government owes to the American people, and that is the question of how

this war was started based on what, according to Mr. Kay, was a false

premise.

The people of this country, the families who have service people

serving in Iraq, those who have lost members of their families, they

deserve a clear, cogent, and complete answer of how a war was started

based on a false premise about what the status of weapons was in Iraq.

And the gentleman mentioned things he was reading. I read something

extremely disturbing to me this weekend. It was printed in the Knight

Ridder newspapers. I read it in the Seattle Times February 10, an

article entitled ``Doubts and Dissent Removed from Public Report on

Iraq. Secret version President Bush received was more cautious about

threat.''

We know at this point, according to Mr. Kay, our expert in the field

and now even according to the President apparently, that the premise

that gave rise to this war was false about the status of weapons of

mass destruction in Iraq. And that is disturbing enough. It is it

disturbing for our soldiers and sailors. It is disturbing of our

standing in the world, starting a war on a false premise. But this

article was more disturbing to me because the conclusion and premise of

this article was not only was this premise false but that

the Government of the United States of America in a sense distorted in

significant ways the nature of intelligence that it had available to it

before the war started. For instance, and again this is in the

newspaper, and I cannot vouch for its authenticity. It makes reference

to some intelligence reports. This is not coming from myself. It is

coming from the Seattle Times and the Knight Ridder newspaper. But they

made reference to a statement essentially by the President that there

is no doubt, and that is a quote from this President, that the

President of the United States looked at the American people and said

there is no doubt, no doubt, that Iraq had some of the most lethal

weapons systems devised by man before this war started.

But this article disclosed that the intelligence reports given to the

President of the United States showed there was tremendous doubt about

this situation. And I will quote from this article: ``Whereas the

President of the United States was essentially saying there is no doubt

that Iraq had reconstituted, in the words of the Vice President, a

nuclear program.'' Listen to what the intelligence report said,

according to this article, that was given to the President of the

United States. This was an intelligence report prepared by the State

Department's intelligence arm, which is called the Bureau of

Intelligence and Research, known as the INR.

This is a quote. That report said ``the activities we have detected

do not, however, add up to a compelling case that Iraq is currently

pursuing what INR would consider to be an integrated and comprehensive

approach to acquire nuclear weapons. Iraq may be doing so, but INR

considers the available evidence inadequate to support such a

judgment.'' The report goes on to say, ``INR is unwilling to project a

timeline for the completion of activities it does not now see

happening.''

So while the President of the United States, the leader of the free

world, was telling the world and American soldiers and sailors and

citizens that there was no doubt that this country had a meaningful,

real, and contemporaneous nuclear program, our own intelligence

services, at least one of them, was telling him they did not think so.

This was not told to the American people. And even if one believes

today that this war was totally justified based on the civil rights of

the Iraqi citizens, and I respect people who have that view, even if

one believes that, it is a moral wrong not to share this information

with the American people and the U.S. Congress when this debate is

going on.

Mr. Speaker, let me make a point, because I think it is

important. It is not just this nuclear threat. As the gentlemen know,

Condoleezza Rice made repeated references to the mushroom cloud, which

is a most disturbing image to all of us having suffered through

September 11, and a real potential threat from Iran and North Korea.

But it is not just the nuclear threat, but the American people were not

given the full scoop in this regard.

The gentlemen will recall when the President and others made repeated

references to the unmanned aerial vehicles that they told us was a

threat to the continental United States, that Iraq could fly over

American cities and spray biological material over the United States

and none of us can always ever eliminate any threat. Today somebody may

be planning to do that today as we speak. I do not want to be

Pollyanna-ish about this, but the President told us that our

intelligence services were telling us that was going on.

According to this article, let me tell the gentlemen what the United

States Air Force was telling the President of the United States. What

it said was: ``The Air Force does not agree that Iraq is developing

UAVs, unmanned aerial vehicles, primarily intended to be delivery

platforms for chemical and biological warfare, CBW agents. The small

size of Iraq's new UAV strongly suggests a primary role of

reconnaissance, although CBW delivery is an inherent capability.'' We

were told that Iraq was developing these weapons that could fly over

Philadelphia and spray biological and anthrax over it when the Air

Force was telling the President of the United States they did not

believe that was the case.

Let me finish one more point. During our national debate, I respected

the President of the United States' statement that Saddam Hussein was a

tyrant and a thug and was massively abusive to his own people, and

perhaps he rightfully argued that he believed preemptive action was

appropriate. That is an argument we would respect and listen to. But

during this national debate, before this President sent our citizens to

die in the sands of Iraq, he did not owe us 30 percent of the truth. He

did not owe us 75 percent of the truth. He owed us the whole truth and

nothing but the truth. Hans Blix, who was defamed mightily by this

administration prior to this war, I think said it best when he got this

information. He said, ``We deserve more than what a car salesman might

give.

We deserve the whole truth.''

If these reports are accurate, again, I have not seen these, but I

read about them in the newspaper, if these reports are accurate, we

need to get to the bottom of what happened here. That is why this

commission that the President has appointed needs to take it upon

itself not only to look at the bureaucracy at the Central Intelligence

Agency, but they need to know why the President of the United States

and his administration was not entirely forthcoming about the

intelligence in this regard.