

the speech were “nonsense” and accused skeptics of trying to “politicize this issue by rewriting history.” At the same time, the White House tried to redirect the debate onto the overall danger posed by Saddam’s chemical and biological weapons—uranium or not—and onto Bush’s resolve in acting to confront that threat.

On July 17, 2003, McClellan cautioned that Senator DURBIN—and possibly other Democrats—were “lying about the little things” related to CIA Director George Tenet’s testimony before the Senate Intelligence Committee. The “little thing” was whether Tenet has named names of these responsible at the White House.

Although I refused to disclose any names mentioned by the CIA Director, I will say this: I stand by my statement.

Let me explain for a moment the issue at hand. We have made it clear that Director Tenet would appear before the Intelligence Committee. That was public knowledge. The fact is that Director Tenet sat at the committee table in the Senate Intelligence Committee with several people from his agency. What he said, of course, was given to the members of committee. Questions from members of the committee were directed to appropriate members of the staff, and he would indicate which member might give an answer to a question.

I took great care in commenting about his testimony to limit any reference to anyone in the room, specifically to Director Tenet, so that I would not even disclose the names of the CIA employees who were in the room. Perhaps I was over cautious. But that caution on my part was then used against me by the White House. Because when we asked Director Tenet pointblank who was the White House staffer responsible for the State of the Union Address—in fact, it has now been publicly disclosed by the CIA and others—he turned to Alan Foley, an assistant who worked on the speech, and Allen Foley gave the name to the committee with a nod by Director Tenet. So my caution and care not to even disclose the name of Alan Foley who sat at the table with the CIA Director was turned and used against me by the White House, saying that I was lying to the American public as to whether Director Tenet disclosed the name.

The fact is, Director Tenet was testifying. He turned to Mr. Foley, his assistant, who said the name. Whether Director Tenet repeated the name, only the record of the hearing can reflect. But what I was establishing was the fact that the identity of the person involved was disclosed during Director Tenet’s testimony. I stand by that.

On July 18, on Friday, the White House press staff began leaking word that one of the leading White House opponents, Senator DURBIN of Illinois, had released classified material regarding names of those involved in the controversy and the number of suspected

WMD sites in Iraq. As a result, the White House said some Senators were contemplating having me, Senator DURBIN, removed from the Intelligence Committee.

Our office pointed out to reporters that no classified material had been released by this Senator. I had refused to name the White House staffer or characterize specific witness testimony. And the number of suspected Iraqi WMD sites, 550, which I disclosed on the Senate floor, had been declassified this year in June. It is public information.

The White House, when they were confronted with the fact that their accusations against me were not true said, they would “Look into that.”

After attacking my honesty and integrity and suggesting I be removed from the Senate Intelligence Committee, they were unable to produce any evidence of the disclosure of classified information. I have gone to great lengths to avoid that, and I will continue.

Then on July 18, that same day, the White House took the rare step of declassifying and releasing eight pages of a 90-page top secret national intelligence estimate that was used to write the questioned portions of the State of the Union Address. Instead of putting a lid on the controversy, the document showed prewar divisions within the U.S. intelligence community that were glossed over by administration spokesmen. The State Department, for instance, termed the reports that Saddam Hussein was shopping for uranium in Africa as “highly dubious.”

That is the chronology. It is an important chapter in our political history. It is an important chapter in the history of the collection and use of intelligence here in the United States.

I am glad the Senate Intelligence Committee will continue its investigation. It is my understanding the chairman and ranking Democrat have said they will call White House staffers before the committee to ask what led up to this situation and why we are in the position we are today.

I can recall times in the past when the Intelligence Committee and its members had been challenged as to whether they disclosed classified information and called on to take polygraphs for fear they may have said something that was top secret and should not be public knowledge. I understand the concern of the administration. That should be the concern of every American. We have to take care not to disclose classified information.

But I have to ask the obvious question: How can this administration declassify things, drop certain items into the press that are complimentary and positive from their point of view and get away with it and not be held to the same standard as members of the committee? When we are in a situation where we are given a body of information and draw a conclusion from that but cannot speak to that publicly,

while the administration discretely drops into the public domain information they think is helpful to their side of the case, that is a one-sided argument. It does not serve this Nation well, and the administration is pushing the envelope when they do it.

I am glad the Senate Intelligence Committee is going forward. There is a lot more we need to do. I will say to my colleagues in the Senate, please do not back off from our responsibility. We have a responsibility to the people who elect us and to the American people at large to hold this administration—indeed, every administration—accountable for honesty and accuracy when they speak to the American people, particularly in areas of the discussion of intelligence information which could lead to military action which could, in fact, endanger the lives of Americans and their families. That is our most serious and sacred duty. We should not back off of it because of threats from the White House or efforts by the White House to silence us.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, before Senator DURBIN leaves the floor, I want to say that the concerns he has raised are serious and grave. They deserve serious attention, not just of this body but of the people in this country. I thank him for bringing them to us today and join him in voicing the gravity of the situation. The kind of actions he has described, if they are true, should not be permitted. They should not be countenanced.

(The remarks of Mr. CARPER pertaining to the introduction of S. 1443 are printed in today’s RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The Senator from Iowa.

#### EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended for 7 minutes.

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

#### WELFARE REFORM

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak on another subject, but I think it is appropriate for me to respond to the Senator from Delaware only in a general way, not to the specific points he made.

I do take very seriously his efforts at what we call welfare reform, moving people from welfare to work, because not only as Governor did he demonstrate leadership in that area, but in the short time I have served with him in the Senate, he has talked with me frequently about various aspects of welfare, and I know he has been working with others on his side of the aisle, as well as Republicans.