

To fix this problem, Senator FEINSTEIN and I are about to propose legislation that will establish a Director of National Intelligence—or DNI. The DNI will be a Cabinet-level position that will lead the intelligence community, and be responsible for aggregating intelligence for the President.

As for the specific processes that cry out for reform, the report focuses on two in particular. One, layering of uncertain conclusions—judgments were layered upon other judgments, and specific concerns and uncertainties were simply lost; two, group think—because we knew Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction, and used them on his people, any data that appeared to support this continued behavior was viewed favorably, and dissenting data was discounted or underreported.

Those “process” types of deficiencies quickly lead one to ask: How can the intelligence community provide better oversight and supervision of “expert” analysts; and how can the Congress provide more effective oversight of the intelligence community? There are clearly process reforms needed within the intelligence community, and Congress’s oversight of that community.

I know that Chairman ROBERTS and Vice Chairman ROCKEFELLER, are very concerned that our intelligence community is broken, and are committed to taking action in the coming weeks and month to address many of the most critical deficiencies.

With particular regard to congressional oversight, I believe that there are some fundamental things that need to be changed such as term limits of committee members. Currently, members can only serve on the Senate Intelligence Committee for 8 years. That means that when they know enough to be conversant in the intelligence business, they need to rotate off of the committee. We need intelligence committee members who can speak the lingo and understand the processes. Consequently, term limits need to be eliminated.

Also, the jurisdiction of the Intelligence Committee regarding classified matter is sometimes muddled due to overlap with the Armed Services Committee. I submit that a simplified approach to jurisdiction could enhance oversight and accountability.

The process of document classification and redaction also needs to be reviewed. When the Intelligence Committee first prepared this report, the CIA recommended that about half of it be redacted. I understand the need to protect the names of sources and intelligence methods. But I can tell you that most of those redactions were not of that nature; they were everyday, unclassified words.

The report you see today is less than 20 percent redacted, and the Intelligence Committee is still working with the CIA to release more of the report.

Notwithstanding, it is my belief that in matters such as these, the CIA is too

close to the intelligence process to provide an objective view of what really needs to be classified. Consequently, I am working with Senator WYDEN to propose legislation that will establish a small independent group under the President that will review documents such as this report to ensure that classification decisions are independent and objective. In addition, I urge the President to nominate as soon as possible a candidate to serve as the Director for Central Intelligence.

This is a critical time of this Nation as we fight the global war on terrorism, and we need to have effective leadership in-place at the CIA as soon as possible. As we make progress in fixing the intelligence community, I repeat my call to both sides of the aisle to not politicize the issues or the prospective remedies. We owe it to the American people and to the members of the intelligence community to fix the fundamental problems outlined in this report, and create an intelligence community that can best serve the national security interests of the United States.

We are part of the problem. Let’s find the solution.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

FEDERAL MARRIAGE AMENDMENT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 40, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A motion to proceed to consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 40, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to marriage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 8 p.m. shall be equally divided between the chairman and ranking member or their designees.

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I take this opportunity, before we continue with the debate, to talk about how important it is that we debate in an earnest and sincere way the issue of marriage. Marriage does matter. It is important to the American people.

We heard earlier comments about how bringing up issues such as class action lawsuits, the marriage amendment, and trade were just wasting the Congress’s time. Yet the other side doesn’t think it is a waste of time to raise taxes, to increase more laws so we have fewer and fewer rights, to restrict the free enterprise system, and in a sense create more government.

In the debate on marriage, we are trying to accomplish a number of

things. No. 1, we want to define marriage as the union of a man and a woman. No. 2, we want to restrict the action of the court’s ability to define marriage. Then, No. 3—and perhaps the most important part of this debate—we want to give the American people an opportunity to debate this through their elected representatives in the Congress here and in the State legislatures.

It has been a grassroots type of process from the bottom up. We have heard a lot of concerns from people all over America about the way the courts are dealing with the issue of marriage and their frustrations in not being able to address this issue.

We heard a lot of good comments from some of my colleagues yesterday in debating the marriage amendment. In favor, we have had Senators HATCH, SANTORUM, SMITH, FRIST, BUNNING, KYL, CORNYN, SESSIONS, LOTT, and BROWBACK—all explaining why it is important that we move forward in passing this amendment.

We have heard pretty much procedural arguments from the other side. Our side was talking about their concern about losing the institution of marriage, that it is basically a fundamental building block of society, and if we want democracies such as the United States to survive, we need to have good, functioning families. If families do well, children do well. We will hear more about that today. Then we will hear about the democratic process in which we allow American citizens to participate. This is the essence of what we were talking about yesterday and the inevitability of what is going to happen through our courts, that there is a master plan out there from those who want to destroy the institution of marriage to, first, begin to take this issue to a few select courts throughout this country at the State level.

We begin to see this in States such as Vermont and Massachusetts and a number of other States, and then proceed up through the States; and once they get favorable rulings from a few courts that are dominated pretty much by activist judges and judges who want to ignore the tradition of marriage for thousands of years, and want to bypass the legislative process—then once they have established their basis, they want to take it to the Federal courts, and they will eventually move it to the Supreme Court.

We heard arguments yesterday about how Members of this Congress and constitutional scholars believe that the Supreme Court—if it reaches the Supreme Court—by a very slim majority is probably prone to rule in a way that would eliminate the traditional family as we know it.

So this is an important issue. It is a very timely issue. We have 46 States that have individuals living in them—at least 46—who have same-sex marriage licenses. They have been granted them as a couple through either Massachusetts or Oregon or California. We