

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 10, 2006]

THE CIA'S MISSION POSSIBLE

(By David Ignatius)

Firing Porter Goss was the easy part. The challenge now is to complete the reorganization of U.S. intelligence so that the 16 spy agencies under Director of National Intelligence John Negroponte are fighting America's enemies rather than battling each other in bureaucratic turf wars.

But how to fit the pieces together? That's the quandary for Negroponte and Gen. Michael Hayden, the administration's nominee to succeed the miscast Goss. I suggest they take a careful look at the British model. The Brits have a basic division of labor: a small, elite Secret Intelligence Service (known as MI6) collects human intelligence; an inter-agency group known as the Joint Intelligence Committee analyzes that information for policymakers and tells the spies what to collect. When I look at Negroponte's organization chart, that's the model that I hope is emerging. If so, he's moving in the right direction.

At the core of the intelligence puzzle is the CIA, whose very name is outdated. It is no longer the Central Intelligence Agency, coordinating the work of the community. That's the DNI's job now. In a sensible reorganization, the CIA should refocus on the specific mission for which it was created more than 50 years ago—gathering HUMINT, which is intelligence jargon for the secrets between someone's ears. The days when the CIA could be all things to all intelligence consumers are over. Today's CIA should be a truly secret intelligence service in which the job of analysts is to target operations. The all-source analysis that creates finished intelligence should be managed by the DNI.

Making this transition at the CIA will be painful, and Hayden is a good choice for the necessary surgery. As a feisty military officer, he's paradoxically the right person to fend off poaching by the Pentagon. By his own admission, Hayden doesn't know much about the CIA's operational work, but he does know how to modernize a big, hide-bound bureaucracy. He did that at the National Security Agency—helping the wiretappers adapt to a new world of e-mail, fiber-optic cables and wireless phones. He made enemies at the NSA, but he was a successful change agent.

Hayden will have the ideal partner in Stephen Kappes, who is slated to be deputy director. Kappes is something of a legend at the agency: a charismatic ex-Marine who knows how to lead from the front. He punched all the tickets—fixing a broken Iranian operations group that had lost a string of agents, serving as chief of station in Moscow and as head of counterintelligence, and visiting Moammar Gaddafi and persuading him to give up his nuclear weapons program. Kappes's pitch to the Libyan leader is said to have been blunt, and irresistible: You are the drowning man and I am the lifeguard.

Kappes is the CIA version of the ultimate stand-up guy. After achieving his dream of heading the Directorate of Operations, Kappes walked away from the job in late 2004 rather than fire his deputy, Mike Sulick, as demanded by one of the conservative hatchet men Goss had brought with him from Capitol Hill. A former agency officer remembers the reaction to Kappes's departure: "It was a devastating body blow, like someone has punched you in the solar plexus. The wind came out of the sails that day and it has never come back."

Kappes had a plan for reorganizing the Directorate of Operations when he left, and

he's in a position to implement it now. It's said that he wants to create a far more nimble spy service—one that can attack terrorist groups and other targets around the world more aggressively. Today the CIA is still locked in a Cold War structure, with the same fixed array of directorates and geographical divisions. The agency is frantically hiring new case officers, but under the old structure there aren't "OCFs" (or overseas covered positions) ready for them, so many of the young recruits languish, "stacked up at headquarters like cordwood" in the phrase of one CIA insider.

CIA veterans say Kappes hopes to create an operations capability that's more like a flying squad—detached from headquarters and its layers of bureaucracy. If an al-Qaeda call surfaces on a remote island in the Philippines where the United States doesn't have an embassy or consulate, officers from Kappes's revamped spy service could grab a laptop and be on their way in hours.

Maybe it's time to say goodbye to those three spooky initials "CIA" and the bloated, barnacle-encrusted agency they represent. Let Negroponte move his shop to Langley and create a new elite analytical service there. Meanwhile, let the covert operatives slip away in the night to destinations unknown, where they can get to work stealing the secrets that will keep America safe.

BIOGRAPHY OF

U.S. AIR FORCE GENERAL MICHAEL V. HAYDEN

Gen. Michael V. Hayden is Principal Deputy Director of National Intelligence, Washington, D.C. Appointed by President George W. Bush, he is the first person to serve in this position. General Hayden is responsible for overseeing the day-to-day activities of the national intelligence program. He is the highest-ranking military intelligence officer in the armed forces.

General Hayden entered active duty in 1969 after earning a bachelor's degree in history in 1967 and a master's degree in modern American history in 1969, both from Duquesne University. He is a distinguished graduate of the university's ROTC program. General Hayden has served as Commander of the Air Intelligence Agency and as Director of the Joint Command and Control Warfare Center. He has been assigned to senior staff positions at the Pentagon, Headquarters U.S. European Command, National Security Council and the U.S. Embassy in the People's Republic of Bulgaria. The general has also served as Deputy Chief of Staff, United Nations Command and U.S. Forces Korea, Yongsan Army Garrison, South Korea. Prior to his current assignment, General Hayden was Director, National Security Agency, and Chief, Central Security Service, Fort George G. Meade, Md.

EDUCATION

1967 Bachelor of Arts degree in history, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pa., 1969 Master's degree in modern American history, Duquesne University, 1975 Academic Instructor School, Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala., 1976 Squadron Officer School, Maxwell AFB, Ala., 1978 Air Command and Staff College, Maxwell AFB, Ala., 1980 Defense Intelligence School, Defense Intelligence Agency, Bolling AFB, D.C., 1983 Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Va., 1983 Air War College, Maxwell AFB, Ala.

Mr. WARNER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEMINT). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes.

ENGLISH UNITES

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, on Monday night, with unanimous support, the Senate passed resolution No. 458 that I sponsored, along with 12 other Senators, affirming that the Pledge of Allegiance and the National Anthem be said or sung in the language that unites us as one Nation, that language being English.

This was more than bipartisan. It was unanimous, with one dissent expressed on the other side. It should be virtually unanimous.

This is the land of immigrants. Almost all Americans know we need and must value our common language, which is English. Yet during the last week, the idea of a non-binding resolution expressing the Senate's thought that whenever we say the Pledge of Allegiance, sing the Star-Spangled Banner, take the oath of citizenship, that it ought to be in our common language, produced quite a little storm across the country. Some said we were restricting liberty.

But this not about what we are free to do; this is about what we ought to do at the opening of the Senate, at the opening of a ball game or Boy or Girl Scout troop meeting. As Americans, we are free to sing the Star-Spangled Banner in Swahili, we are free to say the Pledge of Allegiance in pig Latin, but that is not what we ought to do. And the Senate, by unanimous consent, said that on Monday night.

Some said this was disrespect for other languages. Nothing could be further from the truth. I believe our official documents ought to be in our common language. I have always favored, including when I was Education Secretary of this country, what I call "English plus." The luckiest among us are those who know more than one language, but one of those must be English. Children should learn it as quickly as possible if they want to succeed in the United States of America.

The real reason for the storm of reaction to the singing of the Star-Spangled Banner in a foreign language is that most Americans instinctively understand that while diversity is important, unity is more precious. That is why we pledge allegiance to the American flag rather than the flags of the countries from which our ancestors came. That is why most of our politics is about principles upon which we agree, principles found in our founding documents. That is why we give rights to individuals instead of to groups. That is why we honor our common language, English.

In Sunday's Washington Post, a Chilean-American playwright, a professor at Duke, said our country is well on its way to becoming a bilingual nation and that he thought we would endure just fine. I respectfully disagree. I think it would make it harder for us to endure. I think it would make us more a United Nations than the United States of America.

Now the Senate unanimously agrees. So does the mayor of Los Angeles, an

Hispanic American. Antonio Villaraigosa said:

I was offended by the idea of a national anthem in another language because for me the national anthem is something that deserves respect. Without question the vast majority of people in the United States were offended, as well. Our anthem should be spoken English.

So says New Mexico Governor Bill Richardson, a Hispanic American, who said on the "CBS Early Show" last week:

I agree. The national anthem should be in English. Most immigrants want to become American. They want to learn English. They want to be part of the American mainstream.

Twelve cosponsoring Senators agree. Many Democrats in the House of Representatives have joined as cosponsors. Senator CONRAD from North Dakota spoke on this in the Senate last week and said:

A common language is absolutely essential to our Nation. I look to our neighbors to the north [meaning Canada] and see incredible traumas they have been through because they are speaking in two different languages. My own strong belief is we ought to say the pledge in English and sing the national anthem in English.

Ramon Cisneros, the publisher of a Spanish language newspaper in Nashville, e-mailed me:

Thank you for the resolution. Our common language as Americans is and will always be English. Our national symbol should always be said and sung in English.

We have worked hard to make English our common language, creating common schools, requiring new citizens to learn English to the eighth grade level. The Senate last week passed grants to help prospective citizens learn English. We welcome legal immigrants to this country. But we expect they will become American, that they will learn our common language, English, that they will learn our history, that they will subscribe to our values as found in the Declaration of Independence and Constitution, and when they became citizens, they will renounce allegiance to their former government and swear allegiance to our laws and Constitution. That is what holds us together as the United States of America.

So I am glad, in conclusion, that as the Senate stood together for our economic identity as Americans, it did it unanimously and passed our resolution affirming that statements of national unity, including the Pledge of Allegiance and the national anthem, should be said or sung in our common language, English.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

#### NATIVE HAWAIIAN GOVERNMENT ACT OF 2005

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about an issue of significant importance to the people of Hawaii, S. 147, the Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act of 2005.

While opponents of this legislation have sought to characterize this issue as a Native versus non-Native issue, I am here to tell you that there is nothing further from the truth. This bill is important to all of the people of Hawaii.

Why? It is significant because it provides a process, a structured process, for the people of Hawaii to finally address longstanding issues resulting from a dark period in Hawaii's history, the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawaii. The people of Hawaii are multicultural and we celebrate our diversity. At the same time, we all share a common respect and desire to preserve the culture and tradition of Hawaii's indigenous peoples, Native Hawaiians.

Despite this perceived harmony, there are issues stemming from the overthrow that we have not been able to address due to apprehension over the emotions that arise when these matters are discussed. There has been no structured process. Instead, there has been fear as to what the discussion would entail, causing people to avoid the issues. Such behavior has led to high levels of anger and frustration as well as misunderstandings between Native Hawaiians and non-Native Hawaiians.

As a young child, I was discouraged from speaking Hawaiian because I was told that it would not allow me to succeed in the Western world. My parents lived through the overthrow and endured the aftermath as a time when all things Hawaiian, including language, which they both spoke fluently, hula, custom, and tradition, were viewed as negative. I, therefore, was discouraged from speaking the language and practicing Hawaiian customs and traditions. I was the youngest of eight children. I remember as a young child sneaking to listen to my parents so that I could maintain my ability to understand the Hawaiian language. My experience mirrors that of my generation of Hawaiians.

While my generation learned to accept what was ingrained into us by our parents, my children have had the advantage of growing up during the Hawaiian renaissance, a period of revival for Hawaiian language, custom, and tradition. Benefitting from this revival are my grandchildren who can speak Hawaiian and know so much more about our history.

It is this generation, however, that is growing impatient with the lack of progress in efforts to resolve longstanding issues. It is this generation that does not understand why we have not resolved these matters. It is for this generation that I have written this bill to ensure that we have a way to address these emotional issues.

There are those who have tried to say that my bill will divide the people of Hawaii. As I have just explained, my bill goes a long way to unite the people of Hawaii by providing a structured process to deal with issues that have plagued us since 1893. The misguided ef-

forts of my colleagues who seek to delay the Senate's consideration of this bill, however, may have a divisive effect on my state.

This bill is also important to the people of Hawaii because it affirms the dealings of Congress with Native Hawaiians since Hawaii's annexation in 1898. Congress has always treated Native Hawaiians as Hawaii's indigenous peoples, and therefore, as indigenous peoples of the United States. Federal policies towards Native Hawaiians have largely mirrored those pertaining to American Indian and Alaska Natives.

Congress has enacted over 160 statutes to address the conditions of Native Hawaiians including the Native Hawaiian Health Care Improvement Act, the Native Hawaiian Education Act, and the Native Hawaiian Home Ownership Act. The programs that have been established are administered by federal agencies such as the Departments of Health and Human Services, Education, Housing and Urban Development, and Labor. As you can imagine, these programs go a long way to benefit Native Hawaiians, but they also serve as an important source of employment and income for many, many people in Hawaii, including many non-Native Hawaiians. There are many Hawaii residents whose livelihoods depend on the continuation of these programs and services.

This, colleagues, is why this bill is important to the people of Hawaii. I ask all of you to respect our efforts by voting to bring this bill to the floor for consideration and for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, under the previous order, if I might inquire, the time is allocated to this side; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. Twenty-two minutes remains on the minority side.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, may I be recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Thank you, Mr. President.

#### HEALTH INSURANCE REFORM

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, the underlying bill we are discussing is an attempt at a much needed reform of the health insurance system of this country.

If you wonder why there is the organization of health insurance in this country that we have, it is as a result of a historical accident. It was when all the veterans were coming home after World War II that employers, in order to get them to come and work for their company, would offer fringe benefits, one of those fringe benefits being health insurance. Therefore, a system developed in this country of organizing health insurance around an employer.

As time grew and things got more complicated, health insurance offered