

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