Mr. Speaker, we have heard plenty of questionable

statements today from Members about misrepresentation of intelligence

and alleged use of military force, without enough information to back

up that action. As a former member of the Committee on Intelligence, I

would remind Members about one particular incident and the, quote,

``depth of intelligence'' supporting that action.

Not long ago the United States, on the order of the Commander in

Chief launched a cruise missile attack against a pharmaceutical plant

in Sudan, destroying the facility and taking human life. At the time,

the action was justified by the President and his administration on the

grounds that the al-Shifa plant was involved in the production of

chemical weapons and had ties to Iraq and possibly al Qaeda which had

just bombed two U.S. embassies in Africa.

What was the administration's basis for making these claims? What was

the entire intelligence record that backed up this military action?

This represents the entire intelligence on the al-Shifa plant. Yes, the

entirety of the intelligence record connecting the al-Shifa plant to

chemical weapons production was this, a single soil sample collected by

a friend of a friend of a source. That is it.

The Intelligence Community did not know who actually owned the plant

or have any other clear and convincing evidence to connect al-Shifa to

weapons of mass destruction production; all it had was a bit of dirt

and many unanswered question.

Yes, the information gaps were emphatically stated in the

intelligence record of the day. None of these caveats were expressed by

the President or his administration, and I believe the President picked

this target himself. Now, I could name the President and the precise

day in August 1998 and the attacks, and what else was happening that

day; but rather than dwell on that, I would like to ask my colleagues

on the other side: Where was their outrage in 1998? The information

that this President used to inform his policy decision and act

militarily against Hussein was voluminous, consistent, and as sound as

it could be.