

**CENTER FOR  
STRATEGIC AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES (CSIS)**

**DECISION 2008: THE CANDIDATES' POSITIONS**

**MODERATOR:  
DAVID HEYMAN,  
DIRECTOR, HOMELAND SECURITY PROGRAM  
CSIS**

**SPEAKERS:  
FRANK KEATING,  
FORMER GOVERNOR OF OKLAHOMA,  
REPRESENTING THE MCCAIN CAMPAIGN**

**JAMES LEE WITT,  
FORMER FEMA DIRECTOR,  
REPRESENTING THE OBAMA CAMPAIGN**

**SEPTEMBER 10, 2008**

*Transcript by  
Federal News Service  
Washington, D.C.*

GREG PELLEGRINO: (In progress) – diplomatic corps from the cabinet, from the legislature, and from industry to talk about Europe's response to the Madrid bombings at the time and their combating terrorism across Europe with the director of Europol. The combination of senior leaders, a great environment – also held in a museum there at the time, as well as an unscripted dialogue that I look forward to our speakers sharing with us this evening. It was something that we thought we could recreate here in Washington, and through our collaboration with CSIS, as well as the great people at the Smithsonian's Renwick Gallery, we certainly have accomplished that – so I want to thank all of those that have helped make tonight's event a success, as well as those that have helped us make this program successful over the last two years. (Applause.)

Let me introduce our program this evening. After what seemed like an endless campaign season, we are now rapidly closing in on the election on November 4<sup>th</sup> in what is proving to be one of the most exciting elections of our generation or, as the candidates would like to remind us, an election that will be one of the most exciting races of the next generation. So we are eager to hear from our speakers this evening and despite all the talk about change and the economy, jobs, families, and education, which are the five most spoken words during the course of the convention. I double checked that before I came over, but we need no further reminder this week that homeland security is the top of the agenda here on the eve of the anniversary of 9/11 and in the wake of a series of weather assaults on the Southeast in the form of Gustav, Hannah, and now awaiting Ike, so it is perfect timing for us to have our featured speakers, who themselves have been tested in responding to both natural and man-made disasters in their respective roles as the former governor of Oklahoma and as the former director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

Let me introduce Governor Frank Keating first. Following a 30-year career in federal law enforcement, Frank was elected governor of Oklahoma in 1994 and then again in 1998, and despite many of his accomplishments over two terms, Governor Keating's tenure will forever be linked to the role that he played in leading the response to the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City and the subsequent efforts that Frank personally led to raise more than 6 million dollars to fund scholarships for the nearly 200 children left with one or no parents following that event.

Frank and his wife Cathy continue to be very actively involved in raising both funds as well as awareness for the disaster response community, and particularly, I have the chance to work with both of them here in the national capital area where they both co-chaired the annual fundraising campaign for the American Red Cross National Capital Region. Today Frank is the president and CEO of the American Council of Life Insurers.

Before I ask them to join us, let me also now introduce James Lee Witt. James Lee has over 25 years of disaster management experience culminating, as all of us know, in his role as the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency from 1993 through 2001. And during his tenure at FEMA, he was responsible for overseeing the response to over 350 disasters, including the response and recovery operations for some of the most of the most devastating disasters in our nation's history.

As director of FEMA, James Lee was both the architect as well as the visionary for new national programs for emergency preparedness, mitigation response and recovery, and his experience in state and local coordination has allowed him to help lead the creation of new and innovative programs like Project Impact, the disaster prevention program implemented in over 240 communities throughout the United States to help them become more disaster resistant.

Today James Lee is the chief executive officer of James Lee Witt Associates, a crisis management and preparedness firm here in Washington, D.C., and he is also serving as the special advisory to the state of Louisiana assisting with the nation's largest long-term recovery effort in the aftermath of hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

Moderating this evening's discussion is David Heyman. David is a senior fellow and is the director as well as the creator of the Homeland Security Program at CSIS. We are thrilled to have all three of these speakers, so please join me in welcoming all three of them up to stage here for tonight's discussion.

(Applause.)

DAVID HEYMAN: Let me also invite – there is about – one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine. I see about nine seats right here, so if there are nine of you who want to sit down – as long as you are not working at CSIS, you can sit. (Laughter.)

Thank you, Greg, and thank all of you for coming here. Welcome Governor, welcome Director and all of you. Frankly, I was looking at all the folks who are here and it is really an incredible representation of what it takes to make homeland security work. We have here – those of you who haven't met everybody yet, but there are folks from the local police – D.C. Metropolitan Police are here, the state of California is here, the academic community is here, the Department of Homeland Security is here, the Defense Department is here, the international community is here, so if we could all just continue to work together, we'll be fine in the next few years.

For those of you who are joining us for the first time, let me just say that this is typically – the Homeland Security Strategy Forum is typically off the record, and we try to be informal so that we can have a dialogue, and I want everybody to be a part of that dialogue.

Today we are making a big change. We're going to be on the record, we're going to transcribe it, and we're going to put it on the website because we think this is so important that it needs to be available for as people that couldn't fit in the room who would be interested.

What I'd like to do today is to look at how each president views the homeland security concept – enterprise, what his priorities for the next administration might be. So let's begin.

One of the things that I think struck me and the reason we're hosting this particular event is how silent the campaigns have been on homeland security. I think it's fitting that we're hosting this today, two days before 9/11, just across the street from the White House. It seems if you go back – and I did go back over the last four decades – security, particularly domestic security, has been centerpiece of almost every presidential campaign. Nixon ran on his law and order campaign. Reagan wanted missile defense to protect the homeland against nuclear missiles. Michael Dukakis was painted by George Bush as soft on crime. Clinton ran for 100,000 cops on the street. The current president – obviously, 9/11 was an important centerpiece of his campaign in 2004. And yet today we can argue that it's just as important, if not more so, over the last four decades that security be – homeland security, in particular, be a centerpiece.

Yet neither candidate has raised this, nor really has the media focused on homeland security issues, and I went back and looked at the websites of the candidates, and if you look at McCain's website, he has two sections: one on border security which focuses largely on immigration, but also on securing the border in terms of enforcement; and he has a section on national security which talks about the terrorist threat in particular and his track record, and he says that he will ensure that the war against terrorists is fought intelligently, with patient resolve, using all instruments of national power. Moreover, he will lead this fight with the understanding that to impinge on the rights of our citizens or restrict the freedoms for which our nation stands would be to give terrorists the victory they seek. That is largely the sum and substance of the discussion on homeland security.

Obama, similarly, has a section called Homeland Security, talks about the country being still unprepared in terms of transit systems, chemical plants, et cetera, and he says as president, Senator Obama will enhance our national resilience to any risk, natural accident – accidental or terrorist by ensuring the federal government works with states, localities, and the private sector as an authentic partner in prevention, mitigation, and response. And then there are six categories: Chemical plants, nuclear fuel, reuniting families, drinking water, and protecting the public from radioactive releases. That is the sum and substance of our discussion on homeland security to date, but we're changing that right now.

Let me start – we tossed a coin before we came out here. This is – these guys are old friends, so we're not going to get into fist fights – (laughter) – but in fact the governor won the toss and then said no, you go; no, you go – (laughter) – so we're going to start the questioning with Governor Keating.

In the McCain administration, is homeland security still going to be a national priority, and where would it fall in terms of the other priorities that are out there: Iraq, Iran, the economy, healthcare, education?

FRANK KEATING: Let me say as a prelude to my very brief remarks that James Lee and I have known each other a long time. I unfortunately, as David said, was the governor of Oklahoma during the Oklahoma City bombing. A lot of people don't remember in 1999 the most severe tornadic activity to hit a major metropolitan area occurred unfortunately in the southern part of Oklahoma City.

As David said, in my first term I had the Oklahoma City bombing; in the second term I had the Oklahoma City tornadoes. If I had a third term – and I wasn't permitted to run again – we would have tornadoes of sea urchins and, you know – (laughter) – dragonflies and all sorts of critters from the far deep and the far recesses of the planet. I was really the calamity governor.

But James and I – I said why don't you pretend to be the former Frank Keating and I'll pretend to be James Lee Witt – because we are good friends and work very closely together. James needs to get religion and come across the way, and help the John McCain campaign – (laughter). He probably thinks the same thing about me – (laughter) – I need to get religion as well, but the reality is, David, that the defense of America – from sea to shining sea, the defense of our way of life, the protection of the liberties and the constitutional republic – democratic republic that we have, the security of our borders – that's the whole ball of wax.

The president's primary responsibility – just like a governor's primary responsibility – is to protect the public and of course, in the case of the president, is commander in chief, but what does that mean? Well, that means before 9/11 you had, for example, FEMA largely focused on response to a natural disaster. Before 9/11 you had governors, for example, largely focused on natural disasters or a situation – if you had an insurrection, incidents, you had riots – for example, in 1968, riots that afflicted this community – and a lot of it was piecemeal and it still is.

In a federal society, as we have, 50 sovereign states, 50 national guards, 50 independently elected governors with, like the presidency, the only credentials being that you be a certain age, a resident of your state, and a citizen of the United States. So, it's very, very much a catch-as-you-can environment, which means that any thoughtful leader of the free world, of this free republic has to view all of this in a holistic way.

Number one, since 9/11, we have recognized – many of us recognized this before then – that the threat by radical Islam against the security and the freedom of the United States is very real and it is long lived, so what do you do, how to use the Department of Defense, how to use the Department of Energy, how to use federal, state and local resources to protect the homeland from a repeat of what occurred on 9/11? The reality is, whether it's an envelope of Anthrax that could disrupt an economy or 9/11 or worse – let's say a nuclear device that could destroy cities and kill lots of innocent people; these are events that we never imagined, truthfully, before 9/11.

I remember in my life I – as Bill Sessions over there – I'm a former FBI agent and here supervised the U.S. Custom Service, Secret Service, ATF, Marshalls, prisons, INTERPOL and

most of the Federal Law Enforcement establishment. When the wall went down, there was a genuine debate in this town, now what does the CIA do? I mean, what do we do? It's the end of history – Frances Fukuyama, you know, free societies have prevailed and so what are we going to do?

Well, we see we have a lot to do, and John McCain's view is we need to win the war. This is where he and Mr. Obama disagree, obviously. We need to win the war against – by radical Islam against us, we need to succeed in Iraq, whether we agree or disagree with Iraq. We need to succeed in Afghanistan clearly where the Taliban was, and fast forwarding, we need to have secure borders so that people who would do us ill can't get in. We have to continue the liberties of our society, but we have to be very firm to make sure that if there are criminal events that occur in the United States to destroy people and property in America that they are swiftly prosecuted, and we interrelate and integrate state, federal, and local law enforcement, highly trained, highly credentialed, and quite truthfully, the very best and brightest of both parties that can serve in these top cabinet and sub-cabinet positions. That's extremely important I think.

We have made mistakes on occasion not realizing that the quality of the individuals in these positions is paramount. After 9/11, late that morning – Bill Sessions knows Bob (ph) Ricks who was the SAC in Oklahoma City during the Oklahoma City bombing, special agent in charge, former DEA General Counsel, deputy assistant secretary – or, excuse me, deputy assistant director of the FBI. Bob walked into my office as governor late in the morning and he said, this has been an awful day, and I said, god, it's terrible. Can you imagine – how can you conceive that a Tim McVeigh type event that killed several thousand more people where people would destroy themselves to destroy others. It is inconceivable to us in this society that it could occur and he said, Oh, that's not even half of it. I said, what do you mean? Fortunately the intelligence was wrong. The bureau's intelligence was wrong, but he said, matter of fact, coming across the Atlantic as we speak are two 747s with their transponders off – which meant arguably that these were 747s that were hijacked, they were on the way to the United States to crash into some sensitive site in America.

Well, what do you do? Have you been trained? Have you been educated? Are you physically and morally and emotionally in a position not to crawl into a corner, but to respond to something as awful as that, that requires you to take lives in order to protect lives, you know. Have you surrounded yourself at the federal level? Have you insisted at the state and local level, not only that preparation and a wall around America to protect us against these kinds of things exists, but do you have highly competent individuals that are going to work well together and respond to something like that?

This is the issue and these are the issues we have to respond to today and, in my judgment, John McCain, men and women of good will from both political parties, highly successful professionals in their area will be selected for these positions. I think that's a great starting point.

MR. HEYMAN: Is – in an Obama administration, is homeland security still going to be a priority?

JAMES LEE WITT: First let me just say it's great to be here with Governor Keating, and he and his wife Cathy and I work together worked on many issues in Oklahoma, but he forgot about the locusts he had one year.

(Laughter.)

MR. HEYMAN: Locusts – (laughter).

MR. WITT: Let me say on behalf of Senator Obama and his campaign, thank you CSIS for doing this and I think it's extremely important as well as Senator Obama.

I think you correctly read three of the things that's really important to him and that's mitigation, prevention, and be able to respond to an event, if necessary, in this country as well as around the world, but I think one of the things that's really critical that Senator Obama has said – it's about working with people, building the relationships and partnerships, not only here at home, but around the world to be able to minimize any loss of life from any type of event, whether it's terrorist, hurricanes, earthquakes, wildfires, whatever it may be. And we are facing a situation, not only here in the United States, but around the world where the risks are greater, they are more frequent, and it's really going to be really, really critical about the change that is necessary to not only protect America, but help to protect countries around the world that are partners with America, and making change happen is something that the senator has been on the forefront of, and talking about change and talking about doing it different and better, not only for the American citizens, but for everyone.

And maybe that sounds difficult, but as Governor Keating said, it's – and I think Senator Obama believes this as well – it's about putting people in the positions that has had the background and experience to be able to fulfill that position. It's about building a government that's going to be a responsive to the American people, that's treating the American people like, not only a customer, but a friend. It's about building the relationships and partnerships with state and local governments. If you – if you go back and look at – on the eight years that we there, we worked very bipartisan because it was important in my job that we work with Republicans and Democrats because events didn't pick out a Republican or a Democrat to hit.

And it's critical that not only the political positions, but the career service employees feel comfortable and feel like they have input into making those critical decisions and how we're going to respond to events in our country, whether it's a terrorist or natural disaster or biological, whatever it may be, but it's – I can't stress enough about the change in what we're doing and how we're doing it, and how important that is because we have seen over the past seven years – we have seen that – and I've personally have and – you know, I personally would advise the senator to look at homeland security, look at FEMA, look at public safety as a whole: what's working, what's not working. Make it functional, make it work through a partnership and the relationships that you have to build because really and truly when something happens, no matter what that event is, that local and state government are the first responders.

MR. HEYMAN: Let me pick up on – on what you just said there: what's worked and what hasn't worked. If you were the next secretary in the Obama administration for homeland

security or the advisor for homeland security, what are the things – that you see over the last seven years that you would keep and you would work to preserve, and what are the things you would like to change – what are those priorities?

MR. WITT: When Senator Lieberman and Senator Collins was – and several other members of Congress were pushing to create the Department of Homeland Security, I had an opportunity to go over to the White House to meet with the staff and share – they asked me to come over to share my thoughts on what homeland security should look like.

And I spent a couple of hours with them on a Friday afternoon and – and I said, well, you know the president and the country needs something that's functional now; not 10 years from now, not 15 years from now. And they said, well, how would you do that? – and I said I would not combine 22 federal agencies and 180,000 employees under one cabinet secretary because it could be 15 years before it's functional. And I said I would take INS, border patrol, Coast Guard, the intelligence gathering and analysis, and I would make that the foundation the first year and then I would add those pieces that I found, working with state and local government, working with public safety, and put those pieces in that I found that I needed. And I said I definitely would not put FEMA under the Department of Homeland Security, but my words were not –

MR. HEYMAN: I guess they didn't listen to you.

(Laughter.)

MR. WITT: But I think really and truly, and I think Senator Obama and I think Senator McCain has seen this. I think that we, right now, probably are less prepared at the state/local level and the national level more so than we have ever been in this country. And I think that a lot of change has to happen, and I think it's going to take a strong leadership about implementing the change, but implementing in a way that it is responsive to these events and it should be done in an all-hazard concept, not specific, but all hazard because, as I said, state and local governments are the first responders. The federal government is a resource to them to train, plan, mitigate, prevent, as well as respond with those resources that is necessary to meet the challenges of that event.

MR. HEYMAN: If I can just press you just a little bit more on that. State and local governments as a – as sort of the focus of where homeland security should be and the feds as a resource to them, are you referring then perhaps to the grants – grant programs that are in place that we need to change those, are you referring to perhaps the way we do information sharing? I want to press you to be a little bit more specific in terms of what an Obama administration might change as it pertains to homeland security.

MR. WITT: I – you know, I would advise Senator Obama as president to look at all the above: you know, the \$6 billion that the Department of Homeland Security and the president put out to state and local governments for those type of equipments that they would need to be able to respond to a terrorist, biological-type event – was absolutely critical funding for state and local government that, you know, Congress and everyone worked together to fund.

But I think it needed to go further, and I think it still does because right now in our nation, we still do not have interoperability of public safety communications and the one meeting that Secretary Chertoff and I had for 15 or 20 minutes at an event, I told the secretary, I said, you know, this is great. State and local governments need this funding, but you know one of the – one of the most important things about this is that we need to create national standards for interoperability of public safety communication so that you can have state and local government and the federal government to be able to communicate with each other. We still do not have that. That's part of the change that needs to take place. We still cannot communicate with everyone when we need to. I'll give you an example, I was in Oregon and – and in a city of Oregon I asked the police chief and the sheriff, I said, well, how do you – how does your deputies ,communicate with each other? They said, we agree to meet in a parking lot and roll our window down. You know.

MR. HEYMAN: I was in LA. They have separate cell phones they share with each other.

MR. WITT: I mean this is a serious problem that we've known about for a long time and I said, you know, I believe if you're going to create interoperability and if you're going to create a system within our country, then I would partner with a private sector and I would say, here's our problem, and here's our need. Can you come up with a solution for this? – because the technology is there. It's the mindset you have to change and I think, you know – I think an Obama administration would be on topic, making that change happen.

MR. HEYMAN: Governor, as either a secretary or advisor to the president for homeland security, what are the things you would make sure to preserve going forward and what are the things you'd like to change?

MR. KEATING: Well, I see this as a – the creation of a structure, and the structure has to have a roof so the rain won't come in. It has to be secure. It has to be sound. It has to be intelligently built.

We can debate all we want – and James and I were on the other side of the debate – (laughter) – on the creation of the Department of Homeland Security. I thought you know we created the Department of Defense after we won World War II, but – (laughter) – the reality is this decision was made and it's a decision we will live with. Both political parties have embraced it and they have a stake in its success.

John McCain was one of the members of the Senate who voted for the creation of the Department of Homeland Security. He was one who insisted and still does on the implementation of the 9/11 Commission findings. He was obviously very pleased and was adamant that the Counterterrorism Center be established and that the office of the national – Director of Intelligence be created as well.

He also has insisted many times that you do something about these 80 committees that the Department of Homeland Security has to report because obviously that means utter chaos and inefficiency. So how do you create this structure?

Well, as both James and I have said and we agree, the very best people – you have to have highly skilled, motivated, patriotic, educated very good people. You want to make sure that all of the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission, all the statute that the Congress passed is – are fully implemented because, unlike the Iran Contra scandal of my youth, no, actually my service tour here in the – in Washington – you know – it makes no sense – A, it's illegal and B, it's not real smart – to try to go around an act of Congress, subvert it or ignore it. You know, the – Congress speaks; we, the executive branch, carry out the mandates of the Congress, wise or unwise.

So what you want to do is make sure, for example, that the success the bureau's had in moving into the wind – and not just as when I was an agent, responding to a criminal event when it occurs, but actually proactively seeking to stop criminal activity – in this case, terrorist activity within the United States; to cement together the international intelligence gathering apparatus that we have through the CIA, the domestic intelligence gathering apparatus we have through the FBI; to make sure that there is a seamless relationship which interoperability is a big part of between state and local law enforcement; and an understanding of respect and partnership between the federal law enforcement authorities and state and local.

When I was an FBI agent, it was generally of the view: well, we don't really share information with state and locals. Well, was it because we thought were lawyers and CPAs were smarter than they? No, it was a suspicion that there were some local law enforcement agencies that were corrupt. There obviously is, on occasion, corruption in law enforcement, but today the average police officer in this country, certainly in the largest cities, are – is as well educated as the average secret service agent, ATF agent, FBI agent, you name it – whatever – customs agent – whatever the law enforcement entity is. So these people need to be fused together.

I think certainly here they're fused together. It is spotty in some regions of the country, but that takes a lot of pounding of heads; that you need to recognize that local and state law enforcement, which represent 95 percent, by the way, of the assets that we have out there to protect ourselves against bad things happening, are viewed as partners in this whole process. That has to be accelerated, and obviously it's astonishing – what James said – but it's true, the interoperability issue is largely, I think, driven because states have competitive bidding laws that require that you buy the lowest and best bid item. Usually, it's just the lowest bid, not the best bid. So you have all of this stuff where across borders if an incident occurs, you have people who A, have not trained together in some cases, B, can't talk to each other – seven years after 9/11 that is inexcusable.

So DHS needs to focus twin missions. Obviously, the avoidance mission – law enforcement, the preparation mission for an event, law enforcement as well as an organization like FEMA and the private sector is hugely involved and important there because they do it right, and then the response and mitigation piece; both law enforcement as well as National Guard, the

other entities that are within the state and local communities, but recognize this is all a partnership and to the extent that you can have people – these very fine people that I've worked with throughout my professional career are at the table with you, you have, I think, a more seamless environment in a federal system.

We all understand that in a federal republic like we have, you have 50 governors independently elected. You may have an outstanding governor one year; the next year you have a complete incompetent, and now what do you do? So, you know, to regionalize FEMA, to regionalize preparation response, to certify regions – I really think that's very healthy to do, to require courses just like you do to serve on a college board. If you want to be a trustee, most states require you take a course, but to have people who are certified to serve in these positions, educated, trained, and if they're not, they're not certified by FEMA or the national government, DHS, whoever you wish.

Now, that shames states, that shames localities, but we do it all the time with respect to education – you know. People get As, Bs, Cs, Ds, and Fs. Their education system works or doesn't work. I think the best thing to do would be to make sure that we certify by regions and we have tough standards, training together, responding together, preparing together across state lines, equipment that is seamless, works together and we'll be in a position hopefully to avoid because we have shared intelligence, FBI and other agencies with state and local, and to respond intelligently well.

MR. HEYMAN: Let me just clarify a point on that. You are talking about regionalizing. You said regionalizing FEMA. FEMA has regions. Are you talking about the homeland security regionalization which Tom Ridge originally proposed and people are still debating?

MR. KEATING: Well, no, as – David, as you know, there were two different regions that were originally proposed. Maybe FEMA regions are a good place to start, but there ought to be a regionalized system because it just works better, and let's say in the middle of the country has a mind to have a regional headquarters, for example, in Dallas to deal with Oklahoma, Arkansas – I hate to say it James, but you might not have a region – but at any rate – (laughter) – it makes abundant good sense whether we use the FEMA regions or not.

MR. HEYMAN: Okay.

MR. KEATING: I'm talking about not just disaster preparedness and response, but law enforcement preparedness and response, avoidance, intelligence gathering, systems integration and information integration so that we can avoid, prepare, and respond; not just on a disaster basis, but a terrorism basis as well.

MR. HEYMAN: Does the Obama campaign support that notion as well or is there a different nuance?

MR. WITT: Let me just say this: if I am advising Senator Obama and his administration, I would recommend that the FEMA ten regions and I think in some of the departments has also created the regions similar to FEMA's.

I think on a regional level that to be able to blend and support the efforts of state and local governments, it was the way we did when I was there for eight years.

MR. HEYMAN: Sure.

MR. WITT: But what was different was the fact that when FEMA was the independent agency cabinet level, department heads of other agencies and – and all knew that I had the full authority of the president and under the Federal Response Plan the authority to be able to coordinate any federal resources whether it was nationally or regionally.

I think one of the key factors in the ten regions at that time was that we had very good regional directors that had the background experience to do those jobs, and they worked with other federal agencies in that region and the state and locals, they exercised, they trained together, they responded together. It was a time when you did not – you would never go to an event and be the first time you met the fire chief.

MR. HEYMAN: Right, right.

MR. WITT: You know, and so I think with the change that Senator Obama is wanting to make and create is an agency that is responsive, but also an agency that is going to mitigate and prevent. That's the key. Let me tell you. If you spend as much on mitigating and preventing as you do in responding in a given time, then we are going to be better prepared and we are also going to be – build better and safer communities, in an all-hazard way.

MR. HEYMAN: I want to go into mitigate and prevention, and then response. So let's actually take those three categories and do a couple of in-depth sort of questions, starting with prevent.

And I am keeping track of who went first and I had a follow-up question, and it's the governor's turn now, so on the prevent side of the question, you actually said in your first response that we need to win the war on radical Islam or radical extremism. Some argue that concept of a war on terror doesn't help prevent radicalization; it actually inspires radicalization. And I want to know where the future McCain administration would be. Would we embrace that language of the war on terror or are we – you've in your answer talked also about the need to deal with the law enforcement side of it and there's – in a lot of the campaigns over the last several years there's been this tension as to whether we call it a war on terror or not. What is your position on that?

MR. KEATING: Well, probably many of you have seen the reports that are coming out on where are we with respect to preparation for weapons of mass destruction if -

MR. HEYMAN: Tomorrow it comes out.

MR. KEATING: Yes, and there are several that obviously from various sources, and the bottom line – the common denominator most frequently cited in at least the executive summary

that I have seen are that we need a lot of multilateral – a lot more – which is James' point, which I think is a very good point and Senator McCain would agree with that – multilateral international cooperation, assuming assumption of responsibility and liability. You know, we just can't have this as a civilization. And then secondly, to have people in this town – the secretary of Homeland Security for example, the National Intelligence director for example – who have the authority and the knowledge to be in a position to do the things the country needs to be secure and, you know, there – when we were attacked on 9/11 by fanatics who destroyed the lives of innocent men, women, and children to make a political point – just like Tim McVeigh did – a political point, looked differently than those guys in Oklahoma City in 1995, what do you do?

Well, if you have a body to prosecute, you prosecute him, try, convict him and if you are fortunate, you execute them. That what you do to make sure that that person at least doesn't do something like that again. In the case of 9/11, they burned themselves up in the course of killing a lot of our fellow citizens, so what do you do? You find out who did it and you destroy them. You have to do that. There is simply no way that you can sit back and say we need to dialogue more with the people who are committed to destroying you.

Now obviously you want to dialogue with the culture that would breed that. You want to dialogue with the communities and the states that would permit the cultures to breed that, to say this is a threat to you as well because fanaticism of any stripe is utterly dangerous and ultimately utterly destructive, but this is where I think maturity and judgment and a lot of experience in the world is required. You simply can't have a novice do this. I mean it is too dangerous and too unstable a world to do otherwise.

MR. HEYMAN: James Lee Witt, the war on terror. Is that the right formulation?

MR. WITT: You know, Senator Obama has stated many times that, you know, if somebody caused harm to America, that it would get the full force of America returned. But, also is the fact that we can't just arbitrarily invade countries that hadn't attacked us.

I think also that we have to – and he – the senator has said it many times: we have to open a dialogue with these countries if we ever, ever think that we're going to be able to win the war on terror and be able to stop this – not only in America, but other countries around the world that's been affected of the bombings that has gone on.

So I think that dialogue and the – and setting down, and whether it's some of the most dedicated career civil servants in the embassies around the world, State Department and others, and how they do this, and how they work towards peace and bringing together as many countries as can possibly be brought together, and then those people that are trying and wanting to do harm to not only us or other countries to make a point or a threat, then you're more united and the more that is united and against terror, then the – I think that I would advise him the less terrorists you're going to have in attacking. But that will take time, that will take good people, experienced people, it will take a huge effort and, you know, that's exactly what the senator is talking about and the change of direction, the change of how we're doing things and – you know – and because it – a lot of very dedicated young men and women have lost their lives for

America and a lot of people have, as Governor Keating said, lost their lives here that was causing no harm to anyone by someone, a fanatic that was wanting to make a point. It was after the bombing in 1995 of the Murrah Building, President Clinton created – started creating the terrorism units in each of the federal agencies, and we worked very closely with the Department of Justice and state and local governments moving in that direction.

But we, as a country, have a tremendous challenge before us; not only in natural disasters, but other type of events that can cause harm, and the frequency of them will probably be greater for both, so it's really important that the kind of change that happens and takes place is the mitigation and prevention and being able to respond to it if we need to. That is critical and prevention will not only save lives, but it'll save a lot more.

MR. HEYMAN: I'm taken by the fact that both campaigns are interested in multilateralism and international – as an international dialogue of some sort as a means for prevention. At least at first blush, both campaigns have talked about use of all elements of national power and it seems that diplomacy is certainly one of them, but I would wonder – and we can follow this up at some other point, but there is economic and there is other tools as well, but including legal tools which perhaps we can explore just a little bit. Is our legal system – internationally or here – set up to deal with a so-called war on terror or do we need to do some changes as well? James Lee?

MR. WITT: Well, I'm not a lawyer.

MR. HEYMAN: Yeah, I know – (laughter) – and I recognize that, and we can – and actually, you know what, let me pass on that question because actually I'd like to get to protection, and I know you're not a lawyer and let me – we're going to come back to the campaigns and ask some of these questions and put it up on our website, so we'll do that as a follow on.

MR. KEATING: Well, David I mentioned multilateralism because I wanted James to admit to me and to all of us that this is not proposed to be the third term of George W. Bush. I mean, this is a whole new world. I mean, we're excited about this, you know, gifted man with all these wonderful new ideas, so I just – I just wanted to emphasize that.

(Laughter.)

MR. HEYMAN: Thank you.

(Laughter.)

Let's turn to protection. First thing we need for protection is the intelligence of potential harmful activities. I would argue that at this point we don't have a framework for domestic intelligence, that we've gone seven years – I think one of you had mentioned CIA, asked what's my role – I think, Governor, you said that. And we put together the NCTC for fusion, but and we've passed laws about domestic surveillance, wire taps, these types of things. I think the American public is uncomfortable and has been when we talk about these things because there's

no framework that exists right now. We don't know what the oversight mechanism is, we don't know who does what, what the roles and missions are. In – let me – I'll start with you, James Lee. How will an Obama administration assure that we protect or that we respect federalism and that we protect civil liberties, but we also maintain our security and our economic competitiveness? How do we balance all that with – with domestic – with a domestic security regime?

MR. WITT: When the senator talks about change, and particularly in the areas that you're talking about, I think – I would advise him that he has to look at not only the organizational structure of homeland security, but he has to look at whether it's the CIA, the FBI, across the federal government and the law enforcement side. He has to bring those career people together that has a historic knowledge of the functions and how they work and then basically take the Department of Homeland Security as an organization and help frame that in a way that's going to maximize each of the individual agencies and their talents, and their capability to make the full force of the federal government protecting America. You can't just – you can't build a framework like has been built under the Department of Homeland Security with having the individual turf wars behind the scene and not working to make things happen in a way that it should. And I think that's where – as Governor Keating and I know Senator McCain and Senator Obama both agree – that's where you have those good people, those talented people with that experience in the background, but you capitalize on the historical knowledge of those career people that have been doing that job for 25 years. You build that partnership and you create an atmosphere that is going to maximize this. You can't make change happen if public/private partnerships are not created within the government itself and make this change happen in a positive way and as quick as possible. You can't do it.

MR. HEYMAN: Balancing civil liberties –

MR. KEATING: To me it's really rather simple. The Bill of Rights applies here. There is a bubble, a Bill of Rights over the United States. The Fourth Amendment doesn't apply over there. The Fifth Amendment doesn't apply over there. The First Amendment doesn't apply over there. The Second Amendment doesn't apply over there. Those amendments apply here.

Now what I am saying? When any of us come back into the United States, it's a full body cavity search if need be before we clear Customs and Immigration, two agencies that in my life have reported to me in different cabinet departments. So you want to make sure that to the extent – whatever you're doing overseas is purely – I mean, is consistent with every treaty you've signed and there isn't an issue that you engage in, there isn't an act that you engage in that permits you to lose the public relations war abroad.

For example, if you sign a treaty that says we do not torture, then don't torture. Otherwise, don't ratify the treaty and – so over there where the Bill of Rights doesn't apply, the conduct is – the expected conduct and the reactions to that conduct that results in liability, if you will, are very different. For example, someone who is captured on the battlefield, uniform or no uniform, who had taken up arms against soldiers, sailors, marines or the United States, those individuals are prisoners of war until the duration of hostilities. That's it.

Now, on the other hand, if military people kick in doors and drag out somebody who doesn't have a gun, what are you going to do with them? And that apparently occurred early on in the war. That's how the whole Abu Ghraib and the issue of Guantanamo developed. I mean, you have to think that overseas you have an entirely different challenge.

Domestically what you want to do, perhaps, is what we did – I did in 1995: composed what we called on a southwest border operation alliance, and what an operational alliance was, was to share jurisdiction between, for example, a border patrol officer and a customs agent, because the border patrol person was looking for people, the customs officer or agent was looking for contraband, so obviously a – you know, an immigration officer wouldn't be authorized to look under a hubcap because you can't get somebody in there. So their jurisdiction was the trunk – so to cross-designate these people, especially know that you have a Department of Homeland Security with all of these agencies in it to be able to cross-designate, share jurisdiction, train together, do all the things necessary to make sure that there is, you know, seamless intelligence gathering, seamless enforcement, seamless knowledge of other's peoples protocols and procedures; that's very important to have that kind of relationship and, of course, I would include state and local authorities as well, which we have done by the way in the past and in the recent past.

But, in other words, think outside the box. Sit around with people, the best and brightest we have – state, federal, local, National Guard, obviously the federal family, I mean the – the city family – and say, okay, what's working? What isn't working?

How, for example, did someone almost get into the country to blow up the LAX Airport, but didn't? What was it that happened that assured that that never happened? What did we do right? By the same token, what did we do wrong? You know, murder board all those kinds of decisions and have a structure in place where people know their primary responsibility is not response; their primary responsibility is avoidance and, you know, we need to make sure – must make sure that we remain a federal republic of constitution and statutes and laws.

I've always been a civil liberties/civil rights person. That's exceedingly important. No one – in my judgment, and I'm not speaking for the campaign here – but Article 2 doesn't trump every statute, does not trump every other constitutional provision. That's the Commander in Chief authority of the presidency. So you live within the system. Over there, no Bill of Rights; here, Bill of Rights; figure it out, and you get the best and brightest people around the table to do precisely that.

MR. HEYMAN: Governor Keating played a very important role, and the first time I met him we – in June of 2001, we had an exercise at CSIS – Dark Winter – which was a bioterrorism attack against the U.S., and governor played – he was very talented – he played the role of a governor – (laughter).

MR. KEATING: It's all I knew. (Chuckles.)

MR. HEYMAN: And we – as the crisis unfolded and more and more people became sick – it was a smallpox attack – there was a question about how do you protect – how do you prevent

the spread. And the governor was very much interested in protecting his citizens and he wanted to shut the borders. I believe you did shut the borders, as I recall, with his National Guard. And the president, played by Senator Nunn – Sam Nunn – wanted, obviously, to have control over the National Guard so that he could protect the whole nation.

I bring that up because the National Guard has two primary purposes. They are reserved for our war fighting and they are now critically important for homeland security. What do you see the role of the National Guard in a McCain – I almost said Obama administration – but I guess you're in a McCain administration – (laughter) – you can answer the next one.

MR. KEATING: Yes, I'm more hopeful than that. (Laughter).

Well, Dark Winter was interesting because I was the skunk at the garden party and I introduced federalism to all these people. I mean, to show you how silly the military was, they had all these retired generals. Bill Sessions played the former FBI Director and he did a great job – (chuckles) – but they had these generals and they said, well, first thing, we don't know what smallpox is and we have no vaccines. Well, you know, for me as a state official I'd say, oh, really? Isn't that your responsibility to figure out what are the hazards that will affect my state?

Well, we're going to give the little bit of vaccine we have to all of the military guys. I said, your PR people, too? How about the doctors and nurses who have to treat in my hospitals? They won't go to work! And how about getting food into my state? You've got to vaccinate the drivers of those trucks or they won't drive. What are the PR people and the military needing vaccines for? So we got in a row that day.

That was a healthy debate because in a federal society you have mayors saying things and some of them are fools and some of them are great; governors, same thing. And Sam Nunn did a brilliant job, by the way, as the president, but you've got to murder board this. Where do you take people? And that is the responsibility of state and local officials to respond to the intelligence given to them and for me, for example as a governor, for me, let's say as a state or a city official, if somebody said to me, I gotta just tell you, the big problem we're worried about is anthrax. Oh really? What's that? How do you avoid it? How do you respond to it? How do you segregate, do you have segregate people? I mean these are the debates that have to go on, I mean, in the private sector, medical community, state officials, local officials, school officials if we have to take over, let's say, a building. I mean, it's not rocket science. It just requires bringing people together, debating, discussing, table pounding these issues and resolving them.

MR. HEYMAN: Sticking with the National Guard though, do you believe that the National Guard should be perhaps reserved primarily for homeland security, only for homeland security? How do we balance the war fighting requirements?

MR. KEATING: Well, you know, and I'm not speaking for the campaign on this one, but when you have a big chunk of National Guard people in Iraq, you know, a homeland security, terrorist event or a natural disaster event is not going to be as well responded to because these people, these men and women are not warriors by professions; they are pharmacists, lawyers,

firefighters, police officers. You take a firefighter out of the fire service and stick him in the National Guard; he's a member of the National Guard for two years. You know, there's a hole.

So I think the president needs to be very careful in his federalization of National Guard troops; but by the same token, the National Guard needs to be, in some cases, much better trained because it's all training state by state by state in disaster prevention and how do you cooperate with the private sector.

Same thing with law enforcement. I mean, the private sector is essential here for the – and the nonprofit community – 501(c)3 community in doing this, but everybody ought to be humbled. Nobody is superior here. Everybody is equal trying to resolve, avoid, respond to these problems together.

MR. HEYMAN: National Guard? Balance?

MR. WITT: It's a very, very critical balance between the National Guard and their responsibilities, particularly for governors, and I'm not speaking on the behalf of the Obama campaign on this issue, but there's – when hurricane Katrina and Rita hit, President Bush was going to federalize the National Guard in Louisiana. Governor Blanco asked him not to because she needed the National Guard in New Orleans for security, so they could carry guns. If they're federalized, they can't carry guns. So the demands of the National Guard for their individual states are great and, you know, I would advise the Obama administration the biggest problem the National Guard has is the fact that they're there as protectors, law enforcement, responders, whether it's aid or whether it's security in responding for debris or whatever it may be in a state – and terrorism; homeland security issues.

The problem we have is the fact that our National Guard have not been equipped to fill – fulfill all these responsibilities. We have a lot of National Guard in this country that – and states that need more and better equipment for those National Guards to be able to meet their requirements, and that's an issue that absolutely has to be looked at and corrected because with what we see and what we're facing, and we have seen in the last few years, there's going to be more demand, more need on them and this is important.

MR. HEYMAN: I'm going to open it up to the audience in just a second, so start getting your questions ready. We'll have microphones.

Let me ask the question of the elephant in the room because I'm surprised we've gone this long and you haven't said anything, but the organization of the department and the homeland security enterprise, what changes would you make if you were in the next government? I'm anticipating, perhaps, you might recommend pulling FEMA out, but I'd also like you to talk about the relationship between the Homeland Security Council and the National Security Council.

MR. WITT: First of all, I'd put Homeland Security under FEMA. (Laughter.) But if you really want to make it responsive – (laughter) – and in mitigation and prevention. No, seriously I think the homeland – Department of Homeland Security is very important. I think it has a

significant role, particularly in protecting our railroads, protecting our chemical plants, and helping states to be able to do that, and protecting our airlines and our borders. But you know, Department of Homeland Security hasn't really been defined as what it is yet. It's got so many roles and so many missions, they don't know which one is the priority, I don't think.

MR. HEYMAN: What would – what would you recommend?

MR. WITT: Well, I would recommend that they work with and identify with state and local governments – whether it's governors, whether it is someone they designate – and the private sector, and bring the Department of Homeland Security into truly its function and role and responsibility; that is, protecting our infrastructure, protecting our borders, and protecting the American people in events and preparing and mitigating. The thing of it is when you – if you look at – and I would combine the two committees.

MR. HEYMAN: Definitely – (inaudible) –

MR. WITT: Yes and -

MR. HEYMAN: Oh, you're talking about HSC and SC? Okay.

MR. WITT: Yes, I would. I would combine it into a smaller –

MR. HEYMAN: National Security Council – just subsume the Homeland Security Council into the National Security Council.

MR. WITT: Well, I don't care what you call it, but I would combine them.

MR. HEYMAN: Subsume the National Security Council into the Homeland Security Council.

(Laughter.)

MR. WITT: Yeah, whichever, you know – (laughter) – but I would combine those two.

But I think – you know, Department of Homeland Security to me is securing our borders, securing our country in a way to protect us against events of people that want to harm us. Two things: one is – and based on what I saw when I was Director of FEMA, we – when I became director, we had a federal response plan in place that basically the relationships hadn't been built with the federal agencies and the partnerships, and when I left, we probably had one of the best federal teams the federal government has ever had. That was because other federal departments come together and made a team, worked together, exercised together, and responded together.

You can have a Department of Homeland Security and independent FEMA that works in sync with each other, particularly when you – if you deal with it in a crisis consequence management situation. If it's consequence management, then FEMA takes the lead and fulfills that role and responsibility of coordinating the federal agencies to respond to it, and if it's a law

enforcement or a crisis management, then Secretary of Homeland Security – then FEMA is responsible to help coordinate whatever they need. And what really concerns me is the fact that we put out a national response platform that basically doesn't really define how we're all going to respond together, and I think that you're going to have to go back and look at the federal response plan, bring it up to the level that it needs to be against the challenges of today. I think it worked better, it was more effective and what was interesting is that most states at that time – when we created the ESF functions and we created the EVAC, and we created all these things, most states mirrored the federal response plan.

Now then you tell me how many states today mirrors the federal response platform. Not very many. I'm just saying it's got to be more effective and it's got to be in a way that it – not only on a national level, but at the state/local level that is a functional response capability and I just don't think we have it right now in – that's in sync.

MR. HEYMAN: Governor.

MR. KEATING: I think – well, I think the most important thing to do theologically – small t – is remove all unnecessary levels of bureaucracy and get action and liability at the lowest possible level so that you can quickly respond.

Some of my fellow governors – I never had a problem with the Department of Defense – indicate that the levels of bureaucracy, the delay, the paperwork is not in the best interest of their states when they call upon the Department of Defense to provide assistance. I don't know if that's true. I never had that problem.

MR. WITT: Because you had me there.

MR. KEATING: That's right. But the reality is that you've got to move quickly and intelligently, so to the extent, for example that the National Security Council and the Homeland Security Council, by having two separate entities, delay action, delay resolution, delay liability; that's not good and, you know, this is something for me – I'm not in the government – that I would want to look at. Doesn't it make more sense to have one entity that will do this, but do you really need the entity at all? Well, isn't that the Security of Homeland Security's responsibility?

I mean, I'm just saying you've got to be able to move quickly and you must have liabilities, so assuming as James Lee, I think for both of our candidates, we assume, having highly gifted, highly skilled executives in these positions who are really experienced individuals, I trust them and you've got to be able to move quickly and not have someone reporting to someone who reports to someone to try to figure out what next to do.

And in fairness to James Lee – and the McCain campaign obviously and I would agree it's important to step back and no reorganization – (laughter) – until I try to see what we can make work first before we start changing things, but for me as a governor to grab Witt by the arm and say, let's get this done. If James had said to me, well, but I've got to ask the undersecretary who will have to ask the deputy secretary who'll have to – well, then get out. I

mean, I gotta move. I've got problems; I've got people who are floating away and people who are hurt. So those are issues that have to be resolved if, for example, FEMA remains a part of DHS which appears likely because again I think the Democrats more than likely will control the House and Senate and I think most of them really don't want to see any major reorganizations. But let's make sure the thing works.

MR. HEYMAN: So you're – you're position would be to wait and see. Let's test it out for a bit.

MR. KEATING: Well, I mean, you know, if you walk in, people in this room have forgotten more in many of these areas than I've ever learned. But if somebody in this room says let me just tell you this is a complete disaster because of X; fine, fix it. I would fix it tomorrow.

MR. HEYMAN: I'd like to turn over to the audience folks; get you guys involved in this, so let's see, who has got microphones out there? You guys – you guys do? Okay, can you come down the center to here? Randy, why don't you take the first question? Come straight down the aisle. Please identify yourself.

Q: Thank you. Randy Larson, Institute for Homeland Security. Very interesting, thank you for spending the time here tonight. But I would like to see a little bit clearer line between these two candidates right here. So, instead of talking about response, which I see a lot of head nodding in agreement, that's good. Let's talk about prevention. What would be your – and I'd be very happy with a yes or no answer – would your candidate make any major changes to the Patriot Act. Governor Keating?

MR. KEATING: Well.

Q: Yes or no is fine.

(Laughter.)

MR. KEATING: You know, I think the Patriot Act works, but again, I'm not in the government. Is there a clause or a semicolon?

Q: Major changes, not commas.

MR. KEATING: Right now I think it works.

MR. WITT: You know, I honestly have not asked him what he would do with the Patriot Act yet.

Q: Well, David, we'd like to see that on the website. You said you're going to put it up there. I think it's a really important issue –

MR. HEYMAN: Well, we'll follow up. There's actually three provisions that are going to be up for renewal next year.

Q: The sunsets?

MR. HEYMAN: Let's see where they're going to stand on that, the roving wire taps, FBI access to business records, and the lone wolf provision, so we will ask about that. In the very back?

Q: Bill Courtney with CSC. There's been an expectation in this town that an Obama administration would transfer resources relatively out of the Defense Department and into the Department of Homeland Security. On the other hand, Senator Obama's emphasized the importance of the fight in Afghanistan. Do you expect a net transfer of resources from Defense to Homeland Security?

MR. WITT: Is he asking me?

MR. HEYMAN: He's asking – I can't answer that question.

(Laughter.)

MR. KEATING: I'm for the other guy.

(Laughter.)

MR. HEYMAN: That leaves you, James Lee.

MR. WITT: Well, I don't think you would see Senator Obama as the president transferring resources out of such an important function that Department of Defense has into Homeland Security. I think that you would see Senator Obama strengthening Department of Homeland Security and DOD, from my understanding of his positions and what he's put out there.

MR. HEYMAN: Suzanne?

Q: Suzanne Spaulding with Bingham Consulting Group. Both of you this evening and really for many years have given of your time to come out and speak, in part, to sound the alarm about the dangers we face and how unprepared we really still are. And yet I am struck also by the title of this series: Homeland Security 2010 Strength and Resiliency In the Face of Global Terrorism. Resiliency we know is critically important, the resiliency of the American public in meeting this long-term challenge of terrorism. And fear is one of the most effective ways to undermine resiliency.

In the coming days and weeks, I think it's very likely that Bin Laden will try to scare the American public. And my question is whether you think that Senator McCain and Senator Obama have a role to play in mitigating that fear in frustrating his effort to scare the American public before the election and what they might be able to do in order to accomplish that objective?

MR. WITT: Let me just say this: Every time we responded to an event, no matter what that event was across the United States with states and the governors, and members of Congress, and the president, the one thing that we learned very fast was that it's really, really, really important on the front end to have public awareness, public education. If this happened, this is what you would do and this is what we would do. I think that you would see both campaigns help create less fear and more ways that individuals could help themselves or small businesses or families in their communities. Public education and public awareness, if you can calm the fears and people understand it and they know what to do, then they will respond as well.

MR. KEATING: You know, I think a little fear is healthy. I think, for me, I have an alarm on my house; I have lights outdoors; I have a gun in my desk drawer that's loaded so that anybody who comes in, the five-shot revolver that I have; if there are six guys, I'm in trouble; five guys, they're in trouble. But I mean the reality is a little bit of fear isn't such a bad thing.

And I think to explain to the public what the real threats are; I mean, here are very real threats, so that you are – will be a diligent, but a good citizen, a constable on every street saying you know, there's a problem here, there's a guy trying to learn how to steer an airplane, but not how to take off and land, something is really dangerously wrong. I mean, I think that's healthy, but I think you can overplay it. For example, several years ago, remember a little Cessna buzzed the capital, you know came into –

MR. HEYMAN: It was the governor of Kentucky, I believe.

(Laughter.)

MR. KEATING: No, no it wasn't him. (Laughter.) It was a different one, but this is absolutely the truth. And I used to be chairman of the board of The Federal Law Enforcement Training Center that trains about 23,000, 30,000 officers every year. But I was having lunch in the Senate with Senator Nunn. And I was leaving with a friend of mine because the maitre d', if you will, walked in and he said, there is a threat. There is apparently a plane approaching, you know, going into air space it shouldn't be, so everybody needs to leave the Capitol Building. So, I was leaving the Capitol Building, walking with another guy and this Capitol Police Officer – if there is anybody here representing the Capitol Police, I apologize, came up behind me with an AR-15 shrieking, run, and I turned and grabbed his arm, I said, no, your responsibility is to be calm. (Laughter.) Everything will be fine.

So I think leadership, you know, that guy was not well trained. He wasn't. (Laughter.) Leadership requires that everybody out there who is in the public protection business be mature and responsible and calm, and we not exaggerate the problems. But by the same token, we not explain what it is we're facing because, I mean, we know what could've happened New Year's Eve in 2000. We know what could've happened if those airplanes had come across the Atlantic, what Richard Reid could've done if he had been successful. And I think that's where all of us as citizens try to listen, to learn from each other, share information with each other and pick up the phone and call law enforcement if you see something wrong. I think that's prudent and it's good citizenship.

MR. HEYMAN: Suzanne I think it's a great question. I just want to add my two cents on this because I think, you know, national security issues have been politicized over the last several years and I like the fact that the two senators will be on 9/11 together in New York. If Bin Laden does something to try to scare the American public, they should come together and say, we're not going to take this. We're unified on that. And I'd like to see that. Question over here.

Q: Great comments by the way. Thank you. Frank McGlisi from DuPont. Good to see you again, Governor.

MR. KEATING: Thank you, sir.

Q: I want to lay out three scenarios. One of them you will have no effect on and that it is that incredibly cumbersome and unworkable committee.

MR. HEYMAN: Let me ask you to lay out scenarios quickly so we can get a lot of people involved.

Q: Too many committees overseeing homeland security. The second one I heard the need for standards, and standards especially when you have federal funding flowing down to state and locals, and they have to try to figure out what to buy, and then the third one is the need for quality people when you have an incredibly cumbersome system where people are up for Senate confirmation – that's incredible – if you had one of those that you could fix, which one would it be?

(Laughter.)

MR. KEATING: All of the above. I mean, I think you can fix, frankly – really, I think you can address all of them. I mean this is a three-part government. Did the president ever say, we're not having my people report to 80 committee? You know, this is ridiculous. I'll have my people report to four or five, and you're going to have a long night at the Capitol if you're waiting to – well – you know, let's have a little friction, if you will. Um, you know, getting quality people in; great, we can always do that. What was your third one? I think there was –

MR. HEYMAN: Standards.

Q: The standards – (inaudible) – guarantee federal funding – (inaudible) – state and locals. How do you guarantee – (inaudible) – right equipment.

MR. KEATING: Interstate. There's gotta be an interstate nexus. I mean, the old LEA days if you remember, sometimes there was in Oklahoma, for example, a police department that had a two-way radio LEA gave the police department and there was no one to listen. It was just – (chuckles) – the policeman had his two-way radio and nobody was listening. Well, why did buy that? And you know the federal taxpayers paid for it, so to make sure there's an interstate nexus to any expenditure burn grants, cop grants, interstate nexus that – you know – that's the

only way it'll work. If it's not an interstate nexus on, for example, radio equipment, interoperability and the like, then you don't fund it.

MR. WITT: Let me just say on standards. One of the most important things is all of the communications equipment and other equipment that we have already out there, you cannot just get rid of it and replace it, okay? You're going to have to have standards working with public safety across the board at state and local, and the private sector to say, okay, this is compatible. This is the one that we could use. This will take care of 800 MHz, 700 MHz, all of those individual units that they have without just telling them to toss them out the door. You can't do that.

I think one of the most important things, particularly in leadership in what we're doing, you know you can appoint someone that has the background experience and capability, are they experienced on paper to fulfill the job and help move things forward and make change happen. But you know, that person's got to have a little common sense too in how they want to do things. You know, and the federal government being responsive and from an agency; you know, as an agency you don't break the laws. The laws are there to be enforced and make it work right, but those – you – it's how you interpret those laws to make sure that it meets that demand and still comply. I think that, and I agree with Governor Keating, there's not any of those three issues that cannot be met.

MR. HEYMAN: Right here.

Q: Hi, Stuart Verdery with Monument Policy Group and CSIS. Secretary Chertoff's kind of got the regulatory pipeline full trying to get things done before the end of the year and I'll just ask about two questions – and these are ones where they have tried to consult with stakeholders and the stakeholders have said, no thanks. And so I guess the question is where do the campaigns stand on two controversial border-security issues? One is checking visitors out of the country with fingerprints, that the airlines have been complaining about; and two, is the real ID law – um – that would require states to meet driver's license standards that the governors bipartisanship have been complaining about. Those will both be on the agenda early next year.

MR. KEATING: Well, I have not had an opportunity to examine those important, but certainly, very arcane, very specific issues with the campaign. But I'll say as a governor, who wants to stand in line at the Department of Motor Vehicles, you know, and get another license? That's why the governors are bucking up. You're going to have a rebellion. There's got to be some –

MR. HEYMAN: It was a question about who pays, too.

MR. KEATING: Right. Right.

MR. HEYMAN: Whether the states pay or –

MR. KEATING: But I'm saying you have to start from scratch. For somebody who's got a driver's license, a 10-year license, here you go; start from scratch. You know, border – you

gotta work – the stakeholders have to be a part of this and if they're not a part of it, then you haven't sold it very well. But again, I don't have any direction from the campaign on any of these points.

MR. HEYMAN: Do you have any direction?

MR. WITT: I don't, but you know one of the most important things that a new administration going in is identifying those issues that are critical like this because you don't want an administration coming in and be facing with some major issues that's going to be – could be catastrophic within the first six weeks of a new administration. And I – you know, I think that NCIS and the Center, the presidency, and many other organizations that are identifying things and these reports that are coming out are going to be important for the administration.

MR. HEYMAN: I've the homeland security director for D.C. and California sitting right next to each other.

(Laughter.)

Q: Bicoastally, working together.

(Laughter.)

MR. HEYMAN: Do either of you want to make a comment or a question or sing a song together or something?

(Laughter.)

Q: Two bald-headed guys.

(Laughter.)

Q: I'll defer to my colleague from California.

Q: I think we both agree as we're sitting here, it's about partnerships and one of our – our concern too is reorganization; we're a little tired of that change too. So one of the things is – and I think both of the campaigns are addressing. Let's get some of things fixed. Let's get things moving forward. Let's, you know, I mean there's been a lot of talk about that and it really does have to be driven from the bottom up. It can't be run here from Washington, D.C. I mean outside of his jurisdiction, but, you know inside the beltway. It's about the cultural preparedness. It's continuing to fund the grant programs, whether it's EMPG and I guess both of our concern would be is there a commitment on both campaigns to continue the funding and allowing it for all-hazard preparedness as we train, equip, exercise.

Q: And I would echo Matt's statements. I think more than anything else, what we don't want to see is massive reorganization. I think I've lost track of how many reorganizations we've had of DHS. And I think that puts an incredible burden at the state and local level because when

you have that reorganization, you have more requirements, you have more paperwork and we just don't have the staffs to do that on an every day basis. I mean it really is a huge burden at the state and local level.

I think the other thing is when you talk about standards and those different types of things, and purchasing equipment, I think what I'd like to see, those are really, in my opinion, tactical things. I think what we'd really like to see is really some strategic direction on how do we coordinate and integrate all those different programs together – and one of the things that you had said Governor Keating was having a regional construct.

And I think the first thing that came to my mind is, one, how would you have that certification? You know, are you talking about regions, say, for example, would you combine EPA regions and FEMA regions because EPA has a critical role to play in not only in the safety of chemical plants, for example, but the security of chemical plants. So, would you combine EPA and FEMA regions, and JTTs and those different types of things.

So again, when you say those things, I sit there and I kind of say, wow. Okay, here we go, another reorganization. How is that going to affect me at the local level and if it affects me how it has in the past, that's more reporting requirements, more hoops that I have to jump through, and more things that I don't have to do because at the end of the day when I talk to Mayor Fenty, he wants to know how does that protect the neighborhoods and how does that reduce crime in wards one through eight in Washington, D.C.? And if I can't do that, then we're not answering the question.

MR. HEYMAN: Any of you like to comment?

MR. KEATING: Well, I don't disagree with what you're saying, I'm saying that it's important we figure out how state and local, and I view – my son, when he graduated, got an Economics Degree at Southern Methodist, became a state trooper. And, you know, Chip was well trained for violations of motor vehicle laws. But all these other things, you know, what's a hazard out there, what should I be looking for in terms of national security challenges, which now are domestic security challenges? That wasn't part of the coursework.

So you got a trooper on the road that didn't have that education and knowledge. That has to be fixed. I'm sure it has been because this was some years ago. But the reality is like your comment, if we say look this thing won't work. We got too god blessed many regions, how do we fix it, recognizing our state and local partners not as partners, but as equal partners, how do we fix that? And that, I mean that – that's my culture, okay; that's my culture and, in my opinion, that's John McCain's culture. He's a real federalist.

MR. WITT: Well, let me say something. You know – I know that the change that Senator Obama is wanting to make is the change to make it more functional and more responsive to state and local and public safety and emergency management across the board. Now then, as you said reorganization may not be exactly what you want to go through anymore. But let me ask you this, wouldn't be it wonderful if you knew who you could pick up the phone up and call, and talk to about a problem? Wouldn't it be wonderful if a lot of that red tape and bureaucracy

was cut out of that so that you could train, prepare and be able to respond without the bureaucracy that Governor Keating said a while ago about when the governor picks up the telephone, they don't want have to go through this one, the secretary, and this one to be able to get an answer for someone.

You know, and so I think that using some common sense and using the change that is going to make it better, more effective, and more responsive to the immediate needs and long-term is what Senator Obama is about. And I know that he'll be bringing those people together that are going to be advisors in saying, you know this works, this doesn't work, this is what we need to do to make that change happen. And as well as state and local government, but also in the career service that's been there, that's done it, that knows and understands it. So I think it would be a big change in itself.

MR. HEYMAN: So, we're at the end.

Q: (Inaudible.)

MR. WITT: Hey, I'm a diehard supporter of it, so. I can't say what.

(Laughter.)

MR. KEATING: But as long as it is – there's an interstate nexus, I mean, to suggest it's a responsibility of the citizens of a particular city; federal city is a little bit different.

Q: But when we say interstate nexus though, if I'm building an urban search and rescue team in Los Angeles, but I want to make it available nationwide.

MR. KEATING: Right. There's an interstate nexus.

Q: (Inaudible.)

MR. KEATING: Yea, because L.A., where's Mark? I mean, you think the California who helped – where – where is he?

MR. WITT: L.A.'s got their search and rescue.

MR. KEATING: Yeah, but I mean, but the California authorities were fabulous for us.

MR. HEYMAN: We're also a local city too. I just wanted to throw that.

MR. KEATING: No, no I realize that.

DAVID HEYMAN: We're going to let you guys continue this discussion and I'm glad we brought you all together, but we are at the end of our time. I want to ask one closing question. This is going to be – the transcript is going to put up on the web for others to see. At the end of the day it's the American public who is really interested in these answers. And both of

the campaigns have talked about the interest in the public and the Obama campaign has talked about national service being important; the McCain campaign talking about country first.

In homeland security, there's a lot of criticism early on, and particularly in the development that we never asked that the American public to do anything in terms of protecting this country. I'll give you the guys the last chance, closing remarks. We're going to put it up on the website. What are you going to ask of the American public in terms of the homeland security? James Lee first; Frank Keating next.

MR. WITT: I think it's going to be really important as we go forward in the things that we have to do to make the change happen is that we ask the American public for their input; we ask them for their faith and their trust; and we ask them to be a partner in changing America and how we do things from the past because it's going to take all of us; as Senator Obama has said before, we each will be making some kind of sacrifices in some way to make it better.

And if, you know, if we can't do that within our own country, how do we expect to change countries around the world? At one time, we were the leader; at one time other countries looked up to us. Other countries looked to FEMA as the model for their country. We have to be that model. That's how we can effect change, not only home but around the world; by individuals taking responsibility as the senator has said many times.

MR. KEATING: Those of us have been unfortunately involved in natural and manmade disasters understand that the best result always is a community result. And in Oklahoma City, for example, 302 buildings were damaged or destroyed and there was not one act of looting because the public viewed this as an attack on themselves. It was an attack on their community; it was an attack on their families; it was an attack on their neighbors. So to construct that culture of community, community service, community responsibility, community obligation, protect your neighbors, protect your family, respond, serve.

I think that culture is the barn-raising culture that really made America great. I mean think about in colonial times, everybody grabbed their musket and took off to secure the town or to respond to a raid or a challenge to the community. And I think that sense of obligation, responsibility, fellowship, sisterhood, brotherhood, community service is something that we need to reenergize. And I think John McCain will do precisely that and obviously, since this is kind of a debate – (laughter) – that I hope that all of you would consider John McCain as your candidate for president.

MR. WITT: But, if you really want change to happen –

MR. KEATING: Yeah.

(Laughter, applause.)

MR. HEYMAN: Thank you all for coming tonight and we look forward to continuing the dialogue online. Thank you.

(END)