Office of Legislative Counsel

ILLEGIB

25 February 1977

TO:

Andrew Falkiewicz

Attached is a copy of Admiral Turner's transcript for your information and for your action (corrections, follow-ups, and identification and suggested resolution of problems which fall into your area). A copy is being sent to Morning Meeting participants.

STATINTL

Deputy Legislative Counsel

MORI/CDF

STATEMENT OF ADMIRAL STANSFIELD TURNER, U.S. NAVY, NOMINEE FOR DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Admiral Turner. Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee,

I am very pleased to be here this morning and to have the

opportunity to express to you some of my views on the conduct

of our national intelligence activities, and on the President's

decision to nominate me to the post of Director of Central

Intelligence. May I first, however, thank Senator Stevenson

for his very kind words, and Senator Percy for his in absentia.

I would like to start by noting that governments, no less than any of us as individuals, depend upon accurate and timely information to make decisions. The collection, the evaluation, the dissemination of information to protect our national security, and upon which to base the foreign policy, is essential for any sovereign state. And in this day when our state has such international responsibilities, a good intelligence collection organization is absolutely vital.

Today, however, we are in an era of effort to reduce international tensions, and in this era, the United States, in my opinion, needs an organization for intelligence of high quality and responsiveness perhaps more than any other time. The Congress itself has recognized the fact that the success of our ongoing negotiations for SALT and MBFR may very well depend in part on our ability to verify that past agreements are in fact being carried out. Thus, our intelligence will

u

be one factor in developing that mutual trust which will be essential to further progress in this important area. If our intelligence is faulty, we may misjudge; if it is inadequate, we may read the signals incorrectly. Without good intelligence, we may simply miss opportunities to ensure the world of peace. I believe, then, that we must have the best intelligence agency in the world. I think we can do this and still be fully consistent with American values and law.

At the same time today that we are working toward international understanding, we are also witnessing the substantial investment of the Soviet Union in their military forces, whether their forces are larger or smaller than ours, stronger or weaker, better or poorer is a subject that could involve interminable debate. It does seem clear to me, however, that we are going to require all of the leverage which good intelligence can give to our military posture if we are going to remain adequately strong in the future.

However, today there are more than military requirements for intelligence. Our intelligence must be acutely aware of foreign political, economic and social trends, as well as the military ones, and must be able to relate these in assessing the prospects for our future.

There is no doubt in my mind that we possess the capability to have the best of all intelligence services in all of these areas. To do that, though, we must ensure that our

intelligence resources are employed in an optimal manner.

In this connection, the President has within the last few days made it expressly clear to me that he expects the Director of Central Intelligence to be able to ensure him that our total national intelligence effort is being conducted in accordance with established priorities and with minimal duplication of effort. He also wants to be certain that the foreign intelligence work of all agencies of our government is being conducted strictly in accordance with law and with American values. The President indicated that while he believes that existing law and executive orders encompass these objectives, he intends to work closely with the Congress on any revisions of law or executive orders that may be desirable to assist the Director of Central Intelligence in fulfilling these charges.

I believe that we can adhere to the President's guidance for greater efficiency and responsiveness within full legality while simultaneously maintaining the individuality, the imaginative initiatives, and the independent voice of the various agencies of our national intelligence structure.

I appreciate the importance of maintaining a degree of independence in our subordinate national intelligence activiteis, as well, of course, as in our tactical intelligence operations.

I have already discussed this question with the Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Defense and know that we all approach

it with open and cooperative minds. We all seek greater effectiveness and efficiency from better direction and coordination. We all abhor any though of such a degree of centralization that alternative judgments cannot be heard, and uncertainties discussed.

Again, the President stated that he feels that the decision makers in Congress and in the executive branch will be better served if they all work from the same foundation of intelligence. This is not to say that consensus among the various elements of the community need be forced, or that dissenting opinion need by stifled. Contrary views must be presented, but in such a way that the rationale for such dissent is clearly evident.

In fact, were the Senate to confirm me for this position,

I would look upon maintaining the objectivity which comes from

considering divergent viewpoints as my highest priority.

Objectivity benefits both the producer and the user of intelligence. The user obviously benefits because he is given all

reasonable alternatives. As a frequent user of intelligence,

I understand, I believe, the importance of approaching

decisions with a range of choices in hand, not simply one

option. I also believe that I am aware of the dangers to

military planning and operations of intelligence estimates that

are biased in one direction. The producer of intelligence also

benefits from an emphasis on objectivity because he is not asked

. 11

to sacrifice his intellectual or scientific integrity to support an established position, but rather, he is asked to lay out all sides of a case indicating the level of confidence he has in the deductions he makes from the facts at hand. Objectivity simply must continue to be the hallmark of our intelligence effort.

My second point of emphasis would be to ensure that the work of the intelligence community is conducted lawfully. I believe with my deepest conviction, that the greatest strength we have as a world power is our moral dedication to the rights of the individual. If any part of our government is perceived to function outside of this fundamental American tenet, it can only bring discredit on the whole. I believe that it is the solemn duty of every agency of the United States Government to protect the constitutional rights of our citizens.

I also believe that there are valid national secrets and recognize that the Director of Central Intelligence is charged by law to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of intelligence sources and methods. Thus, though American citizens can rightfully expect their government to operate openly, there must be a relatively small amount of information and activity which is kept secret. As long as representative groups of elected officials such as this Committee and the Chief Executive are kept informed, and as long as they can act for the society in regulating the secret information and

activities, I think that the difficult balance between necessary secrecy and an open, democratic society can be maintained.

From the discussions I have enjoyed over the past two and a half weeks, it appears to me that this Committee has taken great and successful strides in improving communications between the Congress and the intelligence community. I fully support this progress and philosophy. Within the limits of the constitutional prerogatives of the executive branch, I would intend to do my part in ensuring that Congress remains a full and knowledgeable partner.

Similarly, I believe that it is incumbent upon the intelligence community to make a serious and continuing effort to avoid the overclassification of information and even to attempt selectively to publish unclassified information which is of high interest and value to our citizens.

Even though the various disclosures of questionable intelligence activities during the past several years were quite necessary, they have had an adverse impact on the reputation of our intelligence community. A third area of emphasis which I would suggest would be to continue to rebuild this reputation. The intelligence community is, by and large, composed of well-qualified, hard-working individuals who are as dedicated to our national ideals as are any of us. As in any organization, they need a clear understanding of what is expected of them, and a clear recognition of the importance of

the work that they would do. I intend to make the realization of these goals my next highest priority should I be confirmed in this office.

To achieve this, we must continue the work of restoring confidence in the credibility of the intelligence effort, and this can only be done by actions, not by words. Redundant programs, parochial causes, needless controversy within the community must be eliminated. Everyone's full effort must be turned to producing intelligence information and estimates of the highest quality. That product will measure our intelligence community's worth. And coupled with good communication with the Congress, maximum permissible disclosure to the public, we should be able to create that measure of confidence and credibility which is vital to a successful intelligence program.

There is much work ahead, and if I am confirmed by the Senate, I would be excited by the challenge. I have been in the service of our nation for 30 years, and I view this appointment as another opportunity to continue that service in an area of special importance today.

Since you have my biography, I would not want to detail further my experience in managing large organizations or in the analysis and rationalization of defense programs.

I would like to conclude simply by reiterating that I do respect the dedicated professionals in both our civilian

and military components of the intelligence organizations. I hope to encourage them to realize their full capabilities, to be innovative, questioning and objective in their approach to all problems. At the same time, I believe that I also understand the need for honest, rigidly accurate intelligence assessments if they are to be useful to the Congress and to the President.

If I am confirmed, I would work to re-establish the full credibility of the community's work, to ensure that a worthwhile contribution is made in support of our decision making process, and to require that the gathering and dissemination of intelligence for the United States is consistent with the ideals upon which this country was founded.

Mr. Chairman, if confirmed by the Senate, I would be proud to be the Director of Central Intelligence, and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and to work closely with this Committee in helping to provide this country with an intelligence service second to none.

Thank you, sir.

The Chairman. Thank you very much, Admiral Turner.

Before proceeding with the questioning by the Committee, may I administer the oath, sir?

Admiral Turner. Please.

The Chairman. Do you swear that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

2

3

4 5

7

8

6

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23-

24

25

I do. Admiral Turner.

The Chairman. Thank you very much, sir.

Because of the interest shown in this nomination, the Chair would like to once again institute the ten minute rule, and so I will begin with the first ten minutes.

Admiral Turner, as you know, one of the purpose of the creation of the CIA in 1947 was to ensure that United States intelligence would be independent of military control.

Although the DOD related intelligence represents the largest part of the annual U.S. intelligence budget, I believe that purpose still continues, and so the question I ask, sir, is whether you might be able to better serve the intent of civilian control were you to resign your commission prior to becoming the Director of Central Intelligence?

How do you react to this issue, sir?

TESTIMONY OF ADMIRAL STANSFIELD TURNER

Admiral Turner. Mr. Chairman, I come to this nomination as an active military officer. The law provides that an active officer may serve as the Director of Central Intelligence. In fact there have been nine -- there have been eleven military officers who have served either as Director or Deputy Director. Nine of them served while on active duty. Seven of those nine returned to military service after completing their duty in Central Intelligence.

Having thoroughly enjoyed serving my country in active

. 11

military service for 30 years, I am anxious not to foreclose the possibility I may follow in the footsteps of those seven.

The Chairman. Do you perceive any conflict of interest in your serving with your commission?

Admiral Turner. I do not, sir. To begin with, I am charged, or would be charged by law not to accept any responsibility to or carry out any responsibility with the military services while serving as the Director of Central Intelligence, and I would intend to fulfill that law, not only in its letters, but in its spirit.

The Chairman. Have you discussed this relationship with members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

Admiral Turner. No, sir.

The Chairman. Or with the Department of the Navy?

Admiral Turner. I have discussed it with the Secretary of Defense and the Deputy Secretary of Defense, and I believe that we have a thorough understanding, and I think that is the level on which I will be communicating with the Department of Defense primarily.

The Chairman. What are the thoughts of the President on this issue, sir?

Admiral Turner. The President has told me that it is his strong desire that I remain on active duty.

The Chairman. If you retain your military commission while serving as the Director of Central Intelligence, your Deputy

.

Director must be a civilian.

Do you have in mind as to who should be the Deputy Director?

Admiral Turner. I am very pleased with the incumbent

Acting Director who came from the position of Deputy Director,

but I would not feel it appropriate at this time, having such

a short acquaintanceship with him and with the Community to

commit myself irrevocably to maintain him in that position. But

I am pleased with him and I would certainly want to consider

him as a candidate, among others.

The Chairman. You are speaking of Mr. Henry Knoche.

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. Now, as a senior ranking military officer,

I believe you are entitled to personal staff. Do you intend
to maintain this personal staff while serving as Director of

Central Intelligence?

Admiral Turner. I have asked the Chief of Naval Operations and obtained his permission to maintain four officers as a personal staff.

The Chairman. And will these men be drawn from Naval personnel?

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. Senate Resolution 400, the Resolution that created this committee, expresses the sense of the Senate that the head of any department or agency of the United States

8.

10 -

involved in any intelligence activity should furnish any information or document in their possession, custody or control whenever requested by this Committee with respect to any matter within the Committee's jurisdiction.

Do you intend to honor this request of the Committee with regard to any information requested which is within the jurisdiction of this Committee?

Admiral Turner. Within the accepted prerogatives of the executive branch, I certainly intend to do that, and it is my pleasant impression that the arrangements that currently exist between this Committee and the intelligence community are working well to the satisfaction of both the Committee and the community, and I would pleage myself, sir, to continue that spirit of cooperation in every way.

The Chairman. I am glad you brought that up, and I would like to say publicly that as Chairman of this Committee -- and I believe I speak for the members of this Committee -- I have been extremely pleased with the cooperation that we have experienced with all of the agencies of the intelligence community. They have been most forthcoming and forthright and open with us, and I look forward to the same type of relationship with you, sir.

My first question on Congressional oversight related to whether you will honor our requests for information.

Will you also, without a request, advise us as to information

which you feel we should know about?

.19

Admiral Turner. I feel that is an absolute responsibility, sir, not only to your Committee, but to the entire Congress.

I think that the intelligence community should be acutely aware of the activities of all the Committees of the Congress, and anxious to offer intelligence information that may be of assistance to any of them.

The Chairman. This Senate Resolution also expresses the sense of the Senate that each department and agency of the United States involved in intelligence activities should report to this Committee immediately upon discovery of any and all intelligence activities which may constitute violations of the constitutional rights of any person, violations of law, or violations of executive orders, Presidential directives, or departmental or agency rules or regulations. The Resolution further provides that each department and agency should also report to this Committee what actions have been taken or are expected to be taken with respect to any such violations which occur.

Will you pledge to make such reports promptly to this Committee with respect to any and all such violations?

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir. There are established procedures and regulations within the executive branch for reporting such improper activities, and I pledge myself to follow those absolutely and completely.



The Chairman. One of the major problems in maintaining the necessary secrecy has been the proliferation of Committees and members of the Congress involved in intelligence activities. I believe at one time the Director of Central Intelligence theoretically had to call upon about a dozen committees.

Do you have any thoughts on this?

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir. I would draw a distinction between information concerning sources and methods of intelligence collection and covert operations, and information of an intelligence nature. It is very important that we maintain and that is the legal responsibility of the Director of Central Intelligence to maintain the secrecy of our sources and methods of intelligence, and of course, covert operations must be dealt with very discretely because people's lives may be at stake as well as other great matters of importance for our country.

I would think it would be very desirable if the dissemination to the Congress in these categories of sources and methods and covert operations could be limited to a committee in each of the houses of Congress that could assume responsibility for adequate dissemination and adequate measures of control elsewhere. I don't think there should be any restriction at all on the number of committees who are given the product of our intelligence effort as it applies to their work.

The Chairman. Thank you very much. My time is up.

_

Senator Goldwater?

Senator Goldwater. Thank you.

Admiral, you have the dual role of Director of Central Intelligence and Director of the CIA.

Do you feel that these two positions should be separated and headed by two individuals?

Admiral Turner. I do not at this time, Senator, but I am certainly open to looking at that suggestion. I have in the last couple of weeks here heard arguments on both sides of the fence, but I am really unwilling to jump down at this time one way or the other.

Senator Goldwater. Will you keep us posted as to your thinking in this matter?

Admiral Turner. I certainly will.

Senator Goldwater. As Director of Central Intelligence, you control only a small percentage of the intelligence budget. The remaining is mostly controlled by the Secretary of Defense.

How can the Director of the entire intelligence community operate effectively when someone else controls most of the money?

Admiral Turner. If I might, sir, say that the executive order of February 18th, 1976, which created the Committee on Foreign Intelligence, I believe gives that committee considerable authority over 100 percent of the intelligence budget, and

I as Director of Central Intelligence, if confirmed, would be the Chairman of that Committee.

I think that is a very important tool. It is one that has been exercised in this last budget preparation for the first time. The preliminary view I have had of that is that it was reasonably effective in so doing. It is possible that the budgetary authority of the Director of Central Intelligence might be strengthened, but again, I feel it would be preliminary for me to pass such a judgment.

Senator Goldwater. Thank you.

As Director of Central Intelligence, which includes the operations of the DIA and others, you have a responsibility for them but not the authority over them.

Do you think this would be a problem, and how would you handle it?

Admiral Turner. I don't think it need be a problem. It certainly can be. I think it is a matter of good leadership and particularly persuasive leadership. There are tools, such as the budget power that I just mentioned. There is provision in the executive order I described also for the establishment of priorities by the Director of Central Intelligence. All of these things have to be worked out on a cooperative basis, and there may be some need for strengthening the law or the executive order in addition.

I think it can be done, and particularly with men of good

will, and I am very impressed that both Secretary Brown and Secretary Duncan are men of good will, and I intend to cooperate with them in every way.

Senator Goldwater. Thank you.

That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. Thank you.

Senator Bayh?

Senator Bayh. Admiral, I want to add my welcoming voice to those that you have already heard.

Let me go directly to one of the critical questions, it seems to me, that past CIA Directors have had to confront, and which I assume you might be forced to confront yourself. I say this in no way with the intention of suggesting that either you or the present Commander in Chief will be tempted or succumb to temptation to do something that you feel is basically wrong, but individuals differ in their appraisal of factual situations and legal guidelines.

You have to have the trust of the President of the United States to fulfill this role, trust that you will do your job right and report to him honestly. Also, it seems to me, the country has a right to demand a degree of independence so that where your judgment conflicts with that of the President you will have the capacity to say no, Mr. President. As past Director Helms has mentioned, it is difficult to say no to the President of the United States.

1.5

I guess what I want to know, Admiral, is if you are
Director of the CIA, and your assessment of the situation is
that something should not be done and the President thinks it
should be done and countermands your order, are you prepared to
say no, Mr. President, and if you say no and he continues to
say yes, what alternatives are available to you, and what
alternatives are you willing to pursue?

Admiral Turner. The issue in my mind, Senator Bayh, would be whether I viewed this as a disagreement with the President on the proper course of action, or whether I felt that the President was proposing an action which contravened my sense of morals and ethics or the law of the country. Surely if I just think the President's course of action is not as wise as another one, but is perfectly legal and moral and ethical, I feel a responsibility to make my views known to him, but I am not a policy maker if I am confirmed as the DCI, I am a provider of intelligence.

If, however, I am put in a position of being asked to execute something I feel is immoral, unethical or illegal, I believe I have only one option, and that is to make my point extremely forcefully to the President of the United States, perhaps calling upon the new Intelligence Oversight Board for counsel, advice and support, and then, if I am unable to reconcile that difference with the President, simply to resign, and I would be prepared to do so. I have discussed

this with President Carter, but I would not be sitting here today, sir, voluntarily if I thought there was any possibility that I would be confronted by this situation by this President.

Senator Bayh. As I say, I don't anticipate that possibility, but we have been confronted with some rather unusual circumstances in the past, and I think that is a question a lot of American people are asking themselves? Have you explored in your own mind the possibility of the alternative of reporting those significant differences to this Committee?

Admiral Turner. Yes, I have explored that, sir, and I do not believe that I would report such differences to this Committee. I believe that as long as I am employed in the executive branch of the government, my loyalty is to the President of the United States. I believe that if every member of the executive branch who disagreed with the President went to the press or went to the Congress independently, we would have anarchy in the executive branch.

Senator Bayh. Well, Admiral, if you will excuse me,
we are not talking here, again, about your definition with
differences, simple differences. We are talking about -- and
I accept your definition, that petty differences, even
differences on policy, you have to follow the Commander in
Chief, but if you are talking about a President who is embarking
on something that is clearly illegal, clearly unconstitutional,
don't you have a responsibility not to go to the press or not

. 3

to go to Congress generally, but to go to one of those committees that might be in a position to change that policy or say wait a minute, Mr. President, let's rethink this?

Admiral Turner. I would come to you, sir, but after having resigned my office.

Senator Bayh. That's a fair assessment.

Let me ask you to go again, and here I guess we are talking about hindsight and hoping that that can be it's normal 20/20, and keep us from getting into situations that we have had before. This last session, the Congress was considering the matter of how we can limit if not totally avoid the invasion of individual rights, civil liberties. Our Committee and the Senate Judiciary Committee reported S. 3197 which tried to strike a balance between the right of individuals to be protected and secure under our Constitution, and their right to be secure from foreign invasion and this kind of danger.

Could you give us your judgment of this kind of legislation? We were dealing in that area specifically with limiting wiretap legislation. We were trying to provide the same protection in the foreign intelligence gathering area that now exists as far as the application of electronic surveillance to domestic matters.

I would like to know whether you would support our efforts to try to put reasonable guidelines, protections, the use of a warrant, not only on electronic surveillance but other invasions

.11

such as surreptitions entry, the mail openings and the other invasions that we are painfully aware of that had taken place in the past.

Admiral Turner. I certainly would support those efforts, Senator. I am not prepared at this early time to make specific comment on specific provisions of the legislation, or which of them are better served in the executive order as some of those you mentioned already are, or better served in legislation, but I think the intelligence community, as I briefly mentioned in my opening remarks, needs a real sense of direction to be given to it by the Congress and by the Executive Branch so that people know the rules within which they are required to work.

Senator Bayh. You see nothing inconsistent with doing your job of collecting information necessary to protect the country and protecting the rights of American citizens by requiring that warrants be used?

May I ask you to expand this to apply also to American citizens who are abroad? There seems to be a rather unique distinction where if you are an American citizen at home your rights can be protected, but if you are an American citizen abroad, there is significant leeway, so far at least the way the intelligence community has looked at this.

Would you give us your thoughts on that, please?

Admiral Turner. On the first part of your question, yes,

there is an inconsistency between maintaining full rights of

the individual and conducting secret operations, but I don't think that that means that we should not spell out reasonably explicitly how we are going to draw the line between those conflicting interests. That is the whole problem of conducting intelligence in a democratic and an open society. And each instance is going to be a judgment call, and some guidelines laid down by the Congress and the President can be useful in making those decisions.

As far as protection of Americans overseas from invasion of their proper liberties and rights, I believe here again we must recognize that although it is more difficult overseas because we are notin full control of the situation, we must extend to Americans there the protection of the Constitution to the degree at all possible.

And we must conduct our activities over there in accordance with American law.

Senator Bayh. I guess the key lynchpin of what we are trying to do is in most instances apply the same standard, the same proof on intelligence agencies in foreign surveillance and gathering area that is now applied domestically, which basically has been the criminal standard, and in the legislation which we passed through this Committee, in all areas save one, we did apply the reasonable cause standard, the criminal standard, to the foreign area. The one area of exception was where we could find someone who we could say had reasonable

22.

cause to believe, and could nail down he or she was on the payroll of a foreign intelligence system involved in clandestine activity. Given that one roughly minor limitation, do you see any problems? Would you support asking a Federal judge for a warrant before this kind of activity could be initiated as far as American citizens are concerned here and abroad?

Admiral Turner. I am really not prepared to jump into that degree of detail, I am afraid, sir. I can just guess that there must be considerable problems in doing that kind of thing overseas with a judge in the United States in a timely fashion, and I am not opposed to it, but I am not ready to endorse it at this point because I simply haven't been into it deeply enough?

Senator Bayh. Are you -- would you support that as far as intelligence activities in the foreign area as they applied here at home?

Admiral Turner. I think we should conduct our intelligence activities in foreign areas in as close a manner to those in the United States as we possibly can.

Senator Bayh. Does this include your support of an effort to require a Federal judge to give permission before electronic surveillance and mail opening and surreptitious entry can be conducted?

Admiral Turner. I beg your indulgence, sir. I am simply not that familiar with either the problems that that would

create or how that would be executed to pass that judgment here but I will certainly look into it with all dispatch and be back to you if I am confirmed for this office.

The Chairman. Your time is up.

Senator Bayh. Let me make one observation, Mr. Chairman. If the Admiral is confirmed, he will soon find out.

The Chairman. Senator Mathias.

Senator Mathias. Mr. Chairman, I have a brief statement which I request be included in the record.

The Chairman. Without objection, it is so ordered. (The prepared statement of Senator Mathias follows:) COMMITTEE INSERT

Ī

. 11

Senator Mathias. Admiral, again I congratulate you. It is a pleasure to see you here today.

Admiral Turner. Thank you.

Senator Mathias. You have expressed your opinion that

Congress should be a knowledgeable partner within the limits

of the constitutional prerogatives of the executive branch,

and I certainly agree with the first part of that statement,

that Congress should be a knowledgeable partner, but if we

are to exercise oversight, we have to have access to knowledge,

full access to knowledge.

So I am wondering if you could tell us what your concept of the constitutional prerogatives may be which could in some way impinge upon this Committee's need for information.

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir. I think there are two that come to my mind. One is I believe that the deliberations on policy decision making within the executive branch are not necessarily or well transmitted to the Congress and are not a necessary part of the information the Congress needs.

Secondly, I also had in mind in that phrase that the Director of Central Intelligence does have a statutory responsibility to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of sources and methods of intelligence, and it seems to me that there are some very delicate details of covert intelligence operations which the Committee may not want to hear.

It is my understanding that this, as I said earlier to

· .7

. 11

- 24

the Chairman, is an area that has been working well in the present arrangements, and I would hope to certainly keep it that way.

Senator Mathias. Well, I would say to the Admiral that that phrase "may not want to hear" is a little bit of a sore phrase around here.

Admiral Turner. Sorry.

Senator Mathias. There are some very senior members of the Senate, no longer -- I can't think of anyone still here -- but who used to employ that phrase: "I don't want to hear it," "I don't want to know," and there are a lot of things in this life that we don't want to hear and don't want to know, but it seems to me that we have some constitutional responsibility to know and to help bear the burden, and I don't think that it should be a criteria of withholding of information that it is something that this Committee would not want to know.

Admiral Turner. I apologize for using a phrase that could be interpreted in several ways. I did not mean it as a part of the traditional doctrine of plausible deniability. I don't mean that at all. I simply mean that I feel a great sense of responsibility for the protection of, say, individuals who are involved in covert intelligence operations and whose lives may well depend on their being kept secret. I would think in a case like that what I am talking about is being sure the Committees of the Congress are advised fully of the extent and

nature of the operations, but perhaps not the detail of such sensitive significance that would not be germane to their making a decision on the case.

Senator Mathias. You are not asserting this as a right to withhold information.

Admiral Turner. No, sir, I am not. I think this can be amicably worked out between the Committee and the Director of Central Intelligence.

Senator Mathias. When you were kind enough to come and see me a couple of weeks ago, we discussed a very sensitive question of conflicting loyalties that might someday confront you. I hope they never will. I hope that we in this country will all be moving with such common purpose that you won't have a sense of conflicting loyalty, but you have spent your professional career as a member of the Navy, you hold very high rank and very high responsibilities in the Navy, and in those circumstances, the orders of the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States are unquestioned.

Do you have any compunction about revealing to this

Committee information it needs to know, even though it might

be the wish of a President -- I am not talking about the

incumbent President, but a President who might clearly indicate
to you that you are not to communicate that information to the

Committee?

Admiral Turner. As long as in my personal view the

а

Committee had a lawful right to that information, that is, it was not in the categories we have just discussed, sir, I would not have any such hesitation.

Senator Mathias. But if a President were to lay that upon you as a positive injunction, how would you resolve that?

Admiral Turner. I would do as I discussed with Senator Bayh a few minutes ago. I would go to the President and make my position absolutely clear to him. I would not come to you before I had done so. And if we could not resolve that, my alternative is only to leave my position and resign.

Senator Mathias. Admiral, do you draw a line between national intelligence and tactical intelligence?

Admiral Turner. There certainly is a line, Senator.

The line, I believe, is becoming fuzzier. The tactical intelligence used to be the man on patrol. Now it may also be an overhead reconnaissance system controlled from thousands of miles away from the squad leader who would have sent the man out on patrol. There are still, of course, the patrols, the individual reconnaissance aircraft controlled by the local tactical commander, and those, I believe, the commander must retain his control over. But we are going to have to in the near future rethink this definition of the dividing line between national and tactical intelligence and how we best apportion those collection assets that can serve both purposes simultaneously. It is a difficult issue.

5.

Senator Mathias. In view of the fact that the tactical intelligence removes them from the DCI's management, have you thought out and are you prepared now to give us some idea of the guidelines that you yourself would like to see applied?

Admiral Turner. No, sir, I am not anywhere near that, but I think the definition may have to go to something like the source of the control of the intelligence asset. But it would be foolhardy of me to try to jump in and say I had reached a conclusion in this short a time.

Senator Mathias. Having in mind your previous concern for protection of sources and methods, would you be inclined to provide on a regular basis to this Committee counterintelligence information about hostile activities of foreign intelligence and foreign security services which might be of some use to the Congress in developing a comprehensive national policy?

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir. Again in each case we have to make a difficult decision as to how much of the detail is needed for your proper oversight responsibilities and how much of it is very, very sensitive and needs to be protected for the legal responsibilities of the DCI.

Senator Mathias. Well, to give the Committee at least a sense of the level at which these activities are taking place, the kind of direction that they may have or the kind of impact that they could have on policies that we should be either adopting or policies that perhaps we ought to alter?

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir, that gives me no problem.

Senator Mathias. What level of priority do you give in

your mind to counterintelligence activities? Do you feel that
they ought to be a major function of the intelligence community,
that counterintelligence deserves to be treated on a level with
other functions of the community, or do you think it is a lesser
concern?

Admiral Turner. I don't know that I have really made a judgment as to where it fits with the collection, the analysis, covert operations activities. It certainly seems to me a very important one, but it seems equally important that it be strictly in accordance with law which my understanding is that counterintelligence by the intelligence agencies, particularly the CIA, is an overseas responsibility and the FBI a national responsibility.

Senator Mathias. Would you plan to give this some personal attention as you shake down in this particular period?

Admiral Turner. Absolutely, yes, sir.

Senator Mathias. And make your own evaluation as to exactly the relative priority that it ought to receive?

Admiral Turner. Yes, indeed.

Senator Mathias. And will you communicate your judgments to the Committee when you have reached them?

Admiral Turner. I certainly will.

The Chairman. Your time is up, Senator.

Senator Stevenson?

Senator Stevenson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Admiral, I would begin by following up on some of the questions raised already by the Chairman and by Senator Mathias.

Effective Congressional oversight is a recent phenomenon and a little-understood phenomenon, and I say effective because this Committee is kept informed, imperfectly, but we are continuously informed, and misunderstood or little-understood because we are informed in secret.

Now, perhaps it is possible for all of us today to relief some of the anxieties that I believe you alluded to earlier about intelligence activities by being a little more specific.

Now, I recognize that you can't go very far without touching upon sensitive subjects.

Will you inform us in advance of covert operations?

Admiral Turner. I understand the sense of the Senate in Resolution 400 with regard to advance notification, and I would anticipate no difficulty in making every effort to comply with the sense of that resolution, and in complying strictly with the law in the Hughes-Ryan amendment.

I would think it would be an extremely rare occasion when it was not possible to provide information on covert activities in advance.

1

3

5

7

8

Senator Stevenson. The Hughes-Ryan amendment speaks of timely notification, and it has been the source of some The resolution to which you referred to speaks confusion. of advance notification.

I think that answer is satisfactory, and I think we can assume that all of your answers are subject to your earlier remarks about your relationship with the President.

In addition to the extent it is possible, advance notice of covert operation, will you likewise inform us in advance of collection operations which carry high political risks?

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir.

Senator Stevenson. And I think you mentioned this earlier --

Admiral Turner. And again -- I'm sorry, sir -- again with the same provisions.

Senator Stevenson. And qualifications.

Admiral Turner. There is always that possibility that something comes up in the middle of the night where a decision absolutely has to be made right now, and that is the kind of thing I have in mind of not wanting to be pinned down absolutely.

Senator Stevenson. We can't expect more of you than is possible, and we are not unfamiliar with such situations.

Senator Mathias. If the Senator would yield, our Chairman sleeps lightly.

24

25

ľ

Senator Stevenson. In fact, he has a beeper which wakes him up.

(General laughter.)

Senator Stevenson. The same question with respect to improper or unlawful activities which come to your attention - this is after the fact -- you will inform us?

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir, through the normal or the established procedures for this.

Senator Stevenson. And our mandate makes specific reference to, in this connection, to security problems, breaches of security, unauthorized disclosures of sensitive information.

You will again inform us, and to the extent it is possible, of your own knowledge, of such actions?

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir.

Senator Stevenson. Of unlawful activities.

And how do you feel in this connection about public disclosure of aggregate budget figures for the intelligence community?

Admiral Turner. My inclination at this time is that we should publish an aggregate budget figure for the total intelligence community, but I have not, sir, had an opportunity to hear all of the arguments on the contrary side, and I feel that it would be imprudent to make a final judgment until I have heard people out. I know there are certainly those who do not agree with that point of view.

Senator Stevenson. Now, this Committee is assigning a new Congressional emphasis in connection with oversight to the quality of American intelligence, its collection, its analysis, production, and its communication to appropriate policy makers. In addition to the disclosures to the Congress that we have already discussed, will you view the Congress and its appropriate agencies as a consumer, that is to say, undertake to bring to the attention of Congress information available to you which is relevant to deliberations in the Congress?

This has not happened in the past, and yet this is the policy making branch of the government. Can we feel that you will make an effort to inform us of relevant information that will help us in our legislative committees make sound policy?

Admiral Turner. Absolutely, sir. I think that is a responsibility of the intelligence community, and I think that one of the ways to restore the credibility and confidence in the intelligence community is to do just that.

Senator Stevenson. Now, there is some feeling in the Congress, a feeling which I share, that intelligence, both in the collection and production, has been too narrowly focused in the past, and that new priorities are required, priorities which attach more importance to economic and political matters in this interdependent and rapidly changing world.

In this connection, the quality of intelligence, what

in your opinion are the principal deficiencies in the intelligence community, the principal problems which you face?

Admiral Turner. I think the principal problem that concerns me, from the preliminary view I have had of the intelligence community, is ensuring that all of the shreds of intelligence which are available, whether they are in ERDA or Treasury or FBI or DIA, anywhere else, are brought together and synthesized so that we take advantage of all that is available to us, and so that we are sure that the President and the Congress are getting the most balanced view of the situation that we can possibly construct, and the operation is so immense, there are so many different interests involved, that I don't think that is an easy task, but it is one that I think must be continually approached. It has been in the past, and I intend to continue efforts in that direction.

The Chairman. Your time is up, sir.

Senator Chafee?

Senator Chafee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to join in the congratulations to you,

Admiral Turner, for your selection, and congratulate the

President for having chosen you. It has been my privilege to

have been associated with you for many years, and I must say

that every job you have done, you have just been superb.

Admiral Turner. Thank you.

Senator Chafee. I would like to ask one question.

Under the 1947 Act, as I read it, it talks about the Director of Central Intelligence is responsible for protecting intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure.

Now, it seems to me we come down in this modern era to a dilemma, a dilemma in that I think Congress and the nation feel that they were burned by overclassification, by what were considered improper actions in the intelligence community, and therefore it is perfectly proper for those people to have made these disclosures, yet -- and now we have a torrent of books and news articles and scoops and even stealing classified documents. And we don't as a nation seem to be able to do anything about this.

Do you see it as one of your responsibilities, if you consider this a problem, to come to Congress and press Congress to get on with the enacting of some laws that can somehow handle the situation, or do you think it is just up to Congress to take the lead in this area?

Admiral Turner. I certainly think that the Director of Central Intelligence is charged with a very difficult task here under the existing ability or inability to prosecute people who violate these trusts of security information.

And I would be very happy to endeavor to study this to the degree of being able to make recommendations to the Congress, though of course it is the ultimate responsibility of Congress to decide whether a law is needed here.

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Senator Chafee. Well, I am not suggesting there is any easy answer. I think it is a dilemma, particularly based on recent history, but certainly as we go along, I would be interested in, first of all, whether you have considered the problem as you proceed in your activity, should you be confirmed, which I certainly hope you will be, and then the burden falls on Congress, it seems to me, to carry the ball from there based on the recommendations that we look forward to you to come forward with.

Admiral Turner. All right, sir.

Senator Chafee. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. Thank you very much, sir.

Senator Hathaway?

Senator Hathaway. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement be inserted in the record.

The Chairman. Without objection.

(The prepared statement of Senator Hathaway follows:)

COMMITTEE INSERT

A

Senator Hathaway. I would like to pursue the covert activities questions that have been asked you. You indicated that you are, of course, in favor of pre-notification of any covert activities. Would you go a step further and advocate a pre-clearance by the Committee so that no covert activity could commence until the Committee had given its okay, within a certain length of time, say, a week or ten days?

Admiral Turner. Senator, I think that in my position as the executor here for the executive branch, it is my responsibility to comply with the law of the Congress, and if the Congress wishes to make that the law, certainly. Otherwise, the resolution of the degree of approval that the Congress is going to have over these must be something taken between the President and the Congress, I believe.

Senator Hathaway. Well, would you support such legislative action on behalf of the Congress?

Admiral Turner. I would personally have some qualms here, again as to the issues of timeliness that I raised with Senator Stevenson previously, because it seems to me there are practical problems involved. But I surely have not had the time to study this in enough depth to answer you with a definitive yes or no. I will certainly look into it further.

Senator Hathaway. And how about the Congress establishing certain guidelines with respect to covert activities, such as ones that we don't think should be carried out: to-wit,

assassinations of any kind, and other categories, whether we are going to approve influencing elections, payments to foreign dignitaries or whatnot, do you think that you would welcome Congressional guidelines along that line?

Admiral Turner. I would, sir. Which and how many is another issue that I just am not prepared at this time to be specific on.

Senator Hathaway. What about the paramilitary operations of the CIA? What are your thoughts on that? Should that be discontinued?

Admiral Turner. I do not think that we should deprive the country of that possibility. I think in this particular time in our history, the possibility of wanting to rely on paramilitary operations is very low.

Senator Hathaway. Let me ask you some questions in regard to classification. You mentioned something in your statement, that you would welcome a classification legislation from the Congress.

Would this be along the lines of establishing limited authority -- because I understand now that almost everybody in every agency has a rubber stamp that he can stamp a document with, with the result that we have a lot of documents that have been classified that shouldn't be classified, and many that have been classified for many, many years without being reclassified, and there has been a movement on in Congress to

ó

.17

both limit the authority, to limit the number of classifications, and to limit the duration that a document could remain classified, not that it wouldn't be subject reclassification, but at least every year or two years at the most, it would be subject to re-examination.

Would you support legislation along that line?

Admiral Turner. I am not sure whether I believe that

legislation or executive directives -- and there are, of course,

directives today that require many of the things that you have

just suggested, sir -- is the best way to handle this. My

feeling is that with regulations and legislation, it is going

to be very, very difficult to curb the overclassification

problem.

My particular approach to it, as Director of Central Intelligence, were I approved, would be to conduct periodic reviews of what information can be gleaned from existing secure sources and classified information, and deliberately either declassify it, or if it is unclassified, extract it.

We often find a document with one secret paragraph in it and ten pages --

Senator Hathaway. Right.

Admiral Turner. -- of unclassified information, much of which is of value to the public as well as to the Congress.

I would like --

Senator Hathaway. When you say periodic, do you mean at

least annually?

Admiral Turner. Well, yes, sir, but I mean, I would look to taking particular subjects that are of current importance to the country and making sure that we are not withholding information that would improve the quality of public debate on them, unnecessarily withholding it. So I think it would be an ad hoc thing in many way. What is really important that the public know that we have today and can share with them?

Senator Hathaway. Now, with respect to organization, you mentioned in answer to Senator Mathias' question the knotty problem we have separating national from tactical intelligence, and I don't recall whether you came to any conclusion on whether this Committee should have jurisdiction over all intelligence, regardless of whether it is classified as tactical or national or whatever way it is classified, but should we be establishing the budget authorizations for, say, tactical intelligence?

Admiral Turner. I think that I would respectfully like to stay out of the crunch between you and the Armed Services Committee on this one, sir. I think that is as difficult an issue as deciding where Defense and Central Intelligence divide their jurisdiction over the two intelligence activities.

Senator Hathaway. We could use your recommendation, provided it is favorable.

(General laughter.)

Senator Hathaway. There has been some talk, too, of

. 7

1.5

consolidating our intelligence activities rather than having each, the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and so forth, have their own intelligence arms, that we have just one intelligence unit, whatever you may call it, and each one would simply refer to that one for whatever information they might need.

Do you think that is a sensible step to reorganize the intelligence community that way?

Admiral Turner. I think we must look at a number of alternatives for reorganization, but I think we must at the same time be very clear that we cannot so centralize that we in any way make it too difficult for dissenting, differing views to come forward. We must not ever think that somebody's prescient in the intelligence view. We must let different evaluations come out, and I think in any reorganization, a careful compromise has got to be made between centralization in order to effect necessary control and efficiency, and decentralization to be sure that there are differing views.

Senator Hathaway. Along that line, do you favor maintaining or continuing this Team B approach that was used recently with respect to evaluating our posture internationally?

Admiral Turner. I believe that there is a place for outsiders to evaluate what is being done inside the intelligence community. I believe there is certainly a place for a wide divergence of biases, attitudes, opinions to be brought to bear on any intelligence problem. I don't think you necessarily have

to go outside to get the wide variety of attitudes and opinions, but I think that there are good opportunities for something like the Team B-Team A operation, but I would not necessarily endorse that particular method of having done it. But particularly --

Senator Hathaway. But the concept of having some other independent group evaluate the data and come up with its conclusions you are in favor of.

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir, very much so.

Senator Hathaway. What about disclosure of the intelligence budget?

Do you have any views on that, whether we should disclose the total figure, or detailed disclosure, or just what disclosure do you think is necessary to keep the public informed?

Admiral Turner. My inclination is to disclose the one total and go no further, but I mentioned earlier that I am reluctant to make that a commitment to you until I have heard more of the opposing views.

Senator Hathaway. Fine.

Thank you very much, Admiral.

Admiral Turner. Thank you, sir.

Senator Hathaway. Thank you, sir.

The Chairman. Thank you.

Senator Lugar?

Senator Lugar. Mr. Chairman, Admiral Turner, do you

. 11

believe that the armed services have traditionally resisted attempts at oversight and consolidation in the intelligence area, and if so, how do you presume to try to overcome that resistance?

Admiral Turner. I don't think there is any bureaucracy in the world that hasn't resisted its collapse into some more central organization, and I think one has to overcome that resistance by a combination of persuasive leadership, by a combination of encouraging the executive to issue the proper executive orders, and working with the Congress to ensure that the adequate legislation is there to effect whatever changes may be necessary.

Senator Lugar. Earlier on you tried to reflect and answer this question, but let me pursue for just a moment the problem that might be analogous to that which faced George Bush when he came before this Committee, and because George Bush was a politician, it was suggested that he ought not to move on to further office in the political realm, at least not too rapidly after his service.

What sort of problems do you see in terms of your naval career, granted the desire to continue with the commission and to move on in that service, and given very difficult decisions that you may need to make with regard to the other armed services, or very unpopular decisions with regard to future colleagues or those who might be in command over you when you

. 11

resume that career?

Admiral Turner. Senator, throughout my career to date,

I have felt it was always necessary to transfer one's loyalty

completely to the job at hand and let the future worry about

itself, and I am convinced in this instance if, having

transferred my loyalty, if I am approved, to the President

of the United States, to whom I would report directly, if I

ever showed a subsidiary loyalty to the Navy, to the Department

of Defense, the President of the United States would detect

that very quickly, and my usefulness to him and to the

country would soon diminish rapidly.

Senator Lugar. Will you have unrestricted access to President Carter, and have you discussed that access or some modus vivendi for reporting with him?

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir. We have discussed it. He has assured me that I have direct access to him, and we have or are working out an arrangement for regular meetings between the two of us.

Senator Lugar. Let me carry on a point that you made earlier on which I am certain is the right course to follow in the event that after a discussion with President Carter you came to a very severe disagreement or the constitutionality of an action, or its illegality, and therefore you resigned and then informed this Committee. Still, as a practical matter, a resignation under those circumstances of course is bound to

2

3

٥

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

lead to questions by friends and foes alike, not only of the President and yourself, but of this country as to what is going on, what somt of problems are involved. There is no easy way to make certain that at some point reconciliation occurs all the way along the line, but is it your judgment of the conversations you have had with the President or with others in his administration that they are so sensitive to the course of history, at least with regard to intelligence in this country, that they are of a mind to make certain that they do not transgress -- in other words, put all of us in a situation in which there is a blow-up, literally, that would cause your resignation, cause perhaps difficulty with this Committee and with Congress and with the public. In other words, probably, the question I am raising, asks itself, if we are all sufficiently sensitive in this country about the things which have occurred, the misuse of authority, that we are all on guard not to do this again, but I am just simply curious in exploring this relationship which you will have to have with the President, to what extent he or others have really thought through what would occur in the event of your resignation, as a matter of conscience, you saw that you could not perform?

Admiral Turner. I am very persuaded from my several conversations with the President that he is most sensitive in these areas. I am persuaded and very pleased at the high degree of interest that he has shown in the intelligence

g

function, and the surprising, to me, amount of detail that he has absorbed about it in the brief time that he has had.

So I look forward, if confirmed, to working for a man who I think has an intense interest in the job he is asking me to take, and that is a wonderful way to start.

Senator Lugar. As a matter of detail, are you prepared to log all contacts, the President included, and everybody else, with you so that there is some record for yourself or the President or this Committee of all persons who contact you with regard to CIA business?

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir, I certainly am, and I think it would be a very prudent thing to do.

Senator Lugar. What assurance can you give the Committee that improper influence will not be brought to bear, not by the President, but by his staff members, by other intervening persons or by persons in business or labor or public interest groups or other? How will you guard against persons who, albeit from good motives, at least as they see them, want to see you and to have a word and to suggest ways in which you might further your mission?

Admiral Turner. I can only assure you, sir, that one in public office has to develop a sense of propriety here. At the same time, I would also assure you that I have always had a great quest for contact with people from a wide variety of attitudes and diverse opinions, and I would intend to maintain

. 11

that here, but certainly being very careful that none of them placed me or themselves in a position of impropriety in so doing.

Senator Lugar. Let me ask this question finally. Throughout your career, obviously, you have been a consumer of
intelligence. You have some ideas of its value in regard to
command decisions or staff work in which you have been involved.

In what ways could you work effectively with this

Committee, or for that matter, with Congress generally, in

thinking through what ought to be the role of your agency in

providing intelligence for the Congress?

I am thinking in this case not simply information as to covert activity or sensitive data, but I suppose I am thinking more in terms of the fact that the legislative body has a mission to perform, sometimes independently of the President, in legislative initiatives, or at least having good data with which to work, and this comes from all sorts of sources, but have you given any thought as to how the development of your role might proceed so that you not only serve the President directly and are part of his administration, but think of yourself in more national sense, serving the legislative body, too, for that matter, the Supreme Court, should it have need for your services?

Admiral Turner. I hadn't thought of the Supreme Court, good idea, but yes, sir, I would hope that my experience as a

consumer would help me to take the point of view of the Committees of Congress who are approaching national problems. I would hope that I could stay abreast of what the principal interests of the Committees of the Congress were, and charge my staff to be sure that we were carefully seeking out that information that we possess which could conceivably be of value to these Committees, and I speak not only of the Intelligence

Committees, and the Foreign Relations and the Armed Services

Committees, who are major consumers, but it seems to me we should be scrutinizing almost virtually all of the Committees.

Senator Lugar. Well, for instance, take a look at agricultural data and think of food supplies and other energy supplies and sources and what have you that may very well be universal in their application.

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir, very much so.

Senator Lugar. Thank you, Admiral.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. Senator Huddleston?

Senator Huddleston. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I ask unanimous consent that a short statement that I have prepared be included in the record at the beginning of the session.

The Chairman. Without objection, so ordered.

(The prepared statement of Senator Huddleston follows:)

Senator Huddleston. Admiral Turner, in looking at your statement, I find on page 3 an indication of what your objectives with the President are, as detailed to you, to paraphrase, that we explore ways of improving the efficiency of our intelligence gathering, that we see that all elements of our intelligence operate within the law and within the values of Americans. There is also the statement there that indicates that the President believes that this can be accomplished under the existing executive orders and the existing law, and it goes on to say that you will consider any new approaches that the Congress may suggest along this line.

Is it correct that the President, then, has an open mind, and you, too, as to the need for additional statutory charters for the various elements of our intelligence?

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir.

Senator Huddleston. Do you believe that the executive order under which you are now operating, 11905, plus the 1947 Act, gives you the authority that you need to successfully manage the intelligence community?

Admiral Turner. I am not prepared, Senator, to assure you that I think that is optimal. I am drawing a fine line, here.

I think it can be done under the existing orders and laws.

I think it might be --

Senator Huddleston. You don't rule out the possibility that it might be done better.

: 15

Admiral Turner. That is just what I was going to say.

Senator Huddleston. Under statutes that might be developed.

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir, easier or better, or both, if
there were some changes.

Senator Huddleston. Is there any way to really manage the intelligence community without having the authority, for instance, of the purse, being able to assign the various appropriations to them on the basis of assignments that you as DCI would direct them to undertake?

Admiral Turner. I am not actually a believer that you have to have control of the purse in order to control bureaucracies --

Senator Huddleston. It is usually a pretty effective tool.

Admiral Turner. -- but it is very helpful, and whether we need in the DCI's hands more control than presently exists through the executive order and the Committee on Foreign Intelligence, I am not really sure at this time.

Senator Huddleston. The previous investigative committee, that was chaired by Senator Church, and on which I served, in reviewing the act of 1947, described it as no longer an adequate framework for the conduct of America's intelligence activities. It went on to say that it was a vague and openended statement of authority for the President.

Do you disagree with those findings?

3

4

J

6

′

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Admiral Turner. I am not in disagreement with them, but I am not sure I would be quite that explicit or emphatic.

Senator Huddleston. But you are willing to review with this Committee the possibility of additional statutory authority.

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir.

Senator Huddleston. And to the extent of even separate charters for each element of the intelligence community.

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir. I have not formed an opinion on whether charters are appropriate or necessary, but I am certainly very open to considering the subject.

Senator Huddleston. You are not foreclosing the possibility.

Admiral Turner. No, sir, in no way.

Senator Huddleston. One of the things that we found was that it was virtually impossible to ascertain to what extent the President knew about some of the activities, specifically the assassination activities, even though those who were in the field carrying out those activities or attempting to, seemed to be certain in their own mind that they had approval "at the highest level", which was either the President or someone speaking for him in the White House.

Do you believe it is important that we have a system whereby the accountability is clearly defined?

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir.

.

Senator Huddleston. And can be determined who gave the orders, what they knew, and the total line of authority discerned so that persons all the way from the top to the bottom can be held accountable?

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir.

Senator Huddleston. Is that possible under the present, or likely under the present system of operation do you believe?

Admiral Turner. I believe that the current procedures for gaining approval of covert operations give a very high assurance that that would be the case, but it still would depend on the Director of Central Intelligence absolutely demanding that he knows that it is the President who has given the approval and not one of his subordinates, and I would intend to take that position.

Senator Huddleston. On this approval, certainly the awareness ought to be of just precisely how a policy or an action, a covert or clandestine action, is to be carried out, so that the President, the highest authority, might be aware of specifically what is taking place down on the local level, so to speak, in order to carry out an assignment that is given by the National Security Council or the DCI.

Admiral Turner. It would be an act of irresponsibility to fail to inform the decision makers through the entire chain of command of that kind of information and ask them to make a decision on a covert operation.

would be better for this country's interests if a certain leader were disposed of, then that terminology ought to be explicit, and it ought to mean whether or not disposed of by supporting a candidate who might defeat him in a free and open election, or whether he ought to be incapacitated in some way that would eliminate his presence. I would agree that those are extreme cases, and we have dealt with assassination, but the point is, the manner in carrying out a directive sometimes is far different from what might be perceived in the directive itself.

Senator Huddleston. In other words, I am saying if it

becomes important or somebody at the top might believe that it

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir.

Senator Huddleston. Do you agree with that?

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir. I do.

Senator Huddleston. Your experience indicates that to you.

The 1947 Act doesn't specifically give the CIA the authority to collect intelligence. Do you think that the Act ought to be amended or specific authority ought to be given for that purpose?

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir.

Senator Huddleston. Rather than the vague terms that do whatever else the National Security Council might direct?

Admiral Turner. I think there is undoubtedly room for improvement here. We can operate under the existing one, and

-

. 11

have, but I am certainly amenable to reviewing --

Senator Huddleston. But not always in a way that might be termed exemplary.

The investigating committee found a rather wide use by
the CIA of various types of individuals and institutions, use
of the media, use of academics, use of the clergy, in carrying
out covert activities. In the case of the media, new directives
have altered that to a great extent.

What is your feeling about using institutions that if it became knowledge, might seriously reflect on or be detrimental to those institutions themselves?

Admiral Turner. I don't think that the intelligence function of this Committee should attempt to shape the opinion of students on our campuses or to use academic institutions as a tool for propagandizing in any way. At the same time, I would be reluctant to think that a member of an academic community would be denied his right of serving his country in any legal way that he wanted, whether it was in helping the Agricultural Department --

Senator Huddleston. But you feel he ought to be knowledgeable about what he is doing.

Admiral Turner. I don't feel that the intelligence agency should recruit assistance from people on our campuses without making it clear that it is the intelligence community that is doing it.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

Senator Huddleston. Admiral Turner, do you consider the Congress as a legitimate user of intelligence?

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir.

Senator Huddleston. And you would treat it as such.

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir.

Senator Huddleston. Even if such intelligence might be contrary to stated policies of the President?

Admiral Turner. My responsibility, if confirmed as the Director of Central Intelligence, is to provide intelligence, not policy.

Senator Huddleston. Even if the intelligence might be embarrassing to the President.

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir.

Senator Huddleston. You would supply that.

My time is up. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. Senator Biden.

Senator Biden. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Admiral, I have had a new-found feeling of power sitting here. I don't know of anybody who has ever kept Pat Moynihan waiting, and I am able to do that for ten more minutes.

(General laughter.)

Senator Biden. The more he thumps his foot, the more I will hurry, though.

I would like, on a bit of a humorous note, to raise

another question.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10.

17

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I never thought of the Supreme Court as being a consumer, but in light of recent decisions on busing, I would like you to investigate the counterintelligence activities in that area. It would be very helpful to me.

I would like to make a brief comment. I feel very, very strongly, as I indicated to you in my office when we had an opportunity to speak, that the issue raised by several members of the Committee here as to the need or the suggestion that there might be a need for the DCI to have greater control over the entire intelligence community, including the purse strings, particularly that aspect which is part of the Department of Defense. I feel very strongly that -- and I realize you can't make that push, even if you agreed, and I don't know that you do or don't, but I would hope that this Committee will pursue with you and with the President of the United States, the need for there to be one person, if you are confirmed, you, who has control of the intelligence community, not maybe, not sometimes, not part of the time, not part of it, but all of it, and I would hope that as we investigate that, which I, as one member of this Committee am going to pursue with the President, and I suspect the whole Committee will in some way or another, that you will be amenable to listening to our suggestions to move the DCI into a position of greater authority, because I think it is absolutely critical that when the President turns to you,

if you are confirmed, and says, what is the situation, that you know, that it is not -- that you do not have to be embroiled in a controversy, in internecine warfare with the Secretary of Defense or some underling in the Defense Department or any other agency, and that I think that is very important.

You also mentioned, and it has been mentioned here, the need for the Administration, executive branch, and in concurrence or in conjunction with the -- with this Committee, to determine a more definite policy as to what constitutes classified material, what constitutes secrecy, what should and shouldn't be treated as a document, as a classified document, and what sanctions prevail for violation of any directive in that regard.

I know it is the intention of the Chairman of the Committee to, if not have a subcommittee, but for the whole Committee at one point to pursue that issue with you, and we look forward to your cooperation when that time occurs, assuming you are confirmed.

I would like to raise a few specific questions within the remainder of my time, if I may.

With regard to covert activities, I have been somewhat disturbed as a member of this Committee that there is a very fine line between what constitutes clandestine activities and a covert activity, and as I understand the law -- and staff may correct me if I am wrong; I wish they would correct me if

I am wrong -- the -- under the present situation and the situation which you alluded that you agree with, that is, informing this Committee, if not prior, at least simultaneously, with a decision to undertake a covert activity.

Everyone agrees that that is the case, but in my experience on this Committee, there are certain potentially, there are things categorized as clandestine which have potentially more danger to our national security and embarrassment to the United States of America were they to be uncovered, that are of greater consequence and importance, than the covert activities that are going on, and I wonder whether or not you feel there is a need for you to advise us prior to, if not at least simultaneously, with the initiation of a clandestine activity which is obviously of major international consequence?

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir, I think that ties in -Senator Biden. It is clandestine, I am told by the
distinguished Senator from Kentucky, who said you all.

Admiral Turner. I think it is part and parcel of the overall package of proper oversight of our activities.

Senator Biden. Do you agree that there are clandestine, secret activities on the part of the intelligence community that can be of greater consequence to our national security than certain covert activities?

Admiral Turner. I would suspect that is the case. I have not yet read into the covert and clandestine activities

_

of greatest sensitivity other than those that I have known in the course of my military activities.

Senator Biden. Well, again, assuming you are confirmed,
I would hope that the Committee will pursue that question with
you and with the President of the United States.

I would like to move to an area that we have already discussed and ask you, because I am sure, I suspect the press is going to ask us why we weren't a little bit harder on you in terms of the -- your retention of your rank of Admiral, and we did go through, and I was one of the several who voted against the confirmation of George Bush, we went through this great long debate as to whether or not his activities subsequent to service as DCI should be within the purview and scope of consideration by this Committee or the Congress as a whole, and it was concluded that it was, and yet we haven't asked you yet whether or not you -- how long you plan on serving as DCI, if you are confirmed, assuming you stay, you keep the pleasure of the President.

Admiral Turner. I intend to remain in that office, if confirmed, as long as the President of the United States desires me to do so.

Senator Biden. Now, that is in spite of the fact that in July of '78 the position of Chief of Naval Operations and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff will become vacant.

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir.

Ο.

. 11

- 16

Senator Biden. You are aware that that vacancy will occur in 1978.

Admiral Turner. I have heard about it.

Senator Biden. And are you in a position to indicate to this Committee that it is not your intention to seek that Chairmanship and Chief of Naval Operations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir.

Senator Biden. Fair enough.

And I have another question in that regard.

I am not quite sure why you want to remain on active duty. I am not sure I understand. I understand your feeling a commitment to the service and your love for it, and your not wanting to preclude the possibility of becoming -- of going back to the same function or similar function you had prior to becoming DCI, but why is it required that you remain on active duty in the interim?

Admiral Turner. Thirty years of -- retiring after thirty years of service will in no way change my accumulated background and attitudes. The law specifically provides for an active duty man to be in this position. In the years since the first founding of the Central Intelligence Agency, with the exception of the last seven months, there has never been a time that there has not been one military man in either the post of Director or Deputy Director, and the majority of those have been

. .

on active duty. I see no conflict arising.

Senator Biden. I am not suggesting a conflict. I am just looking for your rationale. You will have no command, and so I am not sure why the need to remain on active duty, why you want to other than -- I mean, does it affect if and when you go back where you come in?

Admiral Turner. No, sir. The law specifically provides that there is no impact here, so far as that is concerned, and I am not worried about where I would come or go in that event, in any case.

Senator Biden. The question of the -- you indicated earlier that at least you have requested four naval officers remain on your personal staff.

What is the general capacity of those officers? I mean, you know, we hear a lot about Admirals having people who wait on their tables and that kind of thing. I realize this seems, may seem inappropriate in light of the gravity of this hearing, but it is not, in my opinion, in terms of the need to establish the degree of public confidence which we all feel very strongly, as you do, that must be established there. I would not want any impression left in the minds of anyone in this room, or the viewing audience, if any of this is played, and/or the reading audience after this is covered, that we are in effect, you are maintaining your active duty status to ensure that you have four personal servants.

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

Admiral Turner. No, sir, that is not my intent in any way, and these I don't view as personal servants whatsoever.

They are highly qualified officers. They are officers who have served with me in the past few years. They are officers who I have a great rapport with in writing speeches, in performing duties that are necessary in any office, answering large volumes of correspondence, taking care of the schedules and --

Senator Biden. Administrative kinds of --

Admiral Turner. Administrative.

Senator Biden. -- kinds of duties.

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir. I would anticipate that after
I have settled into this job, if I am given it, I might find
that the need for them atrophied. I am reluctant to step into
what looks to me like a maelstrom of activity without this kind
of support that just takes day to day burdens off your shoulders.

If I do not need them in the course of time, I would certainly
not ask them to stay.

Senator Biden. I quite frankly think that is appropriate. But my time is up. Thank you very much.

Admiral Turner. Thank you, sir.

The Chairman. Now, Senator Moynihan.

Senator Moynihan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Admiral, I don't want to take issue with my good friend Senator Lugar, but I don't see why you shouldn't show a little partiality to the Navy.

Ä

Sir, I should like to take the opportunity to express my own great pleasure that you are before this Committee in these pleasant circumstances, and to take the occasion to put to you a question which, while specific in its particulars, has, I believe, a general bearing of the role of the Central Intelligence Agency in world affairs.

I have recently been in Jamaica where I had the honor
to pay a call on Prime Minister Manley, and as I am sure you
know, during the recent general election in Jamaica, there was
much discussion of the role of the CIA in that country. I
asked the Prime Minister about this and his answer was somewhat
general. However, he did say most explicitly that the opposition
that during the campaign the opposition party, the Jamaica
Labor Party, received funds from the CIA. I replied that if
this were true, it was an outrageous act upon our part, and that
we would owe, at very least, an apology to the government and
the people of Jamaica.

On the other hand, it is my understanding and my belief that this was not true, and is not true, and in that circumstance it grieves me to consider the damage this charge may have done to the JLP. As you know, the Jamaica Labor Party is an established and staunchly democratic political party which on several occasions has formed the Government of Jamaica, to use the parliamentary term.

As you also know, Jamaica is one of those few nations --

 there are scarcely three dozen of us -- which not only carry out democratic elections, but in which those elections have brought about a change in the political party governing the nation.

Inevitably, a party's opposition accused in the manner that the JLP has been accused bears the impossible burden of disproof. In the nature of things, any disavowal on our part is of not much greater avail, and for these reasons, accusations of CIA involvement have become a feature of the political rhetoric of our time around the world.

And I ask you, sir, if as Director of Central Intelligence, you would not give some thought to ways in which the United States could make such charges less rewarding to those who make them in circumstances where we know the charge is not true.

Admiral Turner. That is a most interesting though,
Senator, and I certainly agree with it. I agree that we
should make efforts to make unjustified statements against our
country and its activities less rewarding. I can see that
in some instances this could be done by policy decisions of
the executive and legislative branches, decisions that would
bring the weight of the authority of this country to bear. I
can see that the intelligence community itself can also play a
role, but largely by a gradual process of enhancing our
credibility in the world, enhancing the confidence that people

.

will have that when we say we have not done something, that that is in fact the case, and I would hope we can move in that direction over time.

Senator Moynihan. Thank you, Admiral.

You recognize, Admiral, that the reputation of respected political parties are at stake, and respected people are at stake.

I have two other quick questions, sir. I assume that for thirty years now there has been a fairly consistent effort by the Soviets to infiltrate the Agency, and to some extent they have succeeded.

Would you want to share with us now or sometime your judgment of just how much they may have succeeded, if at all? You have your first major defector in Mr. Agee. I think this Committee would want to know -- has Mr. Agee gone over to the KGB? Is he now a Soviet agent, in your knowledge, or what do you think he is doing?

Admiral Turner. I do not have knowledge of that at this time, Senator, no.

Senator Moynihan. Would you let us know what you think has happened?

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir, I will look into it if I am confirmed for this office and let you know.

The Chairman. The Committee will call upon the Director of Central Intelligence at one of our later meetings to advise

3

5

6

8

10

12

11

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

us of the type of activity you have just described.

Senator Moynihan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

A last point, and again it may be of the same order, but again these are so public things I don't know how -- I think the public in the end will want to know, too. The Boston Globe on February 11 reported that the British Intelligence in early 1973 brought to the United States a document which they regarded as of extraordinary importance, comparable to the text of the 1956 speech in which Nikita Khrushchev denounced Stalin and detailed his offenses, and I quote now from the Globe, it says, speaking of the British report: "It quoted Brezhnev as telling a secret meeting of East Europeans, Communist leaders in Prague, that detente was a stratagem to allow the Soviets to build up their military and economic power so that by 1985 a decisive shift in the correlation of forces would enable the Russians to exert our will" -- I am quoting the story -- "exert our will wherever we need to."

This was not accepted in our government, at least some parts of government, as trustworthy, and was dismissed, and yet it is now very public and I gather it appeared in the national intelligence estimate in 1976, after a sort of subterranean life.

The nation, I think, probably ought to know what our judgment of the validity of the report, the accuracy of the report, did Mr. Brezhnev make such a speech, and is that

3.

•

text as we understand the case?

Would you propose to make any general statement about that sometime?

Admiral Turner. I am not at this time specifically familiar with that document other than, as you report, in the press. I would be very happy to investigate its authenticity and also determine whether, with an eye to protecting the source from which it was obtained, we can release more information on this to the public, but certainly to you in this Committee.

Senator Moynihan. Thank you, Admiral.

Thank you, too, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. Senator Case.

Senator Case. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, my apologies to you and the Committee, and to you, Admiral, for not being here until just a few moments ago. I was in the Foreign Relations Committee, and we had actions to take on behalf of the Administration in another field which I was obliged to attend to.

I think I only have one question that I would like to raise with you, and Senator Biden I believe raised it before.

I would like to sort of underscore it. That is the great importance of the period of continuity of single strong leadership in the CIA, and while no one would want, and I would not want to inhibit the President from choosing you for any

post that he might find you qualified for -- and I can imagine many posts which I would want to engage you in -- that I want to underscore the importance that this choice of you for this post I think makes in respect of an indefinite, at least, period of continuity of leadership in this Agency. I understand you have said you would not seek another post and that you would, of course, serve as long as the President wanted you to.

Have you any indication from the President as to how long he has in mind for you to serve in this post?

Admiral Turner. I have no indication of how long he wants me to serve. I have no indication that he has any ideas of any other use of my services.

Senator Case. Well, that, obviously you cannot bind the President not to ask you to run, say, NATO or the Armed Services of the United States or anything else, but choices have to be made, and I do just want strongly to underscore the great importance of the choice that is being made here now. You are choosing to do this, and my own view is -- and I am not asking you to make any further comment -- is that you ought to stay at it until the job is thoroughly done.

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir.

Senator Case. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. Thank you very much.

Before recessing this hearing I would like to make two

•

announcements.

First, this hearing will reconvene at 2:30 this afternoon, and Admiral, sir, if you can be ready to answer questions because I am certain other members would like to ask further questions, and receive the testimony of three other witnesses.

The second announcement is at 2:30 tomorrow afternoon the Committee will meet to carry on Committee business, including the confirmation discussion and hopefully the vote of Admiral Turner.

The Chair intends to make that portion of the Committee meeting tomorrow open to the public, the portion relating to the debate and vote on the debate and vote on the confirmation of Admiral Turner.

So with those two announcements --

Senator Case. Mr. Chairman, may I ask, there are certain questions I didn't think I should delay the Committee for, be asswered for the record?

The Chairman. Without objection your questions will be handed to the Admiral, sir.

With these two announcements, this hearing will stand in recess until 2:30 this afternoon.

(Whereupon, at 12:03 o'clock p.m., the Committee recessed, to reconvene at 2:30 o'clock p.m., the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

(2:39 p.m.)

The Chairman. We will now resume the hearings.

Senator Stevenson?

Senator Stevenson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just have a few holes that I would like to plug in the record.

First, Mr. Chairman, I know there are questions about the so-called Hussein affair.

Is my understanding correct that that will be taken up by the Committee in executive session?

The Chairman. Yes, tomorrow at 2:30 I will be presenting this to the Committee.

Senator Stevenson. Now, Admiral, getting back briefly to covert operations, both the President --

(Pause)

Senator Stevenson. Admiral, both the President and the Secretary of State have said in words which I can't seem to find at the moment, that covert operations will only take place in the most extraordinary of circumstances. Covert operations are difficult to discuss because the phrase signifies one thing to the public and it means something that is much broader, including conduct of activities which in the main is innocent.

What is your own attitude about the wisdom of covert operations? Could you just address yourself to the general

1 2

3

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Approved For Release 2006/06/15: CIA-RDP91-00901R000600380002-2

subject?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

-11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

TESTIMONY OF ADMIRAL STANSFIELD TURNER -- Resumed Admiral Turner. I would be pleased to, Senator.

I think no covert operation should be undertaken until two standards have been met. The first would be that there was a thorough exploration of any alternative ways to accomplish that objective in an overt manner. The second would be that there was a very careful weighing of the potential value to the country of what might develop from the operation versus the risks that have to be accepted, and I would urge that we think of the risks in two categories: the risks of disclosure of the covert operation becoming overt against our desires, and then simply the risk of undermining our own respect for the fundamental laws and values of our country.

Now, I detect some interest, there Senator Stevenson. certainly should be, in your general attitude towards the Soviet Union. Your impressive article in Foreign Affairs sheds some light on that subject.

Is the Soviet military build-up in your opinion due to aggressive or imperialistic designs, or is the Soviet Union reacting to a perceived threat or in your opinion is the reason some combination of both?

Admiral Turner. I believe that the Soviet Unoin today finds itself at a disadvantage with respect to us in the field They do not have the economic power or the of economics.

å

25.

economic access to the rest of the world that the United States does, and they see little prospect of being able to close the gap with us.

I believe that you might say politically or culturally they also find themselves behind us in their ability to deal in the international forum: witness their debacle in Egypt with their heavyhandedness.

The Soviet Union, however, is quite accustomed to using military power at home as well as abroad, and I think they believe that the existence of strong military forces can be translated into political advantage for them, and I would think this is a primary motive behind their very considerable efforts today, the great expense that they are accepting to build up their military power.

I would be reluctant to hazard a guess as to whether that means they intend to use it in an active, combative fashion or whether they hope that they can simply gain enough political leverage with it to satisfy their needs.

Senator Stevenson. Well, you have referred to their needs and the political advantages.

What are their needs? What political advantages are they seeking? Are they basically defensive, or are they offensive? Is this Russian imperialism, or is it a response to a perceived threat which could also be explained against Russian history, or as I said, some combination?

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Admiral Turner. I think it is a combination. Their actions in Poland, Hungary and Czechoslavakia it seems to me clearly indicate a total resolve not to give up their empire, so-called. I think that they are still attempting to be the world's last empire. I think that Russian imperialism is by no means lost sight of in the Soviet Union today, and I believe that they would be very happy, at least by political means, including the application of military pressure, to try to dominate western Europe, and through it, the United States.

Senator Stevenson. So you wouldn't place yourself squarely in either the Russians are coming school or the, whatever the other extreme, on the other side.

Admiral Turner. I think they are neither benign nor warlike, but I think we must be cautious, we must maintain a strong enough posture economically, socially and militarily to be sure they do not translate such advantages as they have into political leverage against us.

Senator Stevenson. Well, that sounds like a neutral and a pragmatic, a reasonable approach to me.

Has the President assured you access to him whenever in your judgment you have information that he should have?

Admiral Turner. He has, sir.

Senator Stevenson. And now getting back to where I think
I left off earlier on the quality of intelligence and the
estimating process, I believe in response to Senator Lugar

٠.

earlier you indicated that you felt intelligence should be concerned about such sources of authority in the world as food supplies, natural resources, the economic sources of authority as well as the more typical military concerns that have tended to dominate the intelligence community in the past.

Is that correct?

Admiral Turner. Absolutely. There are many more factors than military that determine the fate of our country today.

Senator Stevenson. On the estimating process, do you think the NIEs make a significant contribution to the policy making process, and if so, or if not, how can they be improved?

Admiral Turner. I think they do make a significant contribution. I hesitate as a near outsider to suggest at this short time exactly how they could be improved, but I would emphasize that I think we should be sure the divergent views, the alternative conclusions that could be drawn from the facts that are the foundation of those estimates, must be clearly displayed, and I would like to see a confidence level displayed in many of our intelligence judgments as opposed to factual statements.

I have seen cases, Senator, where people come to an express conclusion from a set of facts in intelligence, and don't allow that maybe another line of deduction could have taken you to another conclusion, and I would hope that we would

express, oh, several lines of deduction and show some level of confidence that one was right and the other was wrong, maybe one was 90 percent and one is only 10 percent, but it sometimes is worth showing that there is at least an alternative.

Senator Stevenson. Do you think regular competition between estimating teams is desirable?

Admiral Turner. I would hope that the very process within the intelligence community that brings estimates forward would have built into it an adequate opportunity for the expression of these divergent views, and that the creation of special teams, if that is done, would be reserved for special occasions rather than just the routine. But I certainly want the divergent views to come forward one way or the other.

Senator Stevenson. If I understood you earlier, you indicate that you approved of competition between estimating teams inside and outside the intelligence community. Is that right?

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir.

Senator Stevenson. Good, I'm glad to hear that.

I might just mention for the record, Mr. Chairman, that since the subject came up earlier -- I think Senator Moynihan mentioned it -- that this Committee is conducting a major study of this estimative process, including the recent A-B Team controversy, and we will welcome your help and cooperation in conducting that study, Admiral.

3

2

4 5

6

7

9

10

. 11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2324

25

Admiral Turner. You will certainly have it, sir.

Senator Stevenson. One question more, Mr. Chairman.

For many years the Office of National Estimates has served as the focal point for production of the intelligence community's national intelligence estimates. In 1973 the Office of National Estimates was disbanded. The successor mechanism, the National Intelligence Officers, has been criticized as an inadequate substitute.

Will you review the present mechanism for producing those NIE's?

Admiral Turner. I'm sorry. You asked if I would review it?

Senator Stevenson. Yes.

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir. I intend to.

Senator Stevenson. And are you considering any organizational changes now with respect to national intelligence officers?

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir.

Senator Stevenson. Would you care to tell us what they are?

Admiral Turner. I would prefer to keep my counsel until
I have a more firm judgment, sir, but I am certainly exploring
that as a matter of high priority.

Senator Stevenson. We will have additional opportunities.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My time has expired.

The Chairman. Admiral Turner, regretfully we will have to take a short recess. There is a vote on the final passage on Senate Concurring Resolution No. 10, the budget. So -- but before we do, I am pleased to recognize a very illustrious member of the United States Senate. He is from the State of Illinois. He wasn't here this morning. He wanted to be here very much but because of some flight schedules he was unable to make it. Senator Percy.

Senator Percy. Mr. Chairman, Senator Goldwater, I will be very brief indeed because of our vote, and also that I just simply wanted to express my appreciation for the opportunity to be here with Adlai Stevenson to present Admiral Turner.

My distinguished colleague has spoken about him this morning. I had a lengthy discussion with Admiral Holloway, whose judgment I consider very good indeed, and with other members, I might say, of my own branch of the service, the United States Navy, six or seven flag officers who have known directly or indirectly of Admiral Turner, so that I speak with the conviction that his own colleagues, both those who have been subordinate, worked along with him, and his superiors, think that the President's judgment in making this appointment is just outstanding.

We in Illinois are very proud to have such a distinguished native son. He is a man of many proven abilities. He is a recognized scholar, capping his number one position in his class

1.

3

5

8

7

10

9

12

. 11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

in the Naval Academy with a Rhodes Scholarship. He has made a significant contribution to the intellectual world through his writings, and as an innovative and extremely effective President of the Naval War College.

But Admiral Turner is more than an intellectual. He has consistently proven his merit has a commander both of U.S. and Naval forces. Through his naval career he has commanded mine sweepers, destroyers, guided missile frigates, a carrier task force, NATO Strike Fleet, Atlantic, and he is presently Commander in Chief of Allied Forces, Southern Europe.

In his Washington assignments he has been in the vanguard of Navy and Defense decision making, in highly competitive assignments in the staffs of the Chief of Naval Operations, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Systems Analysis, and as aide and executive assistant to the Secretary of the Navy, he compiled an outstanding record of performance, and certainly Admiral Holloway emphasized what he considered to be an extraordinarily important asset, not only the work that he has done in systems analysis -- and I happened to head a systems analysis company for a number of years. I didn't understand half of what the engineers and scientists did, but at least I gained a competence or a recognition of a competence for someone who can engage in that process, but even more complicated, he feels that he thoroughly understands Congress, and has had a relationship here that will stand him in good

stead as head of the CIA as well as in the duties and functions performance that we have directed the CIA to perform to this very, very vital Committee.

Now that Admiral Turner has reached the top rank in the Navy, has been acclaimed for his creativity, lauded for his administrative abilities, and proven himself an outstanding diplomat in varied assignments. The President has called upon him to make use of all of these considerable talents.

I can think of no more difficult challenge than that facing him as the Director of Central Intelligence. I can think of no one better qualified to assume this key assignment.

We in Illinois have no doubt that he will meet all of
the challenges and take all of the frustrations in side. I am
sure that you will find Admiral Turner an excellent choice for
this critical and sensitive post. I trust at the end of several
years experience working with him, that you will have even
greater admiration for him than you have today, because I
think he will work intimately and closely with you, and having
spoken to him, I know how sensitive he is to the position that
we must restore the CIA to in the eyes of the world as one
of the great intelligence gathering agencies the world has
ever seen, and in the vanguard of the protection and defense
of this country, absolutely crucial and essential. And certainly
I think he will be respected by all of the professionals inside,
by intelligence all over the world, which is important, but I

think he will have the respect of the American people, which is absolutely crucial.

Thank you.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Senator Goldwater. Might I say to my friend from Illinois that the Chairman and I have decided that the Air Force and the Army like him, too.

Senator Percy. That's either all bad or all good. When I was in the service they didn't get along very well.

(General laughter.)

Senator Stevenson. I will just add a word for the Marine Corps, since the Navy is a subsidiary of the Marine Corps, we will accept him also.

The Chairman. The Committee will stand in recess for 15 minutes.

(A brief recess was taken.)

The Chairman. Let us now resume our hearings.

Senator Huddleston?

Senator Huddleston. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. Senator Mathias.

Senator Mathias. Admiral, under Executive Order 11905
the General Counsel of the Central Intelligence Agency is
required to make reports to the Intelligence Oversight Board
with respect to any improprieties that may come to his attention within the Central Intelligence Agency. Now, my question

to you is, would you as DCI provide this Committee with the substance of those reports, and I am careful to say the substance, having in mind our colloquy this morning as to certain fine points, but with the substance of those reports, the Committee can carry out the oversight function with respect to any improprieties which might arise in the future.

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir.

Senator Mathias. Now, in the same connection, the

Executive Order No. 11905 provides for the Intelligence

Oversight Board to report to the President any activities which

it deems to be improper and which it discovers within the

intelligence community as a whole.

Will you as Director provide this Committee with the substance of those reports so that the Committee can carry out its oversight function again?

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir.

Senator Mathias. So that we get it at two different sequential stages.

Admiral Turner. I see the difference you are -Senator Mathias. In the event that it moves to two
different sequential stages.

Admiral Turner. Yes.

Senator Mathias. Well, I am very gratified to have your unequivocal answer to those two questions.

Admiral Turner. I may be in uniequivocal problems, but

I will --

Senator Mathias. Well, I don't anticipate that you will.

I hope that we won't have such questions arising, but I

think it is of the greatest importance for this Committee to

be advised of them if those problems do exist.

Now, turning to another question, in our original study of the intelligence community, one of the most difficult problems that we observed was the lack of statutory charters governing the activities of different elements of the intelligence community. Where there was no statutory charter, the boundaries of jurisdiction were very difficult to define. They could lack permanence. Individuals who might be affected by the activities of the community would find it difficult to ascertain exactly where their rights began and where they ended.

It has been a subject of concern in the Congress that we should develop statutory charters for the different elements of the community that are not governed by charters at this time.

Do you have any problem in working with the Congress in the development of that kind of statutory base?

Admiral Turner. No, sir, none whatsoever. I mentioned this morning that I don't have a preconceived notion in my mind as to where charters or other instruments may be the appropriate vehicle, but I am certainly openminded to view it and would look on the Congress's interest in better definition of the responsibilities of each of these agencies as something

-

3

5.

6

7

8

9

11

10

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

that could be a bit help to the Director of Central Intelligence.

Senator Mathias. I believe it could be a substantial help to the Director, to future Directors, to have a clear understanding of the guidelines that the Congress adopted with the concurrence of the President, as to what was the proper role and sphere of activity of the intelligence community, and I think that is really the opportunity which lies before us because this hasn't been done. In some cases jurisdiction is defined only in executive orders and directives, some of which are so classified as to be unavailable to certainly the average citizen, and in many cases, to senior government officials, and if this could be embodied in a code of law which was sufficiently flexible to make it possible to operate, but sufficiently firm and defined so that people knew where they were, I think we would have made a substantial advance, and I appreciate your willingness to move forward in this area.

Admiral Turner. I think the problems you have mentioned of flexibilty and of security are very real in developing such charters, and again, having read a few arguments against charters and a few arguments for them, I can only say I am open minded at this time.

Senator Mathias. And you have no fundamental personal reservations.

Admiral Turner. No, sir.

Senator Mathias. All right, thank you.

The Chairman.

. Senator Hart.

Senator Hart. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Admiral, let me add my welcome. I am sorry I missed

this morning's session.

As you know, when we discussed your appointment before,

I have personal reservations based not on your record or

qualifications, but rather on the nature of the Central Intelligence Agency about a military director, and I raised that with

you, and I feel because I have those reservations I should raise
them for the record.

I don't think at this point it would be sufficient as far as my vote is concerned to vote against you, but the record of the purpose and history of the CIA is such that it was established to provide an independent analytic capability separate from the capability of defending this country, so that those who were assessing the threat and those who were responding to it were two different groups of people.

I think you are extremely well qualified for this position, and I think you will be confirmed and will do a very good job.

I think it would be unfortunate if we got into a pattern over a period of time of having the DCI and the Director of the Agency being from the military side.

Having said that, I would like to get -- and I know that you have responded to questions in that area, so I am not going to repeat them merely for myself -- I would like to get

> . o

. 11

to the area that concerns me the most, and that is the independence of the intelligence, the CIA's analytic capability.

As you know, there has been a deep discussion in this community here, this town in the last several months, over the so-called A Team and B Team reports, and with your background in the Navy, in the military, I would like for you to repeat anything you have already said to the Committee in summary form, or to give your thoughts on what you as the head of the Central Intelligence Agency can do or should do to protect the independence of that Agency and its analytic capability from, let's say, outside intimidation by those who do not agree with its assessments or its analyses.

Admiral Turner. I think one of the primary devices, sir, is to be sure that nobody feels he has to intimidate the Agency or the analysts, by being sure that there is adequate opportunity for the divergent views to be expressed. When it comes to the crunch as to which one is the view we express with the greatest level of confidence, when there is a real issue, I am going to be the one who makes that decision personally, and there is no way I can guarantee you that I will be unbiased, but I can assure you that that would be my certain intent.

Senator Hart. Let's say over a period of time, just to repeat what has actually happened, hypothetically, over a period of time other elements within the intelligence community

do not agree with or do not share or like the analyses or the
judgments put forward by the Agency analysts, and pressure is
brought to bear on you to construct or develop a B Team which with the purpose of challenging that assessment, and challenging
it from one direction or the other, not just from a more
conservative point of view.

Would you share with -- what would be your response to that pressure?

Admiral Turner. It is very difficult to hypothesize response to a particular pressure, but I said this morning I am not opposed to outside review, I am not opposed to A-B Team type review where one side is all on one spectrum and one on the other. I personally would prefer to make sure that all spectra were represented in the initial review, or in an outside or post-analysis review. So I only want to make clear that I don't think -- I would not want to respond to pressures for these reviews; I would want to be persuaded that they were really needed and not being done because somebody wanted to have them done, if you see what I mean, sir.

Senator Hart. I see exactly, but I would like to put you in Mr. Bush's shoes, your predecessor's shoes, and that was exactly the pressure he was under six or eight months ago, I think, and if you were in his shoes, given those circumstances, and you were convinced that the analysts under your direct control in the Agency represented different points of view, were

Approved For Release 2006/06/15 : CIA-RDP91-00901R000600380002-2

not all hawks or all doves or all anything, but were selected for their independence and their unbiased analytic capability, and had in fact over a period of time come up with accurate assessments, and pressure was brought to bear on you by those who didn't share your conviction, that you should appoint an outside group with a bias, what would be your response?

Admiral Turner. My initial attitude towards that would be negative, towards having a group with a bias. I can see that there is merit in that under some circumstances, but it seems to me you are inviting problems when they come in with a deliberate bias under a pressure situation.

If you construct a bias here and a bias there, I think you have a better opportunity of keeping control of it.

May I elaborate on one point?
Senator Hart. Please do.

Admiral Turner. I think the way to avoid these crises is to try to make those who feel the estimates are erroneous be more specific and more quantifying in their reasons for objecting. I think if we say we think there are in the Green intelligence estimate, we think there are 32 submarines in this situation and somebody else says it is 52, I am going to ask that they give me concrete evidence as to why they think it is 52, the building rate is higher in their estimation, they think our intelligence has only detected 50 percent of the ones that are in existence. I mean, there must be some

3

basis for this.

And it would be my hope that you could develop your estimate in such a way that the driving forces of difference were readily apparent and nobody could have a complaint that his view was not adequately stated, and yet the decision maker would not just know that one party thought it was a very dangerous situation and one thought it was a negligible situation, he would know that it is because of certain differences in the way they made their calculations.

Senator Hart. Well, I think that is one of the things that disturbed me so much about the so-called B Team, and that was that one of the, according to published accounts, not getting into classified information, one of the areas they looked into was what the Soviet intent was based upon undisputed data.

B Team took data which they did not dispute and reached a different conclusion about what was going on inside the Soviet mind, as if there were, first of all, a Soviet mind, and that is where they quarreled seriously with the Agency. Well, that is a very subjective judgment.

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir.

Senator Hart. And my own view is it is very demoralizing for the analysts at the Agency to have their judgments attacked on a subjective basis.

Shifting to another area, my understanding is you testified

•

this morning that you would not accept an order from the President to conduct an illegal activity.

Is that correct?

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir.

Senator Hart. Was there any circumstance under which it was determined that a head of state represented a threat to the security of this country and had to be eliminated, and you would agree to plot the elimination of that head of state?

Admiral Turner. No, sir, not in peacetime.

Senator Hart. It has been suggested that it is very difficult for a Director of the Central Intelligence Agency to know all the things that are going on at any given time inside the Agency.

Can you suggest to us, either through a completely independent and highly authorized Inspector General System or some other system, that you intend to be satisfied in your own mind that you know everything that the Agency is up to at any given time, that you can go to bed every night thinking, I know exactly what is going on there?

Admiral Turner. I don't think that will ever be possible, sir, but I certainly expect to be able to know the things of critical importance, the things that could lead to problems, and I would lean heavily on the existing Inspector General and his staff. As far as I understand at this point, their charter is clear and adequate. I will certainly be reviewing it to

see if it needs any strengthening.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

But getting control of any large organization takes more than rules and inspectors and others. It is in part the tenor of leadership that you exert. It is in part the example that you set when somebody pulls a surprise on you, and I am going to make it clear in my first days in office that I don't want any plausible deniable theories with respect to my stewardship. I am going to make it clear that if I ever have to come before this Committee and confess that I didn't know what was going on, and it was not good, that I will not ask you for excuse. I will accept the responsibility, and thereby my subordinates in the Agency, if I am approved for that job, had better be prepared to accept the responsibility also, and if I ever find that their sense of their own responsibility is such that they are entitled to hide anything from me or in any way feel I am not entitled to know every detail of what is going on, there will be some fireworks out there.

Senator Hart. Thank you, Admiral.

Thank you very much.

The Chairman. Admiral Turner, a number of significant CIA policies are embodied in CIA internal regulations rather than being fixed by law.

If you become head of the CIA and you find that you can waive the application of these regulations or simply change them without notifying Congress, would you do so or would you

17.

ensure that this Committee would be notified of any change in CIA regulations?

Admiral Turner. I have no problem with notifying you of change of CIA regulations, Mr. Chairman. I am not sure what detail these get into and how much detail you want to get into. My only hesitation is that I would be very happy to be sure you were advised of those which seem to be of -- seem worthy of your attention.

The Chairman. Fine.

Admiral Turner. And if you feel there are others that are worthy of your attention that are not, why, I will happy to go deeper.

The Chairman. I would like to apologize.

Senator Lugar, do you have any questions?

Senator Lugar. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Admiral Turner, following up Senator Hart's questions a moment ago about the control of the Agency and your knowledge of what was occurring, you know, obviously this is critical in terms of the relationship with this Committee or the Congress or the nation, that you have this control.

Now, having examined the organization, do you feel that you have sufficient control with regard to personnel policy, or maybe to state it another way, without doubt are going to have the loyalty of persons who have been affiliated with the Agency for a long period of time, so that they are going to accept

without any difficulty your leadership, the chain of command, or whatever the organizational relationship is.

The reason that I ask this, in a parallel situation, much less grave, from time to time a Chief of Police may be appointed, and he may come in from the outside, and sometimes all of the police officers who are members of that police department do not share enthusiasm for the chief. As a matter of fact, they may feel that the attitudes that he is adopting are very different from the code that they have followed, and they believe they are going to outlast him, that they will still be there after he has gone, and maybe four or four successors.

What is your basic feeling as you enter this situation prospectively, about your ability, really, to obtain management control and to have knowledge and to have loyalty and to have the sort of feeling on the part of subordinates that they would really geniuinely care that you knew and that you were thus able to represent the truth to this Committee?

Admiral Turner. Senator, I think that the tools, the official legal tools available to the Director for those purposes are adequate today. From there, I think it is a matter of personal leadership. You must not only have a threat of some sort over people, you must be able to win their enthusiastic support for what you are doing.

I cannot guarantee you I am that leader, but I can only say with some sense of immodesty that I don't think I have

1.

ever failed to be in control of an operation I have commanded.

Senator Lugar. But you perceive the importance of that, obviously, from Senator Hart's questions and from mine, that if this was not to be the case, then we are all in trouble.

In other words, that you have been appointed and maybe confirmed, but there is somehow rather a, I suppose some would feel on occasion that people might be going off doing their own thing, and your feeling is that whether that has been true historically or not, that it will not be true in your administration of the Agency.

Admiral Turner. Sir, I am not so immodest as to agree that it will not be true, but I will be making every effort to be sure it is not true.

Senator Lugar. This morning the wire services report that President Carter was disturbed over leaks in intelligence, and at least the wire service report suggests that from the executive branch standpoint, he felt that the number of persons who had a need to know ought to be reduced substantially. At least one ticker tape story that I saw mentioned a reduction to as low as 5 persons, although I am not certain what type of information that might have referred to. Apparently he left the ball over in Congress's court as to what the response of the Congress ought to be.

Let me ask you now as a professional in the intelligence business, if you were to have the best of all worlds and to

o

. 11

indicate how many persons ought to have a need to know in the Congress, about how many persons can safely be entrusted with information, given the normal odds of hearsay and problems of security and so forth, what sort of target would you advise us to be aiming at if we were to have the sort of control that we would want on behalf of the people we represent, but at the same time, from the standpoint of national security and intelligence, the odds would be substantially diminished, as apparently thought they needed to be in his distress this morning.

Admiral Turner. It is my view, sir, that I would feel more comfortable, if confirmed in this office, and assuming the responsibilities under law for the protection of sources and methods of intelligence, if I could report these very sensitive clandestine collection operations or covert operations only to one Committee of each chamber.

Senator Lugar. And you feel that the Committees, at least constituted as they are, about the size that they are, are appropriate, at least, that this is a reasonable situation.

Admiral Turner. At this point I see no problem with that, sir.

Senator Lugar. In the regulations for the Agency — and you have offered to share those with the Chairman or with the Committee, as the case may be, so that we can have some surveillance, are you satisfied, having read through those,

. 11

 that there is an adequate code of conduct for persons affiliated, really, in all sorts of activities with the agencies, in terms of how they ought to conduct themselves in interrogating persons, for example, or in a worse case, maybe, of capture, how they ought to react if they were under capture? Are you satisfied that that situation has been explored and that the rules are reasonable, and that everybody involved has a good anticipation of what he or she ought to do?

Admiral Turner. No, I am not satisfied, but only because I simply have not probed into this in depth as yet, sir. I am sorry, I just have not had the time.

Senator Lugar. Would you agree that this is a reasonably serious proposition that probably ought to be looked into, given the debate in the military services from time to time on similar situations, especially the prisoner of war situation?

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir.

Senator Lugar. The code of conduct there, and what ought to be anticipated in the national service.

Admiral Turner. I certainly agree.

Senator Lugar. Finally, what in a general sense do you see as an ideal course for the development of superior intelligence gathering or evaluation in this country? I suppose two prongs of my question: is there a part, at least, of your administration, as you look at it, that would be devoted to

research capability, discovering new ways in which information can be found. Obviously the discovery means that we don't know precisely which technique we are looking at, but the research and development aspect, if that is appropriate, will that be a part of your outlook as to how we refine technique, and then I suppose secondly, what should be the objectives of intelligence finding, what sort of capabilities, and beyond that, has the President discussed with you his philosophy of what intelligence ought to be about, in other words, any new dimensions that he sees or that you see in conversation with him?

Admiral Turner. I certainly think we must pursue a vigorous research and development program. There is a prospect that new developments in intelligence collection techniques can perhaps make unnecessary some of the more risky ones that we must suffer today. In addition, we must always stay ahead of the competition. This is one of the great strengths we have, it seems to me, over the Soviet Union is a more advanced technology.

The President has shared some of his philosophy with me,
particularly his great desire for a well-coordinated intelligence,
drawing upon all the sources that are available to us, particularly his desire for a very balanced presentation, perhaps,
as he said in the press several times, with several sources
coming to him separately, and again, as I said this morning,
I am just very encouraged because of his intense interest

in this whole area, and I am sure that means that I and you are going to have lots of interchange with him and lots of cooperation.

Senator Lugar. Did you mean in that last answer that the President might on occasion encourage the publication of -- take this A and B Team controversy, suggest that A, B, and C Teams have looked at identical data and have come up with these evaluations, and for the good of the national argument, he might say I want to share this with you, or does that go well beyond what the President's intent would appear to be?

Admiral Turner. It goes beyond any specific discussion

I have had with him, so I don't wish to commit him there, sir.

Senator Lugar. Thank you.

The Chairman. It appears that I will be the one to wrap up the questioning sir.

Reading some of our front pages and books being published,

I gather that many Americans have reached a conclusion that the

CIA and the other agencies in the community are insidious,

close, ultra-secret, conspiratorial type organizations. The

very nature of the work requires secrecy, but I think the

record should show that of all the intelligence gathering

organizations in the free world, ours happens to be the most

open.

As you are well aware, Admiral, in a great democracy, Great Britain, the identity of the head of MI-6 is not known

.

to the people of that country. In fact, the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister are the only two who are aware of the identity of the Chief of MI-6.

MI-6, and tomorrow we will have an open discussion, and open vote as to your confirmation.

As Senator Lugar has pointed out, the President unquestionably is and should be concerned with some of the unauthorized disclosures that have been appearing in the press and elsewhere, and my question is this: employees of the Government who are made privy to highly sensitive material, such as those who are working for the CIA, are required to take a special oath, and the oath would in essence say that we will never divulge the information that we have received during our service to this country, and yet we know that in violation of this oath, articles have been written, books have been written, names have been printed, operations have been described.

Do you believe that criminal sanctions should be provided for by law to punish those who violate this oath?

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. Do you have any suggestions as to what sort of criminal sanctions?

Admiral Turner. I really do not at this time, Senator.

The Chairman. If confirmed, do you intend to work with your colleagues in the Community to come forth with some sort

of legislation that we can look at?

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir, I would certainly be very amenable to doing that and bringing any legislative suggestions through the normal channels of the executive branch to the Congress and to your Committee.

The Chairman. You have indicated that you would like to be required to just respond to one Committee. Here in the Senate we have this Committee. Then you have the Appropriations Committee with a special Subcommittee, a highly secret Subcommittee handling intelligence appropriations; the Armed Services, I think will jealously guard its prerogatives over the activities of the Defense Intelligence activities, and I presume the Foreign Relations Committee will insist upon having its hand in the foreign policy aspects of intelligence gathering.

How do you think we can improve the situation?

Admiral Turner. What I intended to say, sir, was I

would hope that for very sensitive, clandestine collection

efforts or covert operations we could report those to one

committee who would assume the responsibility for oversight of

these delicate, risky operations. I certainly see -- I certainly

do not propose, for instance, not reporting to the Appropriations

Committee on appropriations matters, but I am not sure that

need carry through to the degree of detail that I am suggesting

on the sensitive side.

1

3

5

6

7 8

10

12

. 11

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The Chairman. Well, I believe I speak for all members of this Committee when I say we are very much impressed by you, sir.

Admiral Turner. Thank you, sir.

The Chairman. And we appreciate your forthrightness and your responses to our questions, and although this may sound rather premature, and maybe uncalled for, but I don't see any problems tomorrow at 3:00 o'clock in the afternoon.

So if you have an assignment in Naples this evening, I would say to you, bon voyage and you can go ahead knowing that you will be confirmed, sir.

Admiral Turner. Thank you very much, and may I think all the members of the Committee for their generosity and for the stimulation that I have received and I do look forward, if confirmed, to working very closely with all of you, sir.

The Chairman. And Admiral, if we may, we would like to submit to you questions that were prepared by members who were not able to be here today, and by some of the staff people, and your responses will be most appreciated.

Admiral Turner. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. Thank you very much, sir.

Admiral Turner. Thank you.

The Chairman. Our next witness is the President of Common Cause, Mr. David Cohen.

Welcome to the Committee, Mr. Cohen. We have received

Approved For Release 2006/06/15 : CIA-RDP91-00901R000600380002-2 your statement. Without objection, your statement will be made part of the record in toto. (The prepared statement of Mr. David Cohen follows:)