Mr. President, I come to the floor to ask a number of

questions of my colleagues who are managing the bill. I have very high

regard for the chairperson, Senator Collins. I have worked with her on

other matters and found that she is an extremely able and diligent

Member. I admire the way she has handled this legislation. I have

watched the process as it went through the committee. I am not on the

committee but I watched as it was being televised. I thought it was a

very professional process.

I also have very high regard for the Senator from Connecticut, Mr.

Lieberman. I am not on the relevant committees. I am not on the

Intelligence Committee. I am not on the Defense Committee. I am on the

Budget Committee and the Finance Committee and deal with these issues

from a budget point of view and financing point of view.

With that said, I come to the floor to ask a series of questions. I

want to indicate that I have with me charts that were prepared by the

office of Senator Lieberman to talk about what the structure currently

is and what this legislation would do to change it and to raise a

number of concerns that I have about that change.

First, I think we should indicate the problem we are confronting with

the American intelligence community, where there is a lack of

coordination and communication, which has been clearly outlined in a

series of hearings and a series of reports, including the report by the

9/11 Commission, including the report by the Intelligence Committee,

including the work of the very able chairman, the Senator from Maine,

all that has been laid across the record very clearly.

This chart from the office of Senator Lieberman shows the

organization of the intelligence community as it is, with the President

and the National Security Council overseeing the various agencies of

Government, including the Director of Central Intelligence, the

Secretary of Defense, but has within it the National Security Agency,

the National Geospacial-Intelligence Agency, the National

Reconnaissance Office, the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the

Military Services and Combatant Commands. The large majority of the

funding of the intelligence community is in the Department of Defense.

I think maybe that is too little understood by the general public.

But that is fact. The large majority of the funding is not at the

Central Intelligence Agency. I think people in the United States

probably assume that is the case; it is not. The vast majority of the

funding for intelligence operations is within the Department of

Defense.

Other agencies that have a significant role, of course, are the

Attorney General's office, because he oversees the FBI, and the FBI has

responsibility for intelligence operations within the United States.

Then we have the Secretary of Homeland Security within which we have

the Information, Analysis and Infrastructure Protection Director and

the Coast Guard intelligence. The Secretary of State has the Bureau of

Intelligence and Research, and the Secretary of Treasury has an

intelligence branch, as does the Secretary of Energy.

The problem with this structure, which has been pointed out

repeatedly, is that these are a series of stovepipes, basically leading

only to the White House. There is nobody that is in overall

coordination and direction of these various intelligence agencies. And

the idea has been to have a national intelligence director that would

have responsibility to coordinate and communicate with respect to these

various agencies.

So the proposal before us is to create a national intelligence

director with these other various agencies already

existing reporting to the national intelligence director, so there is

someone in a position to coordinate and ultimately communicate what

intelligence agencies are finding.

Let me just say that I thought that what was going to happen with the

national intelligence director is that funds were going to be brought

together and we would not have the continuing existence of all of these

other agencies.

That is really what I want to ask the managers about. The concern

that I have is if we have a failure of communication and coordination,

especially between the FBI and the CIA, how does adding another entity,

how does adding another player improve the chances for coordination and

communication?

Let me say that I was trained in business management. My career

before I came here was to manage organizations. My experience has been

the more layers, the less communication, the more inefficient the

communication.

When this was first outlined and I found out that the CIA is still

going to exist, I must say I was taken aback. I was surprised by that.

I thought the Central Intelligence Agency would become the new

intelligence, with a new national intelligence director. Therefore, we

wouldn't be adding another player to the mix, but we would be putting

somebody in a position of authority so that we could hold them

accountable.

The concern I have is instead of that, we have maintained a Central

Intelligence Agency and all of the other intelligence agencies we had

before, and added a national intelligence director.

The fundamental concern I have and the question I have is, Why has

the committee concluded that this is the right way to proceed? Why

wouldn't it be better by joining the function, reducing the number of

players, reducing the number of boxes on the organizational chart,

instead of adding a layer?

I would be quick to say I think you need to have a national

intelligence director, somebody who is in overall coordination and

control because before we did not have that.

That is really the question I came to the floor this afternoon to

query the chairman and ranking member about.

I would be happy to yield so they might respond.

Might I ask a followup question, because the Senator

referenced these earlier reports going all the way back from 50 years

ago. I fully support the concept of a national intelligence director.

My concern is how we are implementing it. Did the earlier reports,

including the most recent from the Intelligence Committees, from the 9/

11 Commission, contemplate with the creation of a national intelligence

director we would still have a Central Intelligence Agency?

One additional question, if I could, on the budget

authority inherent in this plan. I indicated the vast majority of

resources actually go to the Department of Defense and the various

intelligence operations within the Department of Defense. The Senator

from Connecticut indicated it was as much as 80 percent.

In terms of management of an operation, are we going to be left with

a circumstance in which 80 percent of the funding is at the Department

of Defense? And if so, how do we avoid a circumstance in which the tail

is wagging the dog? That is, typically one finds in organizations that

initiative and power follows money. If there is at the top a relatively

weak national intelligence director, with most of the functions and

resources in a subordinate agency, that creates its own management

challenges.

I am interested to know what the concept is with respect to budget

authority. Who will have that overall authority over resources?

Might I just conclude on that point, and then I am

finished. I know there are other Senators waiting. I waited to have

this opportunity because I think this is very important. These are

questions I am getting.

In my position on the Budget Committee, people are asking

me, how is this money going to be controlled? People are given

responsibility. Do they have authority?

The final question I have with respect to the Department of Defense

is, we heard the other day from the Secretary of Defense, Secretary

Rumsfeld, who has a very strong management background. He expressed

great concern, and I think it is a concern that absolutely deserves

full consideration. His great concern, as I heard it the other day in

our briefing, was that he is going to have a separation of

responsibility from authority; that is, resources that are currently

under his control and direction are going to move up the line to the

national intelligence director. He and the warfighters have a

fundamental responsibility and need for intelligence. He is concerned,

with the separation of these resources--as the Senator describes, much

of the budget moving from the Department of Defense level up to the

national intelligence director--that he not be shortchanged and that

his combatant commanders not be shortchanged of the resources they need

to make tactical and strategic decisions.

This is my final question: What is the response of the leadership of

the committee to his concerns?

The last reference of winding up ``with a big mess,''

whose quote is that?

Let me conclude on this note: The thing I am most

concerned about is having an entirely separate Central Intelligence

Agency and an office of national intelligence director. The thing that

I have a difficult time understanding is how that is not going to

create its own turf battles, its own communications problems. I hope I

am proved wrong by this, but it is the one thing I looked at and I was

surprised by and, I must say, I wondered about.

I read the reports on the difficulties we had with the coordination

between the CIA and the FBI and their turf battles and their

unwillingness to share information. When we preserve the Central

Intelligence Agency and create an office of national intelligence

director and we still have, of course, the FBI's Office of

Intelligence, I wonder whether we don't wind up with more turf battles.

I know the intention is to avoid that and to appropriately create a

place that will coordinate all the work of the intelligence community.

My great management concern is that we will wind up with additional

turf battles. I hope that is not the case. I am glad the reviews are

built in because I think that is important. I wanted to express these

concerns publicly. I wanted to raise these issues and have a chance for

the managers to fully respond.

I very much thank the chairman and the Senator from Connecticut.