intelligence issues in the House. On the Senate Intelligence Committee, he makes great contributions. I appreciate and second what he has said.

SENATE INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, it is interesting today that some of our colleagues are on the floor talking about the wonderful expose Ambassador Joe Wilson made. Joe Wilson and his wife have become quite a cause celebre. He has had 30 appearances, he is writing books and, oh, yes, now he is on the Web site of Senator KERRY. The Web site is ironically entitled ''RestoreHonesty.com.''

On that Web site, Mr. Wilson said:

. . . this President misled the nation in his State of the Union Address.

Then he goes on to say:

They tried to intimidate me and others who were willing to speak up and tell the truth. . . . I was courageous to speak truth to the power of the Bush White House. . . .

George Bush's Administration has betrayed our trust—I know that personally.

That is quite an indictment. It goes along with quite a few other points.

I understand on the first page of his book—I did not buy it and I do not intend to. I was told that three times on page 7 he said President Bush lied. Why did he do that? It was all because of 16 words in the State of the Union Address on January 28, 2003.

I addressed this issue last week in this body, and I think I raised some very serious questions about the veracity of Ambassador Wilson's suggestions. I was given the opportunity last night on the Jim Lehrer PBS ''NewsHour'' to have a discussion with Mr. Wilson. Margaret Warner was the interviewer. Unlike many of the other sound-bite discussions on TV these days, we had a full 10 minutes. It was a very interesting discussion because I had the opportunity to make my points, and Mr. Wilson made his points. I commend PBS for giving us the opportunity.

What I cited when the interviewer asked me about my contentions that Mr. Wilson was not truthful was I noted that the basis of his charge and the basis of so much nonsense we have seen disseminated in the press and repeated by some of my colleagues on this floor and covered in scam political pieces being put out by friends of the Democratic nominee that President Bush lied was totally debunked, among other things, by the finding of Lord Butler's commission in the United Kingdom.

He said in paragraph 499 of the report released last week:

We conclude that on the basis of intelligence estimates at the time covering both Niger and the Democratic Republic of Congo, the statements on Iraqi attempts to buy uranium from Africa in the Government's dossier and by the Prime Minister and the House of Commons were well-founded.

This is the important point. This is the examination of British intelligence:

By extension, we conclude also that the statement in President Bush's State of the Union Address of January 28, 2003, ''The British Government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa'' was well-founded.

Mr. President, the British went back and looked at it, and they said what President Bush said about British intelligence was well-founded. He says:

The British Government had intelligence from several different sources indicating that this visit was for the purpose of acquiring uranium.

Now, we get a little bit more of that. Actually, the one piece of information that Ambassador Joe Wilson brought back from his trip to Niger in February-March of 2003—the only useful data he brought back was the fact that the Prime Minister of Niger told him the Iraqi delegation met with him in 1999 to begin discussions to establish commercial contacts. What do you think they wanted to import from Niger? Well, there are a couple of choices. Niger's second and third largest exports are mung beans and goats. Niger's largest export—three-quarters—is yellowcake uranium. The Prime Minister reasonably concluded that they were probably seeking yellowcake uranium. There is no evidence they actually purchased it. It was not conclusive. There was a forged document about purchases that was not truthful, but that does not debunk or in any way take away from the fact that President Bush was correct, and the British intelligence is still correct in saying that Iraq was seeking uranium from Africa.

Based on that, and since Ambassador Wilson, who came back finding only that there had been one contact, and that contact, according to most analysts, suggested there was even more of a basis for the conclusion in the State of the Union Address—he came back and debunked the whole thing, made it a lie.

The conclusion, unanimously reached in the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, after over a year of investigation, 15,000 documents reviewed, over 200 interviews, signed on by all members of the committee, including Senator JOHN EDWARDS, says in conclusion 12:

It was reasonable for analysts to assess that Iraq may have been seeking uranium from Africa based upon Central Intelligence Agency reporting and other available intelligence.

Conclusion 13 says:

The report on the former ambassador's trip to Niger, disseminated in March 2002, did not change any analyst's assessment of the Iraq-Niger uranium deal. For most analysts, the information in the report lent more credibility to the original Central Intelligence Agency reports on the uranium deal.

You talk about thoroughly debunking the debunker. Our staff asked Mr. Wilson how he knew some of the things he was stating publicly with such confidence. On at least two occasions, he admitted he had no direct knowledge to support some of his claims, and he was either drawing on unrelated past experience or no information at all. For example, when they asked him specifically how he knew the intelligence community had rejected the possibility of a Niger uranium deal, or even exploration for a deal, as he wrote in his book, he told the committee his assertion may have involved a ''little literary flare.''

That is a heck of a thing to call a whopping lie, a ''little literary flare.'' Back home, we call that a fraud and a hoax. Now, I suggest to Mr. Wilson once again that he owes a public apology to the President and the Vice President. By the way, he said he knew the Vice President knew of his report. The Vice President did not get his report. There is no evidence of that. If he had, it would have been with the analysts' conclusion that his report probably made it more likely and not less likely that Iraq was seeking uranium from Niger. Anyhow, he stood by it.

I tell you, the whole premise of this smear campaign that was started by Ambassador Wilson to call the President a liar has been totally debunked by the British intelligence report, by Lord Butler, and by our own Senate Intelligence Committee's unanimous report.

By the way, we have been hearing a lot—and I understand we are going to hear a lot more—about Ambassador Wilson's wife. Let me deal with that. In our report, we found good evidence that she had actually made recommendations to the CIA to send her husband to Niger. On page 39 of the Intelligence Committee report, we state:

The former Ambassador had traveled previously to Niger on the CIA's behalf. The former ambassador was selected for the 1999 trip after his wife mentioned to her supervisors that her husband was planning a business trip to Niger in the near future and might be willing to use his contacts in the region.

Also, on page 39:

. . . interviews and documents provided to the Committee indicate that his wife, a CPD employee, suggested his name for the trip. The CPD {} reports officer told Committee staff that . . . . On February 19, 2002, CPD hosted a meeting with [Mr. Wilson], intelligence analysts from both the CIA and INR, and several individuals from the DO's Africa and CPD divisions. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the merits of [sending the Ambassador]. . . . The INR analyst's notes indicate that the meeting was apparently convened by the former ambassador's wife, who had the idea to dispatch him to use his contacts to sort out the Iraq-Niger uranium issue. She left after she set it up, but she managed to get the job done.

But we didn't stop there. Even though Mr. Wilson had angrily denied and used barnyard expletives in Time magazine to say that his wife had nothing to do with the trip to Africa, and Joshua Marshall quoted him saying that it defies logic that his wife sent him, the most compelling answers of all that his wife gave to our staff when interviewed in January 2004, 6 months after the Wilson hoax began, and the

months and months of charges and Joe Wilson's fierce denials that his wife had anything to do with his selection—let me repeat. Ambassador Wilson angrily said his wife had nothing to do with his trip to Africa.

> That is bull [expletive]. That is absolutely not the case.

That is what Wilson told Time magazine on July 17, 2003.

So he had denied it. What did she say? Did she deny it? Six months after she heard her husband angrily denying it and knowing what he had been saying for months and what he wrote in his book, I had staff go back and see what she said when asked about this issue. Her quote was:

> I honestly do not recall if I suggested it to my boss. . . .

That is what she said. That is from the transcript. Frankly, I think that is very telling. She doesn't recall if she suggested it to her boss after 6 months, and her husband has been out there saying she had nothing to do with it. Are you kidding? Just who is the Ambassador's source for all of his denials? Yet 6 months later she cannot remember if she suggested it to her boss?

I know the occupant of the chair has interviewed some witnesses and tried some cases. When you get a person who has knowledge that is right on point, and it is an issue that has been the focus of great discussion for months and you ask them, Did you, in fact, say what the other witnesses said, you can do two things: Say, absolutely not, I didn't say it. But if that is not true, you have all these other witnesses who said you did. So what do you say? You say: I honestly do not recall.

I think that leaves us pretty clearly in the camp of saying that what the analysts and others said the February 12 memo she prepared means, and that is that she was the one who proposed sending her husband to Iraq.

Joe Wilson said that the CIA said to a couple of reporters who asked about that—and this is from last night—that she did not recommend her husband to undertake the Niger assignment. He stated that the officers who did ask him to check the uranium story were aware of who he was married to, which is not surprising; she did not recommend her husband.

Well, Ambassador Wilson may have found some people who were willing to say that, but we sent this whole report to the CIA. They fact-checked the whole thing. We even set out the facts that she recommended sending her husband. The CIA commented on almost everything that we had in the report. It was a lengthy report. It took them a long time. Not one comment, not one change, in the findings in our report that she was the one who recommended him to go.

That has been discussed at great length on the floor by people who are charging that somehow there was a criminal conspiracy to ''out'' Ambassador Wilson's wife in retaliation.

I believe the Wall Street Journal has been doing a very interesting analysis of this, and I ask unanimous consent that yesterday's Wall Street Journal article ''Mr. Wilson's Defense,'' be printed in the RECORD after my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BOND. In fact, it was such a traumatic experience to have Mr. Wilson's wife identified that I saw their pictures in the paper. They posed for Vanity Fair in front of the White House. It must have been a crushing blow to them to have her identity publicly disclosed. So they had to get on the cover and make 30 appearances? And I trust his book sales are going well. Maybe he will even have a movie contract.

Anybody who reads the Kerry Web site, listens to his interviews, or goes to a movie should know that his whole thesis is a fraud and a hoax.

Regrettably, that is merely a continuation of a plan that we have seen implemented by opponents of President Bush and Vice President CHENEY.

I joined the Intelligence Committee in January of 2003 because I realized that intelligence is absolutely critical in the war on terrorism. We cannot stop terrorism by retaliating against suicide bombers. We cannot prosecute them. We cannot find enough to identify them, much less prosecute them. So I joined the Intelligence Committee.

Clearly, we used to have a history that politics stops at the water's edge. Well, I understood that politics stopped at the entrance to the Intelligence Committee, but it has not been that way.

There are those in the Intelligence Committee on the other side who want to use the Intelligence Committee as a vehicle not to improve our intelligence, not to find out what the weaknesses are and how to build a stronger case, but to attack the President. That is what this November 2003 minority staff memo says: Here are our options under the rules and we have identified the best approach. Our plan is as follows: One, pull the majority along as far as we can on issues that may lead to major new disclosures regarding improper or questionable conduct by the administration. And they certainly they have done it.

Two, essentially prepare Democratic additional views to attach to any interim or final reports, and we intend to take full advantage of it. They have done that, and either today or tomorrow I will discuss the politicization in those views.

They also go on to say: We will identify the most exaggerated claims and contrast them with the intelligence estimates that have since been declassified.

Well, tough luck, guys. There were no exaggerated claims, nothing to contrast with the intelligence estimates. In fact, the big claim that they make that the administration was pressuring analysts to change their conclusion has been debunked. It has been debunked thoroughly and repeatedly throughout, and I have described this on the floor numerous times.

The conclusions are there was no pressure to change conclusions on weapons of mass destruction or on terrorism. We found in the conclusions that the Vice President's visits and questions to CIA were not only not pressuring to change the views but were expected.

One of the problems we find is that there is not enough questioning by policy users. By the way, one of the things they are attacking and one of the things that some of my colleagues have attacked is the office of Doug Feith, special policy—a two- or three-man operation—had a Defense Intelligence Agency analyst working with him. They reviewed for the Department of Defense the Secretary of Defense, the intelligence estimates they had, and they questioned them. That is what they should have done.

Somehow this office is being called unlawful by one of my colleagues. How bizarre. That is so far beyond the pale it is bizarre to say it is unlawful for a DIA agent working for the Secretary of Defense to question the CIA. Come on, gang. We need the CIA and the DIA to interact, get rid of group think, challenge those assessments.

Unfortunately, this attack on Doug Feith in the Office of Special Projects has heavy overtones of anti-Semitism. We can see the charges. They talk about the ''neocons'' who are warping our intelligence. Unfortunately, that is their code word for Jewish public servants, and I believe that is an unacceptable way to go about challenging policy. It is not a fruitful endeavor.

Going back to the political memo of 2003, as I said, they wanted to contrast the views. They also said:

> Once we identify solid leads the majority does not want to pursue, we could attract more coverage and have greater credibility in that contact than one in which we simply launch an independent investigation based on principled but vague notions regarding the ''use'' of intelligence.

Well, they are doing that because they are saying they want to go back and investigate Doug Feith's office. They had no findings of anything that Mr. Feith did was illegal, unlawful, or unwarranted pressure, but they are choosing to attack him because he represents the ''neocons.'' I think my colleagues get what I mean.

They go on to say:

> In the meantime, even without a specifically authorized independent investigation, we continue to act independently when we encounter foot-dragging on the part of the majority.

They say, in summary, that intelligence issues are clearly secondary to the public's concern regarding the insurgency in Iraq. Yet we have an important role to play in revealing the misleading, if not flagrantly dishonest, methods and motives of the senior administration officials who made the

case for a unilateral preemptive war. The approach outlined above seems to offer the best prospect for exposing the administration's dubious motives and methods.

That was the game plan that some of my colleagues took into this investigation of pre-Iraq war intelligence. That is deeply disappointing—disgusting, I would say—to say this is the game plan being played out on the floor to politicize intelligence.

Their conclusions about ''misleading,'' about ''pressure,'' unfortunately, are not supported by the facts. There was exhaustive examination and interviews. Chairman ROBERTS invited in anybody who claimed to know about improper pressure on the analysts and nobody could come forward with anything. Nobody could come forward with any. No wrongdoing by Doug Feith, but they are still going at it.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are not troubled by an absence of fact. They have a political jihad. They have their crusade. They have sold, to too many people, the base canard that President Bush and Vice President CHENEY were not telling the truth when, in fact, the whole basis of that charge was a fraud and a hoax.

As my colleague from Georgia said, we need to improve the intelligence operations. We have a lot of work to do. But we also have some work to do in the Congress, and that is to get over attempting to use the Intelligence Committee and the intelligence community as a political weapon to attack our opponents.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 20, 2004]

MR. WILSON'S DEFENSE

After U.S. and British intelligence reports exposed his falsehoods in the last 10 days, Joe Wilson is finally defending himself. We're therefore glad to return to this story one more time, because there are some larger lessons here about the law, and for the Beltway media and Bush White House.

Mr. Wilson's defense, in essence, is that the ''Republican-written'' Senate Intelligence Committee report is a partisan hatchet job. We could forgive people for being taken in by this, considering the way the Committee's ranking Democrat, Jay Rockefeller, has been spinning it over the past week. But the fact is that the three most damning conclusions are contained not in Chairman Pat Roberts's ''Additional Views,'' but in the main body of the report approved by Mr. Rockefeller and seven other Democrats.

Number one: The winner of last year's Award for Truth Telling from the Nation magazine foundation didn't tell the truth when he wrote that his wife, CIA officer Valerie Plame, ''had nothing to do with'' his selection for the Niger mission. Mr. Wilson is now pretending there is some kind of important distinction between whether she ''recommended'' or ''proposed'' him for the trip.

Mr. Wilson had been denying any involvement at all on Ms. Plame's part, in order to suggest that her identity was disclosed by a still-unknown Administration official out of pure malice. If instead an Administration official cited nepotism truthfully in order to explain the oddity of Mr. Wilson's selection for the Niger mission, then there was no underlying crime. Motive is crucial under the controlling statute.

The 1982 Intelligence Identities Protection Act was written in the wake of the Philip Agee scandal to protect the CIA from deliberate subversion, not to protect the identities of agents and their spouses who choose to enter into a national political debate. In short, the entire leak probe now looks like a familiar Beltway case of criminalizing political differences. Special Prosecutor Patrick Fitzgerald should fold up his tent.

Number two: Joe Wilson didn't tell the truth about how he supposedly came to realize that it was ''highly doubtful'' there was anything to the story he'd been sent to Niger to investigate. He told everyone that he'd recognized as obvious forgeries the documents purporting to show an Iraq-Niger uranium deal. But the forged documents to which he referred didn't reach U.S. intelligence until eight months after his trip. Mr. Wilson has said that he ''misspoke''—multiple times, apparently—on this issue.

Number three: Joe Wilson was also not telling the truth when he said that his final report to the CIA had ''debunked'' the Niger story. The Senate Intelligence report—again, the *bipartisan* portion of it—says Mr. Wilson's debrief was interpreted as providing ''some confirmation of foreign government service reporting'' that Iraq had sought uranium in Niger. That's because Niger's former Prime Minister had told Mr. Wilson he interpreted a 1999 visit from an Iraqi trade delegation as showing an interest in uranium.

This is a remarkable record of falsehood. We'll let our readers judge if they think Mr. Wilson was deliberately wrong, and therefore can be said to have ''lied.'' We certainly know what critics would say if President Bush had been caught saying such things. But in any event, we'd think that the news outlets that broadcast Mr. Wilson's story over the past year would want to retrace their own missteps.

Mr. Wilson made three separate appearances on NBC's ''Meet the Press,'' according to the Weekly Standard. New York Times columnist Nick Kristof first brought the still anonymous Niger envoy to public attention in May 2003, so he too must feel burned by his source. Alone among major sellers of the Wilson story, the Washington Post has done an admirable job so far of correcting the record.

Also remarkable is that the views of former CIA employee Larry Johnson continue to be cited anywhere on this and related issues. Mr. Johnson was certain last October that the disclosure of Ms. Plame's identity was a purely ''political attack,'' now disproven. He is also a friend of Ms. Plame and the author of a summer 2001 op-ed titled ''The Declining Terrorist Threat.'' You'd think reporters would at least quote him with a political warning label.

The final canard advanced by Mr. Wilson's defenders is that our own recent editorials and other criticism was somehow ''orchestrated.'' Well, by whom? Certainly not by the same White House that has been all too silent about this entire episode, in large part because it prematurely apologized last year for the ''16 words'' in a State of the Union address that have now been declared ''well-founded'' by Lord Butler's inquiry in Britain. If Mr. Bush ends up losing the election over Iraq, it won't be because he oversold the case for war but because he's sometimes appeared to have lost confidence in the cause.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. How much time do we have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 4½ minutes remaining.

SENATE STANDARD OF MEASUREMENT

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, of course we all have spent a good deal of time concerned about the direction we are taking here, the number of things we are accomplishing, the fact that many of the things we would like to do have not been accomplished. I think that is a legitimate concern. We ought to try to deal with some of those issues.

On the other hand, there have been a number of things done, of course. I think we have had the most obstruction in the movement here that we have seen in many years. Many important issues have been stopped, have been obstructed, frankly, because our friends on the other side of the aisle did not want to go forward with these issues, or wanted to hold them up where they could add all kinds of unrelated amendments to them.

The Class Action Fairness Act, of course, was blocked. The fairness in asbestos injury resolution was blocked. The Patients First Act, the energy policy—probably one of the most important issues we could have dealt with this entire year is still there. Charity aid, recovery, and empowerment legislation, which gave strength to do things in the private sector, we were unable to do that; Personal Responsibility, Work, and Family Promotion Act; workforce investment; five judges were held up simply for the purpose of holding them up.

It is too bad. It is something we need to change. We ought to be concerned here with issues, not politics, not Kerry, not Bush, but talk about what the issues are here and the things we ought to be doing. Politics, of course, is part of our lives, but so is accomplishing something in the legislature.

We have done some things. The Omnibus appropriations bill for this fiscal year was passed this year. It was delayed but nevertheless passed. The Pension Stability Act had to do with changing the requirements for putting money into pensions. That made that better. The accountability, flexibility and efficiency—the transportation bill—again, one of the most important bills we could possibly pass, we passed it in the Senate but, unfortunately, it is still hung up in conference. The Internet bill which allows for the moratorium of taxation on the Internet, a good thing, was passed by the Senate.

The Jumpstart Our Business Strength Act, of course, is one that is pending and ready to go, I hope, to the conference committee. This is the one that the WTO had the penalties on exports from the United States and we had a 3-percent reduction for those that exported goods and that gave us a penalty. Now we are changing that. There is also a great deal in that bill with regard to encouraging the economy to grow.

So we have done a number of things. We have done some things to reduce