

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this story should be in Ripley's Believe It Or Not. Lawyers for the President of the United States, Bill Clinton, who has been sued by a former Arkansas State employee, have now asked to postpone the lawsuit claiming that the President, who is the commander in chief, should be covered by the Soldiers and Sailors Relief Act of 1940, which means they are claiming that Bill Clinton should be protected as a uniformed service member.

Mr. Speaker, this is outrageous. On the eve of Memorial Day, this man, to avoid a lawsuit, would claim he is protected because he really is wearing the uniform of this country.

Mr. Speaker, how outrageous can we get? In Ripley's could we find such a story.

Please join me and sign the letter authored by our colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP], to this President asking for some civil decency.

FIFTEEN PERCENT RAISE FOR CORPORATE EXECUTIVES; REPUBLICANS ATTEMPTING TO REDUCE MINIMUM WAGE

(Mr. MARKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, Harry Truman used to say the Republican Party supports the minimum wage. The lower the minimum, the better.

In today's Forbes magazine, the bible of the Republican Party, we find that the 800 top chief executives in the United States averaged \$1.5 million last year, up 15 percent. But for the minimum-wage workers in this country, the Republican Party wants nothing for them, no increase whatsoever, and the proposal they are bringing out here will lead to a reduction in pay for millions of these working people.

The Republican Party has had two responses so far this year. First, like Oliver Twist, when he held up his empty bowl and said "More," the workhouse master said, "Too much," and the second Republican response has been revolutionary, as in the French Revolution when the starving French citizens pleaded for bread and Marie Antoinette said, "Let them eat cake."

REPUBLICANS AND THE MINIMUM WAGE—THEY OUGHT TO BE ASHAMED

(Mr. LEWIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, NEWT GINGRICH and BOB DOLE oppose an increase in the minimum wage. The Republican leader has said he will fight the minimum wage with every fiber in his being and the Republican whip has said in regard to families living on the minimum wage, they do not exist.

Today, the Republicans in this House are pulling one of the dirtiest and most despicable deceptions I have seen in my 10 years in this House. They say they support an increase in the minimum wage, but today they will vote to repeal the minimum wage for nearly two-thirds of the people earning that wage. That is right, repeal the minimum wage.

Unbelievable, Mr. Speaker. Extreme in the extreme. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves, Mr. Speaker, you ought to be ashamed.

PERMISSION FOR SUNDRY COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: The Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on National Security, the Committee on Resources, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

PRAIRIE ISLAND INDIAN CHARTER REVOCATION

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 3068) to accept the request of the Prairie Island Indian Community to revoke their charter of incorporation issued under the Indian Reorganization Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. KILDEE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I will not object, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HASTINGS] to enable him to explain the legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 3068, authored by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT], is to accept the request of the Prairie Island Indian Community to revoke their charter of incorporation issued under the Indian Reorganization Act. The Federal charter of incorporation for the community contained a provision which requires that it can only be revoked by an act of Congress.

The revocation was requested by the community because the community

has never used it in the management of its enterprises, finding it to be outdated, ineffective, and cumbersome. Instead, the community relies on provisions in its constitution.

A similar revocation relating to the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe was included in Public Law 104-109. I ask for the Members' support for this non-controversial measure.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDEE. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

(Mr. GUTKNECHT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to offer H.R. 3068, a bill to repeal the corporate charter of the Prairie Island Dakota Community in Welch, MN.

The tribe contacted me last June requesting revocation of their 1934 charter. By law, revoking this 62-year-old document can only be done by an act of Congress.

In its entire tribal government history, the Prairie Island Community has never used its corporate charter in the management of its enterprises. Additionally, with this outdated and paternalistic charter, the tribe is restricted from doing many of the things necessary to carry out business activities.

For example, the community cannot sell or mortgage property, lease land for more than 10 years, or contract for work without approval from the Interior Department.

This legislation acknowledges that the people of Prairie Island know best how to handle their business. It is another example of this Congress sending control back to local communities, and I am proud to be a part of that process.

My colleagues, I and the good people of the Prairie Island Community would appreciate your support for this important legislation.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, further under my reservation of objection, like many tribes, the Prairie Island Community has realized the many shortcomings of the BIA's 1930's policy of encouraging tribes to incorporate under the Indian Reorganization Act. I think that it is a good thing that we are finally beginning to shed some of the paternalistic vestiges of those times. I hope that we keep this in mind as we deal with future legislation affecting Indian tribes.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3068

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REVOCATION OF CHARTER OF INCORPORATION OF THE PRAIRIE ISLAND INDIAN COMMUNITY UNDER THE INDIAN REORGANIZATION ACT.

The request of the Prairie Island Indian Community to surrender the charter of incorporation issued to that Community on July 23, 1937, pursuant to section 17 of the Act of June 18, 1934, commonly known as the "Indian Reorganization Act" (25 U.S.C. 477) is hereby accepted and that charter of incorporation is hereby revoked.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 437 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3259.

□ 1045

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3259) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, with Mr. DICKEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] will each control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST].

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to bring H.R. 3259, the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 1997, before my colleagues for consideration and, I trust, approval.

Before I turn to the contents of the bill, I would like to thank the staff of the committee for their hard work. We marked up two bills in 1 week and brought this bill to the floor in half the time that we have taken in the past. None of this would be possible without our staff's diligence and very long hours.

Five short months ago, I spoke on the floor about the conference report for the fiscal year 1996 authorization. I noted at that time that we had been disappointed in the President's budget submission on intelligence for fiscal year 1996 because it did not show the forward thinking and vision I think our intelligence policy needs. Instead of a blueprint, we got a snapshot of 1 year's needs. I also noted that another such submission would not be acceptable. I had been assured by both the Vice President and the Director of Central Intelligence that the fiscal year 1997 intelligence budget would show vision and foresight.

Unfortunately, this has not been the case. The budget we received was more of the same, another status quo budget. To say that we have been disappointed would be an understatement. That is why the committee has made more substantial changes in the intelligence budget than last year. The details of those changes are in the classified annex, which I hope Members have taken the time to read.

Our changes were made only after the most careful consideration. We held 6 full committee hearings, 15 member briefings, and more than 100 staff briefings. I might add that we expect to have further briefings between now and conference on issues that are still undergoing changes.

Overall, this bill increases the amount requested by the President by an additional 3.9 percent. It is money well spent. As always, our ability to talk in detail on this subject is limited, but as many of my colleagues know, U.S. intelligence continues to provide crucial support for sensitive negotiations and for U.S. forces deployed overseas, and in combating terrorism, narcotics, and proliferation.

I would like to spend a few moments highlighting some of the major aspects of this bill.

Our most important intelligence asset is the people who are the intelligence community. Downsizing, more drastic than we had first assumed, has taken its toll and yet we are still faced with the problem of the proper skills mix in each NFIP agency. There are also a number of quality of life issues that are of fundamental importance. I give DCI Deutch full credit for making personnel reform his highest priority issue. Unfortunately, he did not provide the committee with the kinds of detail we require in order for us to commit the sums of money he needs. Section 403 of our bill denies authorization for the expenditure of funds for personnel reforms until the committee is briefed. Some may argue that we are taking the DCI to task with this provision. We are not. Our colleagues in the other body have no provisions at all in their bill that deal with personnel reform. Section 403 is a good-faith pledge on the part of our committee that we will address this important issue when we have a detailed proposal.

Some of our most important changes to the President's budget are in the Na-

tional Reconnaissance Program. Last year we began to force the NRO to give more thought to alternative means of intelligence collection, with satellites that are smaller and cheaper, yet no less capable. Many attacked this vision. I am happy to report that it has been confirmed by experts and that we will continue to push the NRO along these lines. We are coming up to a crucial moment of generational change in our satellite systems. Unless we begin planning for that now, we will face a future when we will pay more to know less in a more complex world.

As we did last year, we are limiting the amount of money that can be spent on declassification under President Clinton's Executive Order 12958. We favor more open government. Some of the recent declassifications of such programs as CORONA and VENONA underscore the achievements and importance of intelligence. But we do take exception to having annual expenditures mandated by an Executive order for a program that has yet to prove it can declassify without revealing secrets.

H.R. 3237 helps put us on the path toward the intelligence community we will need in the 21st century. I despair that this President will ever give us the kind of intelligence budget that will move us in the right direction by bold and large steps, rather than hesitant ones. I look forward to the next President doing so, soon. Until then, I know that my colleagues will support this bill so that we can move the intelligence community in a positive direction.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation now before the House.

I want to begin by commending Chairman COMBEST for the manner in which he has presided over the committee's activities this year. He has been solicitous of the views of the Democratic members and has sought to address our concerns when he felt it possible to do so. We do not agree on every issue, although we do agree on many, but I have always felt that he was willing to give us the opportunity to make our case, particularly on matters concerning the intelligence budget.

We are, of course, waiting to have a couple of additional hearings, Mr. Chairman, on some of the issues that we discussed in our markup.

At a time when most programs are feeling the effects of a constrained budget environment, H.R. 3259 provides a significant increase—nearly 5 percent over the amount authorized for the current fiscal year and about 6.5 percent over the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1996. While some of this increase is the result of the substantially higher defense budget approved by the House, a major portion reflects decisions by the committee that a number