

Constitution—in a Presidential election year, I might add—instead of talking about the cost of health insurance and making it more affordable and more accessible for people across America? That is a real issue, and it is an issue that has been really avoided by the leadership in this Senate.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I direct another question to my distinguished friend.

About 6 weeks ago, I asked all 17 superintendents of school districts in Nevada to meet with me. We have 17 counties in Nevada. Each county has a superintendent of schools. The largest school district has about 300,000 students; the smallest, Esmeralda County, with 88 students. I don't know what their political affiliation is, but I will bet a lot more are Republicans.

We met for a couple hours. They were all asked the question: How is the Leave No Child Behind Act treating you in your school district? Without exception, every one of the superintendents said: The Leave No Child Behind Act is leaving children of Nevada behind, without exception. They said: Please change this. Give us some resources.

I say to my friend, education is important in Nevada. The Leave No Child Behind Act has been a disaster for Nevada. Shouldn't we be spending some time talking about education in the U.S. Senate rather than class action, marriage, and a few judges. We have approved more than 100. They want to defer attention away from the real issues of this country, so we are spending days of our existence on the Senate floor talking about judges. Shouldn't we be dealing with education?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Nevada. In response, I would say, the reason why the Senate does not talk about education is because the President's education bill, No Child Left Behind, has been underfunded by \$20 billion. We put Federal mandates on school districts that cost them enormous sums of money, which changed the way teachers teach in a classroom.

This administration—the President and his followers in Congress—has refused to send the money to help kids who are not scoring well on tests, kids who need someone to sit next to them and help them read, someone to help them understand basic math, someone to be there after school to sit down and work with them on their homework, someone to be with them in the summer months so they can do something and not lose all the knowledge they gained in the previous school year.

It takes people—dedicated men and women—who are teachers. It takes money. This administration says the money should go for tax cuts for wealthy people; it should not go for education. We should continue to spend \$1.5 billion a week in Iraq, with no end in sight. That is why we don't talk about education.

This administration will not budget the money to pay for the Federal man-

dates the President included in No Child Left Behind. Ask any school district—in Nevada, Illinois, across America—what do you think of No Child Left Behind? We like accountability, but where is the promised money the President said would come to the school district to help us improve test scores? It is not there. That is why this do-nothing Congress avoids the issue of education, like the issue of helping families and businesses pay for health insurance.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I believe our time has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 30 seconds.

Mr. REID. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, it is interesting to listen to my friends on the other side of the aisle this morning talk about any number of issues, in particular what we have been doing over the last several weeks—really the last several months—relative to the legislative agenda in the Senate. This is the only legislative body, I am sure, anywhere in the world that, because it is the most deliberative body in the world, allows the minority to in effect set the agenda because they have the ability to stop any legislation or debate or control the debate on any legislation unless the majority can obtain 60 votes to bring the debate to an end.

Here we have folks standing up this morning being critical of the leadership on this side of the aisle for not moving forward with a legislative agenda when, for the first time in the history of our great country, certainly the first time in the history of this great deliberative body, we have the folks on the other side of the aisle filibustering circuit court judge nominees of the President of the United States. That has never happened before.

There is one simple reason it is happening now. That is, in spite of this body approving hundreds of more liberal-leaning judges during the 8 years of the previous administration, the Democrats in the Senate refuse to allow more conservative judges to be appointed and confirmed by this President. We had another yesterday relative to another judge that is now being filibustered. That takes time.

In addition, the folks on the other side of the aisle are doing something I have never heard of in my 10 years of service on Capitol Hill; that is, they are demanding that before we go to conference on any bill, the end result of that conference be deemed to be so-and-so, which is to their way of liking, before they will agree to appoint conferees. That is not the way the legislative process works. The American people select the majority party in the Senate and the House to pass legislation. The majority should control, but, unfortunately, it does not.

Lastly, I am a big supporter of the No Child Left Behind program. I am a huge supporter of public education. It

is the foundation of the future of America. I am happy to be the husband of a 30-year former schoolteacher. My daughter starts next week teaching in the public schools in my home county. My mother was a public school teacher. My brother is a public school teacher. I am a huge fan.

In spite of what I have just heard, I have yet to meet a teacher anywhere in America who doesn't say: I love the idea of providing accountability to the American people for the quality of education that I am providing to the children I teach. That is the basic concept of No Child Left Behind.

Sure, we have had problems with No Child Left Behind. Every major reform is going to have bumps in the road. I did four hearings in my State, invited every single school superintendent in all 159 counties, plus the city schools in my State to get together to bring their administrative personnel, but primarily bring me your teachers. I wanted to hear from them what complaints they had. They had serious complaints that were discussed with representatives of the U.S. Department of Education and the Georgia Department of Education. We resolved—we didn't resolve all of them, but we went to work and we got their complaints answered. We made changes in the regulations. All I heard this morning is: Well, No Child Left Behind doesn't work. Everybody is upset.

Everybody is not upset with it. I assure my colleagues, there has been no legislation coming forward from the other side of the aisle to try to correct it. It is simply a political year. It is unbelievable what we hear on the floor of the Senate these days. That is not what I got up here to talk about this morning, but I couldn't listen to that and not comment on it.

INTELLIGENCE

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I want to say something about Ambassador Wilson and his activities, but I see Senator BOND is here. He is going to follow me, and I know he is going to talk about that. Suffice it to say, only one comment needs to be directed about the issue of Mr. WILSON; that is, he didn't tell the truth. He didn't tell the truth, and that is explicitly set forth in the Senate intelligence report. It was also set forth in the report issued by Mr. Butler in Britain last week.

On the 7th of July, Chairman ROBERTS and Vice Chairman ROCKEFELLER of the Senate Intelligence Committee released a report on the U.S. intelligence community's prewar intelligence assessments on Iraq prepared by the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. This 511-page report is highly critical of our intelligence analysis and collection capabilities, especially in the field of human intelligence or what we refer to as HUMINT.

Yesterday, the Senate Intelligence Committee began the first of a series of

hearings on intelligence reform. We heard from our colleague Senator FEINSTEIN about her proposal to create a new position of director of national intelligence to oversee the entire intelligence community. We also heard from three prominent experts—former Deputy Secretary of Defense John Hamre; former Director of Central Intelligence, Jim Woolsey; and Lieutenant General Odom, former Director of the National Security Agency—on how best to structure the intelligence community to meet the needs of the threats we face today and will face tomorrow.

This was a very interesting hearing. Senator FEINSTEIN does her homework. She studied this issue. She presented a very insightful presentation regarding her bill. I look forward to continuing this debate and continuing to review the process, looking both at what we have in place today as well as what reforms we should make relative to the intelligence community.

Tomorrow, we expect the 9/11 Commission to release its report on events leading up to the attack of September 11. There is no doubt that the intelligence community will also come under heavy criticism in that report.

These various reports and hearings are getting wide coverage in the media. I am glad they are. It is important for our debate on reforming the intelligence community to be as inclusive as possible. Intelligence reform is a bipartisan issue. The problems we have uncovered span more than a decade, under both Republican and Democratic administrations and Republican- and Democratic-controlled Congresses. The fact is, the systemic changes and reforms in the intelligence community, which would have made it more difficult for terrorists to strike us on 9/11 or to have more accurate information on Iraq's WMD capabilities, simply did not take place.

As more and more information gets into the public domain, especially in this highly charged political year, there will surely be attempts to politicize the complex issues of intelligence failures and intelligence reform. What I would like to do is to put some clarity on this for the American people.

First, there is only one principle to follow on intelligence reform. Intelligence is our first line of defense against terrorism, and we must improve the collection capabilities and analysis of intelligence to protect the security of the United States and its allies.

We should beware of anyone who tries to twist this principle in a political fashion. The truth is our country, our people, our liberties, and our way of life are under attack by radical Islamic terrorists who kill and destroy in the name of religion.

The security of the United States, which is so dependent on having accurate and timely intelligence, is not a Republican or a Democratic issue. It is a responsibility of all of us in the Con-

gress to make sure we legislate and appropriate moneys so we have the best possible intelligence community.

Second, let's be clear about our tasks ahead. We are talking about amending the National Security Act of 1947, which has been the cornerstone of our security and intelligence structure for over half a century. While change is needed, it should be deliberate. It should also be substantive, even radical, if necessary.

The first comprehensive report detailing critical shortfalls within the United States intelligence community's performance was conducted by the House Subcommittee on Terrorism and Homeland Security. As the chairman of that subcommittee, I released its report on July 17, 2002. Following this, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence conducted a joint inquiry into the intelligence community's activities before and after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, and issued its report in December 2002.

The Senate Intelligence Committee report released on July 7 reflects my deep concern that a number of issues identified both by the Subcommittee on Terrorism and Homeland Security and the joint inquiry have not yet been acted upon. For example, the subcommittee identified that information sharing among intelligence agencies was abysmal, and the joint inquiry report pointed out the CIA was too heavily reliant on foreign liaison reporting and that it had not taken the steps necessary to penetrate hard targets, such as the inner circle of al-Qaida. These issues have not yet been corrected to my satisfaction.

Third, as we address the question of how to reform the intelligence community, including the possible creation of a director for national intelligence, there are five important objectives for us to focus on.

First, coordination and information sharing throughout the intelligence community must be improved.

Second, HUMINT capabilities must be increased, and we must be willing to accept the risks associated with aggressive HUMINT operations. And that is a critical part of this. We must be willing to accept some of the risks that are going to be necessary to secure the type and quality of information on the intelligence side that we need.

Third, analytical competition needs to be preserved.

Fourth, our counterintelligence capabilities need improvement.

And fifth, the role and scope of the military's position in the intelligence community should be reviewed.

I included this last point because I want to ensure that the military's capability to support the intelligence requirements of our unified combatant commanders is maintained in any reformation of the intelligence community. That is absolutely critical. All one had to do was listen to our panel

yesterday to understand the real importance of that point.

The scope of the military's direct involvement in intelligence is enormous and it needs to have a proper role in the intelligence community. Eight of the fifteen members of the intelligence community belong to the Department of Defense. In the current structure, each one of these DOD elements acts more or less independently, representing one small segment of the overall intelligence interests of our military. The creation of the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence has helped somewhat to bring a common intelligence policy to DOD, but we should also consider the creation of a single DOD intelligence command as part of any extensive and meaningful intelligence reform.

The Congress directed the establishment of the Unified Combatant Command for Special Operations, or what is known as SOCOM, over the objections of the Department of Defense because our colleagues had the vision to foresee the requirement. At the time, the DOD and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff objected, but in hindsight, the creation of SOCOM was the correct path. The rationale for establishing a Unified Combatant Command for Intelligence, or INTCOM, is very much the same, and I believe now is the proper time to explore this idea.

As we found in our review on the intelligence on Iraq, the intelligence community is made up of hard-working, dedicated men and women, and Chairman ROBERTS, in his statement, referred to giving them an intelligence community worthy of their efforts. So I welcome the proposal of Senator FEINSTEIN for establishing a Director of National Intelligence as one of the several ideas and issues for us to address and debate.

One final point. As President Bush has said many times, he is determined to make sure American intelligence is as accurate as possible for every challenge we face. America's enemies are secretive, they are ruthless, and they are resourceful. That is why the President supports intelligence reform as much as we do in the Congress.

In the coming months, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence will solicit a broad range of views on reforming the intelligence community, and we will vigorously debate each intelligence reform measure that comes before us. I look forward to this challenge, and I will do everything in my power to ensure that the United States has the intelligence collection and analytical capabilities necessary to protect our lives, our property, our way of life, and our liberties.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I commend my colleague from Georgia for his very thoughtful and incisive comments. I believe he is a great addition to the Senate with his experience working on

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