

We also should remember we have always underestimated the progress that Saddam Hussein has been able to make in the development of weapons of mass destruction . . .

The Senator from West Virginia continues:

Saddam's existing biological and chemical weapons capabilities pose real threats to America today, tomorrow. Saddam has used chemical weapons before, both against Iraq's enemies and against his own people . . . At the end of the day, we cannot let the security of the American people rest in the hands of somebody whose track record gives us every reason to fear that he is prepared to use the weapons he has used against his enemies before . . .

There has been some debate over how "imminent" a threat Iraq poses. I do believe Iraq poses an imminent threat. I also believe after September 11, that question is increasingly outdated. It is in the nature of these weapons that he has and the way they are targeted against civilian populations, that the documented capability and demonstrated intent may be the only warning we get. To insist on further evidence could put some of our fellow Americans at risk. Can we afford to take that chance? I do not think we can.

That was Senator ROCKFELLER back in 2002. I agree with what he said. Senator ROCKFELLER's assessment was a reasonable judgment at the time given Hussein's belligerence, his refusal to open his country to weapons inspectors, decades of intelligence collection, and the fact that not a single international intelligence agency believed that Iraq did not have WMD. Indeed, what we have found in Iraq indicates that Hussein maintained the capacity to produce chemical and biological weapons, even if he had destroyed or shipped out of country his stockpiles of WMD.

Senator ROCKFELLER is not the only democrat to change his tune. Senator JOHN KERRY, with Senator EDWARDS at his side, told the New York Times over the weekend that President Bush "certainly misled America about nuclear involvement, and he misled America about the types of weapons that were there, and he misled America about how the would go about using the authority he was given."

But in March of 1998, the Senator from Massachusetts declared on the Senate floor that Iraq continued clandestinely to maintain its WMD stockpiles and programs. This is what he said in 1998.

We do know that he had them [WMD] in his inventory, and the means of delivering them. We do know that his chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons development programs were proceeding with his active support.

We have evidence . . . that despite his pledges at the conclusion of the war that no further work would be done in these weapons of mass destruction programs, and that all prior work and weapons that resulted from it would be destroyed, this work has continued illegally and covertly.

And, Mr. President, We have every reason to believe that Saddam Hussein will continue to do everything in his power to further develop weapons of mass destruction and the ability to deliver those weapons, and that he will use those weapons without concern or pangs of conscience if ever and when-

ever his own calculations persuade him in is in his interests to do so . . .

. . . The United States must take every feasible step to lead the world to remove this unacceptable threat.

I have to ask: How can Senator KERRY claim he was misled by the current President into believing precisely the allegations he made back in 1998, when President Bush was Governor Bush?

Those who hold Senator KERRY's view would have you believe that President Bush invented these allegations and forced this war upon an unwilling Congress. Far from it.

Senator EDWARDS noted in 2002:

As a member of the Senate Intelligence Committee, I firmly believe that the issue of Iraq is not about politics. It's about national security. We know that for at least 20 years, Saddam Hussein has aggressively and obsessively sought weapons of mass destruction through every means available.

We know that he has chemical and biological weapons today . . . I believe that Saddam Hussein's Iraqi regime represents a clear threat to the United States, to our allies, to our interest around the world, and to the values of freedom and democracy we hold dear.

Now, I find it troubling that neither Senator KERRY, nor his running mate seems to recall his own prior assessments of the threats posed by the Hussein regime.

I believe America is better off with Hussein gone, and I know the Iraqis are happy with his ouster and increasingly optimistic about their future. Unfortunately, some here in the Senate don't share their optimism.

Equally perplexing is a partisan view of this United States economy. Just as partisans see no threat from Iraq now when they call it a threat a few years back, they see a Great Depression now when they would have called it a great recovery a few years back.

They claim signs of this Great Depression are all around. But the cold, hard, inconvenient fact for their theory is that we have added 1.3 million jobs so far this year. The unemployment rate has been dropping for a year, to 5.6 percent today. That is below the average of the 1970s, the 1980s, and the 1990s, but the naysayers read it as proof of an economic collapse.

They point to all sorts of signs of weakness in our economy, such as strongest annual growth in 20 years, low mortgage rates, low inflation rates and the highest productivity rates in half a century. The stock market has "crashed" upward by 40 percent in the last 2 years. NASDAQ has had a 70 percent gain! The "human costs" of this Great Depression are apparent, such as having the highest homeownership rate in United States history.

This is the new speak of the Great Depression.

We don't have a depression; what we have is political spin. We have political leaders who are trying to convince the American people that the economy is bad, that we have not gotten over the 2001 recession, the terrorist attacks of

9/11, the corporate scandals, or the uncertainties of war.

Yet the facts say we are well on our way, and we won't rest until every American who wants a job, has a job.

I understand the spin game in Washington. We can spin a lot of things in Washington, but a weak economy can't be spun as a strong one, and a strong economy can't be twisted as a weak one.

Ant I can only hope my friends have not dizzied themselves so much that they cannot separate reality from politics or understand the difference between a recovery and a depression. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank the deputy majority leader for his excellent comments. As a member of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, I congratulate him on his very thorough and thoughtful discussion of the work of the Intelligence Committee.

Last week, as we all recall, the committee released a remarkable report unanimously supported by the Democrat and Republican members of the committee. However, despite the findings of fact, which took a year of interviews by staff of over 200 people reviewing 15,000 documents, the campaign continues to attempt to politicize this process perfectly consistent with the political strategy memo uncovered last November designed by minority staff to show how the Intelligence Committee could be manipulated in order to hamper the President and his administration during the election year. The fact this is a time of war is apparently insufficient justification for leaving politics at the water's edge.

No rule of law should ever stifle honest debate, discourse, or dissent in this country, but somewhere public leaders can recognize self-discipline can be a benefit to our troops and our Nation. I saw a report recently that in the 1944 election, as Republican candidate Thomas Dewey was set to blame President Roosevelt for what transpired at Pearl Harbor, General Marshall appealed to Dewey, arguing that the Nation should be united against the real enemy. Dewey acted on behalf of the country. I guess times were different then.

In this country, we need to make sure our service men and women understand that while we can have our debate, we can demonstrate more disdain for the enemy than we have for the opposition party.

Since Friday, we have heard the suggestions that the efforts of our troops to depose Saddam Hussein and set the long-term stage for peace and democracy in the most dangerous region in the world was not—yes, not—warranted. Besides being wrong, what kind

of horrible message is this to send our troops and their families, not to mention the enemy, whose only hope is to win in Washington what they cannot win from our troops on the battlefield?

If it is the will of this body that we cut and run, then let's debate and vote on it. Maybe we need a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, in any case, to send a message to our troops and the enemy that we intend to see this through. If we agree on it, as I believe we do, we should let our troops do what they are doing, and we should spend our time supporting their efforts, not retracting from their mission.

Of course, we should be focused on the need to provide better intelligence, but some of us have been saying that since the 1970s when our intelligence collection was destroyed. Some of us had said that when we failed to predict the Iraqi Army would amass on the Kuwaiti border and when intelligence failed to predict they would cross over and overtake Kuwait and threaten Saudi Arabia. Some of us said that when we learned the estimates of Saddam Hussein's nuclear capability were not 5 to 10 years in the future but less than 1 year. All we need to know about the quality of intelligence in the region is to know we did not have one single agent on the ground.

As said in today's editorial in Investor's Business Daily, intelligence spending was cut, the number of spies sharply dropped, so sharply, in fact, that after 9/11 the CIA had to create a 5-year plan to undo the damage. During President Clinton's two terms, the number of spies fell an estimated 20 percent, the budget tumbled by some estimates as much as 30 percent—it is classified—spy satellites got taken down, experienced analysts got fired.

Well, much has been said of the pressure that policymakers allegedly put on the intelligence community to get hard answers to important questions. We just heard that repeated in the Chamber. They are talking about pressure to change the analysis. Let's go back to what the bipartisan committee unanimously concluded.

Conclusion No. 11.

Several of the allegations of pressure on the intelligence community analysts involved repeated questioning. The committee—

That is the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence—

believes that the intelligence community analysts should expect difficult and repeated questions regarding threat information. Just as the post-9/11 environment lowered the intelligence community's reporting threshold, it has also affected the intensity with which policymakers will review and question threat information.

With respect to the Vice President, conclusion No. 84:

The committee found no evidence that the Vice President's visits to the Central Intelligence Agency were attempts to pressure analysts, were perceived as intended to pressure analysts by those who participated in the briefings on Iraq's weapons of mass destruction programs or did pressure analysts to change their conclusions.

Conclusion No. 102:

The committee found that none of the analysts or other people interviewed by the committee said they were pressured to change their conclusions related to Iraq's links to terrorism.

Now, talking to the people who work in the intelligence community, they are expected to get tough questions. They need to be able to defend what they have produced, and a good policymaker will challenge them not to change the evidence, and there was no evidence—zip, zero, none—of pressure to change.

I ought to mention Ambassador Wilson's name was raised. The committee also found that his so-called review was inadequate and did not conclusively determine that there was not an effort—in fact, some analysts were led to conclude from what he brought back that it was more likely that Iraq was trying to get uranium from Africa, and I would refer my colleagues to Chairman ROBERTS' additional views.

The partisan suggestions continue nevertheless, as administration officials are accused of making the same charges against Saddam's regime as the Senators themselves made in 1998 and during the debate for war which was overwhelmingly adopted in 2002. Candidates accuse our President and Vice President of having little swing with our so-called allies. Yet somehow they must have had enough swing to intimidate the English, French, Swiss, German, U.N. and Russian intelligence agencies to fall for the same WMD charge. This notion did not survive investigative scrutiny, and it does not survive common sense. Furthermore, it is a gross insult to analysts in the intelligence community to suggest they conform their views to the pleasure of policymakers.

Again, I would draw the attention of my colleagues to yesterday's Wall Street Journal editorial on this subject, which says something that I said in the Chamber last Friday. A few apologies would seem to be in order. I think apologies are owed to the Vice President and to the administration. And yet we are still continuing to hear the same misguided, unsubstantiated charges made. Some Senators trying to win the White House away are criticizing the President for looking at the same intelligence they did and coming to the same conclusion they did. Is political victory more important than victory in Iraq? Has political victory become so important that some believe it necessary to divide America with this blame game while their sons and daughters are risking their lives abroad? If we are going to blame someone, I recommend we all agree to start with Saddam and bin Laden. Have we forgotten who the real enemy of peace, democracy, and humanity really is?

Recall what President Clinton said who saw the intelligence in 1998. President Clinton said:

The fact is that so long as Saddam remains in power, he threatens the well-being of his

people, the peace of this region, the security of the world. The best way to end that threat once and for all is with the new Iraqi Government, a government ready to live in peace with its neighbors, a government that respects the rights of its people. Saddam will strike again at his neighbors and he will make war on his own people, and mark my words, he will develop weapons of mass destruction. He will deploy them and he will use them.

My colleague, the deputy majority leader from Kentucky, has already pointed out the words of the Senators in this body, and I agree with him and I endorse that reference. But as we focus to the point of obsession on intelligence—and we must make it better if we are to stop future acts of terror—we cannot leave behind our own personal intelligence. We do not exist to swallow whole what the intelligence community feeds us. Sometimes they are wrong, sometimes lazy, but most of the time they work tirelessly under dangerous conditions and are dead right, and other times their guesses, which is much of what intelligence is all about, may not be as good as ours. But in the case of Saddam, who in this body needed a CIA report to understand that the man and his despicable sons set to lead Iraq through the first half of the new century? Ordinary citizens need not have a security clearance but need only to have watched or read the news over the previous 20 years.

What don't we know about this man's evil intention, his hatred for the U.S., his willingness not only to pursue but use weapons of mass destruction? Is his track record of insanity meaningless?

By the time a crazed maniac invades two foreign countries, defies repeatedly the mandates of the U.N., fires missiles at Israel, fires missiles at our patrol aircraft, pays suicide bombers to blow up innocent women and children, not only builds and stockpiles weapons of mass destruction but uses them, fills mass graves by the tens of thousands, attempts to assassinate our former President, and suggests that perhaps his only regret in 1990 was not waiting a few more months so he would have the nuclear capability to confront our troops, what else do we really need to know about this man? Do we really need the CIA to introduce Saddam to the Senate? Can it be true that there is this signal that unless WMD are found, Saddam is somehow acquitted? Look at the thousands and thousands of people he killed with the WMD.

In retrospect, many things are more clear, including that we would have been better off taking care of him in 1991, but in post-9/11 could we really afford to trust him, to let him continue to fester indefinitely? Were we prepared to wait until the threat was imminent? President Bush said we can't wait until the threat is imminent, meaning to wait until the threat is executed which is too late. We didn't know his invasion of Kuwait was imminent until we saw his tanks through the dust of the Kuwaiti desert. We knew bin Laden was a threat but the

threat did not appear imminent until after the USS *Cole* was bombed, after the embassies were bombed, after the towers were dropped, killing 3,000 innocent Americans.

While it may be lost on some perhaps in this body, but in our national news media, the burdens of leadership are not lost on this President. While no one else may see the irony, President Bush does. He sees a 9/11 commission asking: Why didn't the administration act on sketchy intelligence at the very same time some on the other side are asking why did the administration act on sketchy intelligence? The first investigation answers the second to anyone sitting in the hottest political seat in America. Meanwhile, the hottest job abroad is being faithfully executed by our soldiers, marines, airmen, and civilian support personnel.

I am proud my son is a marine who expects to get his turn to serve in the sandbox. I want him to return safely, but I want him to win, and I want our troops abroad to win, and I want them to know that America is behind them and to know that addressing the most dangerous nation in the most dangerous region of the world makes this world safer because it will if Washington will let it.

Winning the real war on terror is more important than winning the political war for the White House. We want to win the war on terror and we must. The continued charges of pressure and misinformation are totally off the mark based on what the Intelligence Committee found. There is no question that we are better off. The region is safer, the Iraqi people are much safer, and we in the United States are much safer because we have deposed Saddam Hussein, because we have enacted the PATRIOT Act, because we have pursued very vigorously the war on terror.

We ought to be strengthening that war, supporting our troops, supporting our agencies here at home and not trying to phony up charges of pressure to win political points.

I ask unanimous consent that two editorials, one from the Wall Street Journal and one from Investor's Business Daily, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Investor's Business Daily, July 13, 2004]

POINTING FINGERS

It's a little funny watching some of the very same people who voted repeatedly in the 1990s to strip the CIA of its spies and slash its budget now taking it to task for not doing its job.

It is true the CIA failed to anticipate Sept. 11—though it's not clear any organization operating in a democratic society could have done so.

It's also true the CIA made mistakes in estimating the scope of Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction programs—and in suggesting the U.S. would find stockpiles of WMDs when it invaded.

(Although, it's equally clear the CIA wasn't entirely wrong: Iraq did have WMD

programs, and coalition troops did find weapons of mass destruction—namely, deadly sarin and mustard gas—in Iraq, though not in the amounts the CIA hinted they would).

Nonetheless, in a predictable game of political tag, some try to pin the blame for the CIA's failures on President Bush—as if the eight years of massive intelligence cuts in the 1990s played no role at all.

It's a matter of record: President Clinton slashed intelligence spending and cut the number of spies sharply—so sharply, in fact, the CIA after 9-11 had to create a five-year plan to undo the damage.

During his two terms, the number of spies fell an estimated 20%. The budget tumbled, by some estimates as much as 30% (it's classified). Spy satellites got taken down. Experienced analysts got fired.

That doesn't mean Clinton had no spying priorities. He did: the economy. In place of a relentless focus on the growing terror threat, the Clinton White House made "economic security" its top priority.

Typical was this comment from then-Secretary of State Warren Christopher: "Our national security is inseparable from our economic security."

So much for terrorism.

Unfortunately, terrorists found the U.S. an easy target during the decade. They started with the World Trade Center bombing in 1993, killing six and wounding a thousand more. They kept at it, blowing up a U.S. barracks in Saudi Arabia, attacking U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, and bombing the USS *Cole* in port in Yemen. They murdered hundreds in these and other terror attacks.

Yet, it was still "the economy stupid" in the White House—an attitude that found many allies among Congress' Democrats.

That includes Sen. John Kerry. He proposed deep cuts for the CIA in 1994 and 1995.

We mention this because the report on the CIA's shortcomings has been the source of a good deal of finger-pointing. Bush often gets the blame, even though the weakened intelligence community he inherited was Clinton's creation.

The CIA, no doubt, needs reforms. But its troubles didn't arise in just the last three years. And playing political football with America's intelligence failures won't make us more secure.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 12, 2004]

OF "LIES" AND WMD

"The Committee did not find any evidence that Administration officials attempted to coerce, influence or pressure analysts to change their judgments related to Iraq's weapons of mass destruction capabilities."

So reads Conclusion 83 of the Senate Intelligence Committee's report on prewar intelligence on Iraq. The committee likewise found no evidence of pressure to link Iraq to al Qaeda. So it appears that some of the claims about WMD used by the Bush Administration and others to argue for war in Iraq were mistaken because they were based on erroneous information provided by the CIA.

A few apologies would seem to be in order. Allegations of lying or misleading the nation to war are about the most serious charge that can be leveled against a President. But according to this unanimous study, signed by Jay Rockefeller and seven other Democrats, those frequent charges from prominent Democrats and the media are without merit.

Or to put it more directly, if President Bush was "lying" about WMD, then so was Mr. Rockefeller when he relied on CIA evidence to claim in October 2002 that Saddam Hussein's weapons "pose a very real threat to America." Also lying at the time were John Kerry, John Edwards, Bill and Hillary

Clinton, and so on. Yet, Mr. Rockefeller is still suggesting on the talk shows, based on nothing but inference and innuendo, that there was undue political Bush "pressure" on CIA analysts.

The West Virginia Democrat also asserted on Friday that Undersecretary of Defense Douglas Feith has been running a rogue intelligence operation that is "not lawful." Mr. Feith's shop has spent more than 1,800 hours responding to queries from the Senate and has submitted thousands of pages of documents—none of which supports such a charge. Shouldn't even hyper-partisan Senators have to meet some minimum standard of honesty?

In fact, the report shows that one of the first allegations of false intelligence was itself a distortion: Mr. Bush's allegedly misleading claim in the 2003 State of the Union address that Iraq has been seeking uranium ore from Africa. The Senate report notes that Presidential accuser and former CIA consultant Joe Wilson returned from his trip to Africa with no information that cast serious doubt on such a claim; and that, contrary to Mr. Wilson's public claims, his wife (a CIA employee) was involved in helping arrange his mission.

"When coordinating the State of the Union, no Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) analysts or officials told the National Security Council (NSC) to remove the '16 words' or that there were concerns about the credibility of the Iraq-Niger Uranium reporting," the report says. In short, Joe Wilson is a partisan fraud whose trip disproved nothing, and what CIA doubts there were on Niger weren't shared with the White House.

The broader CIA failure on Iraq's WMD is troubling, though it is important to keep in mind that this was a global failure. Every serious intelligence service thought Saddam still had WMD, and the same consensus existed across the entire U.S. intelligence community. One very alarming explanation, says the report, is that the CIA had "no [human] sources collecting against weapons of mass destruction in Iraq after 1998." That's right. Not one source.

When asked why not, a CIA officer replied "because it's very hard to sustain." The report's rather obvious answer is that spying "should be within the norm of the CIA's activities and capabilities," and some blame for this human intelligence failure has to fall on recently departed Director George Tenet and his predecessor, John Deutch.

The Senate report blames these CIA failures not just on management but also on "a risk averse corporate culture." This sound right, and Acting Director John McLaughlin's rejection of this criticism on Friday is all the more reason for Mr. Bush to name a real replacement. Richard Armitage has been mentioned for the job, but the Deputy Secretary of State has been consistently wrong about Iran, which will be a principal threat going forward, and his and Colin Powell's philosophy at the State Department has been to let the bureaucrats run the place. We can think of better choices.

One real danger now is that the intelligence community will react to this Iraq criticism by taking even fewer risks, or by underestimating future threats as it has so often in the past. (The failure to detect that Saddam was within a year of having a nuclear bomb prior to the 1991 Gulf War is a prime example.) The process of developing "national intelligence estimates," or NIEs, will only reinforce this sense of internal lowest-common-denominator, conformity. If the Senate is looking for a place to recommend long-term reform, dispensing with NIEs would be a good place to start.

Above all, it's important to remember that the Senate report does not claim that the

overall assessment of Iraq as a threat was mistaken. U.N. Resolution 1441 gave Saddam ample opportunity to come clean about his weapons, but he refused. The reports from David Kay and his WMD task force have since shown that Saddam violated 1441 in multiple ways.

Saddam retained a "just-in-time" capability to make WMD, even if he destroyed, hid or removed the "stockpiles" that the CIA believed he had. It's fanciful to think, especially in light of the Oil for Food scandal, that U.N.-led containment was a realistic option for another 12 years, or that once containment ended Saddam wouldn't have expanded his weapons capacity very quickly. The Senate report makes clear we need a better CIA, not that we should have left in power a homicidal, WMD-using dictator.

Mr. BOND. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). Who yields time? The time is under the control of the majority.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, on behalf of the minority, are we now on the constitutional amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, we have 4 minutes 45 seconds left on the Republican side.

The Senator from Montana.

CONGRATULATIONS

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I wish to make a short statement of congratulations to my good friend from Missouri, Senator BOND, and also congratulate his son on graduating OCS at Quantico, now a fresh new lieutenant in the U.S. Marine Corps looking for assignment. He is talking recon. I know that is a tough road. So congratulations on your son. We wish him well in his tour in the U.S. Marine Corps.

Mr. BOND. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, how much time do we have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 4 minutes.

CRITICAL ISSUES

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues and our leadership on both sides of the aisle to find a way for us to work together to address some of the critical issues facing this country. We have in conference now on a highway bill, a transportation bill that is important for economic development, for the creation of jobs, and for safety. I hope the conference will not become so obsessed with achieving the highest possible funding level that we wind up not getting a bill. It takes leadership and courage. It also takes being willing to accept what you can get, and get a conclusion that is good for everybody and move forward.

We need an energy bill. The very idea that we still do not have a national energy policy is indefensible. Yet we continue to labor over how do we get an energy bill, what is in the package, and how are we going to get back to the floor of the Senate. We need to find a way to do that.

The very idea that there is an effort to block the FSC/ETI JOBS growth bill, which involves a ruling by the WTO which has led to American products being hit with a penalty in Europe, and that we are not going to go to conference until we get some guarantee of what the result will be or that one Senator will be able to decide the conference report, what have we come to? We should get this bill in conference and get a result. Does it need to be changed? Yes. Has it become bloated? Absolutely. But if we don't deal with this, American products are going to wind up facing a penalty of 12 percent or more before we get a chance to address it again. It could go up to 17 percent. We are not going to deal with the job growth provisions in this legislation. We need to find a way to get it done.

I hope our leaders will find a way to get these conferences going or get us into conference and get a result, because we need to get this done for the American people. I know it is a political season—Presidential campaigns, Senate races, and congressional. I still maintain, as I always have, that the best politics is results. Get things done for the people. There is plenty of credit to go around.

If we stand here and find a way to question each other's motives and block and obstruct and confuse, we are going to pay a price as an institution. I worry about that.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, on the Select Committee on Intelligence report, I emphasize again, this was a unanimous bipartisan vote. There are problems with the intelligence community. We did not get what we needed before we went to war in Iraq. It was flawed and misleading and inaccurate. We should acknowledge that. But all the effort that is going on now to find a way to fix political blame is a mistake. We should be working together to produce results. That is why I am working with Senator FEINSTEIN of California on some proposals. That is why I am working with Senator WYDEN on some proposals.

We have 1 minute remaining?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am happy to not object, but Senator LAUTENBERG was on the floor this morning and asked for an additional 5 minutes, and it was objected to.

Mr. LOTT. I think I have 1 minute left.

Mr. REID. I was just waiting for an opportunity to say what I just said.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, we need to find a way to deal with the problem.

The point I want to make is, Congress is now like somebody that has been at the scene of an accident. We saw it happen, but now we are pretending we weren't there. Congress is a part of this problem. For 20 years we have underfunded, we have limited

human intelligence. We have improperly funded the intelligence community. We have allowed a situation where 80 percent of the money for the intelligence community is under the Department of Defense, not the CIA.

Let me give some numbers. During the 1990s, the number of CIA stations declined by 30 percent. The number of agents declined by 40 percent. The volume of intelligence reports decreased by 50 percent.

The intelligence community connected the dots, and got it wrong. It was not just our intelligence community that got it wrong—there was a global breakdown in intelligence analysis. The report is not an indictment of the hard-working and dedicated men and women who put their lives on the line, and are charged with connecting the dots. It is a criticism of the process and community at large, and demonstrative of a lack of leadership, oversight, and insufficient investment.

The breakdown in intelligence capability evolved over several years. It was recognized in 1976 by a 5-volume report by the Church committee. Our intelligence gathering and analysis capability—especially human intelligence and linguists—was gutted in the 20 years that followed, particularly in the 1990s, when the Congress did not adequately fund the intelligence community.

President Clinton relied on this same analysis of the Iraqi threat when he signed the Iraqi Liberation Act. The Congress relied on this same intelligence when we passed several resolutions regarding Iraq; President Bush relied on this intelligence when making his decisions as well. Many have asked whether I want to change my vote given today's assessment of pre-war intelligence—I do not.

Saddam Hussein was a mass murderer who used weapons of mass destruction on his own people; supported terrorism and trained terrorists; provided "bonuses" to the families of terrorists; a destabilizing factor in the Mideast.

Let's not play armchair quarterback by asking "what would have happened if." The country would be much better served if the Congress and the President took action as soon as possible to fix the organization, leadership, and oversight problems that we have with our intelligence community.

When the American people read the Intelligence Committee's report, they will see some fundamental things that need to be changed in the intelligence community. First and foremost it is evident that the Director of Central Intelligence does not really control all aspects of the intelligence community. In fact, as I have said, 80 percent of intelligence dollars go to the Department of Defense, not the CIA. Moreover, many of people that lead the 15 agencies that comprise the intelligence community work for the Department of Defense, not the Director of Central Intelligence.