

Mr. BONIOR. I guess it is possible it might slip altogether.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, the gentleman's optimism is not contagious in that regard.

Mr. BONIOR. Let me request of my colleague and the distinguished Committee on Rules chairman that adequate time be reserved on this issue for all Members to have a chance to express themselves. If it is indeed, as some on your side have said, one of the biggest votes, not only of this Congress but in a generation, then it seems to me that all Members on all different sides of this issue ought to have a chance to express themselves. So I would hope that the majority would err on the side of generosity with respect to time here, as opposed to trying to cram this into a short afternoon or a morning.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for that observation. If the gentleman would continue to yield, let me just say we will work with both sides of the aisle on both sides of the issue to try to get ample time for all Members.

Mr. BONIOR. I gather from the gentleman's comments that the majority has not decided yet on how to treat the Bereuter-Levin proposal in terms of whether it will be grafted on to the main issue at hand, or it will come out separately. Has there been a decision made on that that we could apprise people of?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, first of all, I should like to take a moment to thank both the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BE-REUTER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) for their hard work and willingness to work with everybody concerned with this. We will do everything we can to find a way to make sure they can be assured their work will be managed throughout the entire process.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

#### INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 506 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 506

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4392) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 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. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 4(a) of rule XIII are waived. General

debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered by title rather than by section. Each title shall be considered as read. Points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII and except pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Each amendment so printed may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or his designee and shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 506 is a modified open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 4392, the Intelligence Authorization Act. The most notable provision in this modified open rule is the requirement that Members wishing to offer amendments were asked to have them preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to their consideration. Notice of this requirement was provided on Monday of this week.

This provision does make sense, given the unique nature of the matters covered in this particular bill. In the past, we have found it works well to allow the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence the opportunity to review potential amendments ahead of time in order to work with Members to

ensure that no classified information is inadvertently disclosed or discussed during our floor debate. By no means is it our intent to shut out any debate on the bill in any way; we simply want to use extra caution in terms of making sure sensitive material is properly protected.

As is customary, the rule provides 1 hour of general debate, equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. The rule makes in order the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The rule further waives points of order against the amendment in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI, which prohibits nongermane amendments. This is necessary because the introduced bill was more narrow in scope, as it usually is, than the product reported out by the committee.

Finally, the rule provides the traditional motion to recommit, with or without instruction.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair rule, given the nature of this bill, and, as far as I am aware, it is without controversy and it is the traditional rule.

That said, I encourage Members to vote for this fair rule. Furthermore, I encourage support for the underlying legislation, which I believe is well prepared and an excellent bipartisan product that will continue our joint efforts to reform and revitalize our intelligence capabilities on behalf of our country and its citizens.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 4392, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001. H.R. 506 is a modified open rule requiring that amendments be preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. However, Mr. Speaker, the preprinting requirement has been the accepted practice for a number of years because of the sensitive nature of much of the bill and the need to protect its classified documents.

The bill is not controversial, and was reported from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence by a vote of 12 to 0.

1245

Members who wish to do so can go to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence office to examine the classified schedule of authorizations for the programs and activities of the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the National Intelligence Program, which includes the CIA as well as the Foreign Intelligence and Counterintelligence Programs, within, among others, the Department of Defense, the National Security Agency,

the Departments of State, Treasury and Energy, and the FBI. Also included in the classified documents are the authorizations for the Tactical Intelligence and Related Activities and Joint Military Intelligence Program of the Department of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House considered and passed the authorization for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2001. This bill and the activities it funds is another key and critical component in our national defense. The end of the Cold War has brought us a new set of threats, among them global terrorist operations, narcoterrorism and threats to computer security, in addition to threats against our military, our State Department representatives around the world and our citizens at home.

Mr. Speaker, this is a noncontroversial bill, providing authorizations for important national security programs. I urge my colleagues to support this rule so that we may consider H.R. 4392.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEWIS of California). Pursuant to House Resolution 506 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill H.R. 4392.

1245

#### 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. 4392) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 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. THORNBERRY 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 Florida (Mr. GOSS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DIXON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 4392, the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2001. H.R. 4392 authorizes for fiscal year 2001 the budgets of the 11 agencies and 13 programs of our Nation's Intelligence Community.

Our bill authorizes the expenditure of what our country needs to keep its

eyes and ears on the rogue states, the terrorist nets, the drug cartels overseas that threaten our well-being. It puts our satellites up and over our adversaries, our agents in their meetings and our linguists on their communications.

Mr. Chairman, our committee has examined every line of the President's budget request for the Intelligence Community. We have had over 200 briefings and have held 11 hearings on the particulars of the request. Members of the committee have personally visited a number of places throughout the world to ensure that the men and women of our Intelligence Community, many of whom must work in anonymity and obscurity, have what they need to do their critical jobs.

Through this long and painstaking process, the members of our committee have had to work through some troublesome and complicated issues to come to the unanimous bipartisan recommendations that are in this bill.

Every member of our committee contributed to this effort and I must mention the gentleman from California (Mr. DIXON), my ranking member, for his outstanding work in helping us to shape this bill.

Also the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the vice chairman of the committee, who is also the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, which appropriates the intelligence funds, deserves full commendation for the outstanding work that has meant that this bill and his appropriations bill are indeed coordinated in lock-step.

Finally, let me thank the staff of the committee. Yet again they have worked together in a way that has greatly assisted the members in what would otherwise have been an impossible task in reviewing so many programs in so much depth.

I would note also that this bill represents the swan song for a senior committee staffer, Tom Newcomb, who is leaving the legislative branch where he has helped to make laws, to go to the Department of Justice where he will now have to help enforce those laws. Let us hope they were good laws. Tom has my personal thanks for his help these last 3 years on the committee and I wish him the best of luck.

I hope he is listening.

Mr. Chairman, those who have read the unclassified, public bill or the press accounts of it know that we have made many criticisms of the current state of intelligence in our Nation. This is constructive criticism. The vast majority of these criticisms derive from the weakened condition that intelligence, our first line of defense, is in after years of underinvesting and making do. The men and women of the Intelligence Community and its leaders deserve commendation for what their ingenuity and perseverance have done to hold together a vastly complicated set of programs with some proverbial chewing gum and bailing wire. As with

our military, our intelligence resources are stretched to the breaking point. Indeed, it has this last year tragically unraveled and even broken more than once.

For example, a few months ago at NSA's headquarters we went deaf for 3 days, largely due to inadequate resources for maintaining their computer systems. Fortunately, again, other elements of our community kicked in and picked up what slack they could and we did okay. But let me say clearly, had we been actively engaged at that time in hostilities in the Balkans or the Middle East or elsewhere it could have been a disaster of very high degree with American lives gravely threatened and possibly lost.

Elsewhere, the problems are just as serious. In some places our agents do not have resources to recruit and run clandestine sources to penetrate hostile threats to our Nation. We soon will not have the funds to process and actually make full use of extraordinary pictures taken by our satellites. I could go on and on.

We cannot expect our Intelligence Community to do more and more without giving them the resources to do what we ask of them. I wish I could say that this bill dramatically reverses the situation. It does not. Unfortunately, the way intelligence is funded, paid from the same budgetary pot as our military forces, the military would have to make do with even less. This is obviously a Hobbesian choice we should not have to make, sacrificing intelligence to pay for defense or vice versa. But it is the only choice we have, given the way the administration has presented the budget.

We tried to address the critical problems that we have uncovered. We cannot go all the way but we at least are going down the road in the proper direction. We do increase funding for our intelligence disciplines of human intelligence, HUMINT as it is called, and signals intelligence, SIGINT; that is, espionage and foreign communications interception. These two activities give us our most sensitive information on the plans and intentions of our adversaries.

As last year, in the area of imagery intelligence, the use of photographs, we are moving closer towards funding and planning adequately for the tasking of systems and the processing, exploitation and dissemination of the imagery derived from them. Nevertheless, our efforts do not sufficiently meet identified needs even with these efforts.

This bill also addresses some of the most urgent concerns that we have with inadequate security and counterintelligence practices within the Department of State, which we have been reading about, and other agencies as well.

Mr. Chairman, none of these issues should be a surprise to anyone. We have been telling the Intelligence Community and the administration and the

public, when we can, about them and other issues for quite some time, sounding, I think, a bit like a tree falling in an empty forest.

What we have done, Mr. Chairman, is to do the best we could with the available resources. Two years ago, we started rebuilding. Since then we have made steady but agonizingly slow progress to provide capabilities to enable us to confront the world as it is today, with its new threats and its new technologies.

I can only hope that some day we can accelerate the rebuild rate. I can also hope that future administrations will approach intelligence funding differently and with more commitment.

That day is not here, though, and knowing that lives can hang in the balance and do because intelligence can be very risky business, indeed we have tried to balance critically important competing priorities properly.

Mr. Chairman, as much as I wish I could have done more I believe that as a committee working in a bipartisan, or rather I should say nonpartisan manner, we put before the House the best intelligence authorization act possible. I am proud of this legislation and the people who worked on it. I strongly encourage my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), a member of the committee that is very valuable to us, in the interest of accommodating him.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. DIXON), for his accommodation.

Let me join my colleagues in wishing Mr. Newcomb well in his future endeavors.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. It is a bipartisan bill. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), and the gentleman from California (Mr. DIXON), have achieved an exceptional level of cooperation in the work of the committee.

The bill provides the resources to ensure that the President, the National Security Council, cabinet secretaries and our military forces get the intelligence they need to protect our national security.

This bill seeks to redress some of the important problems revealed by the campaign in Kosovo, especially in the area of airborne reconnaissance. These actions include investments beyond those in the President's budget request for the Department of Defense tactical intelligence programs. In all cases, these recommendations were coordinated with the Committee on Armed Services. Our bill in this area reflects the views of the Committee on Armed Services and vice versa.

The bill also recommends actions in a number of critical areas in the so-called national intelligence budget. One of these areas is the exploitation of imagery taken from satellites and

aircraft, an issue of great concern to the committee for several years. It is clear to all that our ability to exploit is going to fall far behind our capacity to collect, and this is unacceptable. The administration has taken a very positive first step by asking and planning for more funds in this and subsequent budgets, but the amounts remain well short of requirements.

The committee added substantial funds to enable the National Imagery and Mapping Agency to begin a major upgrade of its information management capabilities, the necessity for which was specifically emphasized in the Department of Defense Kosovo lessons learned study.

Another important problem area concerns the National Security Agency. The telecommunications and information technology industry appears as a whirlwind with NSA, at the moment, trailing in its wake. NSA's new director, General Hayden, is a committed reformer who deserves our support. He has asked the committee to help him by closing down some of the ongoing activities and shifting resources to solving the future problems.

The committee has tried to do that in a responsible manner. This bill would give NSA substantially larger resources for modernization. At the same time, the bill would require NSA to expend more time and energy to ensure that its plans are sound.

Similarly, we think it is prudent to ensure that the executive branch apply systematic oversight of NSA's complex and expensive modernization program.

I am particularly concerned about the impact of launch failures on our intelligence activities. The committee has examined current arrangements by which the Air Force and the NRO procure launch vehicles and manage launch vehicle contracts. The committee proposed that the NRO, in the future, manage its own procurements. It is my hope that this measure will improve accountability and launch reliability, while preserving the very positive partnership between the NRO and the Air Force.

Mr. Chairman, this bill would accomplish much and I certainly urge my colleagues to support it.

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

1300

Mr. Chairman, one of the most enjoyable aspects of serving on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is that most issues which come before the committee are considered and resolved in a bipartisan way. That has been the committee's history, and each of its chairmen has worked hard to keep to a minimum those issues which might divide the committee along party lines.

The gentleman from Florida (Chairman GOSS) has been particularly tenacious in this regard. I want to thank him for that, and for the sense of fairness which he brings to the commit-

tee's work, especially with respect to the drafting of this bill.

Reliable and timely intelligence is an essential component of national security. The United States is without peer in its ability to provide high quality intelligence to policymakers and military commanders. Lives of Americans and people in countries throughout the world are saved as a result.

Maintaining that capability in intelligence, though, is expensive. It relies not only on recruiting human intelligence sources, but on the development of systems which are at the forefront of complex technology. Keeping pace with change in that technological environment requires a substantial commitment of resources.

That fact is not lost on the President and his national security team. This year the administration's budget request for the national intelligence programs, which include the programs of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the National Security Agency, among others, was 6.6 percent above the appropriation last year.

That is a healthy increase by any standard. It clearly reflects a commitment by the administration to intelligence, and a willingness to make meeting important intelligence needs a national priority.

I support the total amount of money requested by the President for the national intelligence programs in part because of the persuasive justifications made by the Director of Central Intelligence, George Tenet, and other witnesses who appeared before the committee.

As a result of information provided during the committee's budget review, some of which was not available to the administration when the budget was submitted, the committee has made changes to the allocations of fund within the budget request. We have also made a very small increase, one-tenth of 1 percent, to the total amount in the President's request. In my judgment, the changes and the increase are necessary, and I support them.

Mr. Chairman, I spoke earlier of technological challenges facing our intelligence agencies. Nowhere are the challenges more daunting and the need to successfully address them more acute, than at the National Security Agency. Our ability to continue to collect and process signals intelligence needs to be better ensured. To do so will require new approaches to many aspects of the signals intelligence business.

The NSA director, General Hayden, has proposed changes, some of which have already been implemented. He has asked for support from Congress in resources and in other forms. I believe that this bill by and large provides that support. The Director has an important task, and the committee wants him to succeed. Given the consequences if General Hayden's modernization effort is not successful, and

the significant amounts of money invested in it, the committee needs, and will, keep a critical eye focused on the NSA.

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), a member of the committee, will be offering at the appropriate time an important amendment which I will support. Currently, the aggregate amount appropriated for intelligence programs and activities is classified on the grounds that to make it public would threaten national security.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) would require the declassification of the aggregate appropriated amount, not for the current fiscal year but for the preceding one.

The administration has, on two occasions within the past few years, chosen to disclose amounts appropriated for intelligence. By definition, national security was not threatened by these actions. Extending and regularizing declassification, as advocated by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), in my judgment would provide no information which would constitute a national security threat.

On the other hand, this limited look at how much is being spent on intelligence would enable U.S. taxpayers to be better informed about the uses to which tax dollars are being put.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4392 is an appropriate response to the needs of our intelligence agencies. In some cases, it begins work which we will need to sustain in the future if its promises are to be realized. I urge the adoption of the bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, for a colloquy.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I want to commend the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), and the ranking minority member (Mr. DIXON), for bringing this measure to the floor at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. Chairman, as indicated in the unclassified report accompanying H.R. 4392, the gentleman's committee is taking steps to reorganize the management, operations, and security of diplomatic telecommunications. That effort will affect the State Department, and the Committee on International Relations would like the opportunity to assess the impact of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence's recommendations.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I am asking if the chairman would agree that as this bill moves forward, the two

committees can discuss the best approach to deal with the concerns that are reflected in the report to H.R. 4392.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the chairman of the Committee on International Relations has spoken correctly about this situation. The bill does address the issue of the diplomatic communications system.

As the gentleman is well aware, there will be ample time and opportunity prior to conference on this bill to address the matters of concern to the gentleman and his committee. I appreciate the chairman's willingness to support the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence on this issue, and I am happy that he has previously expressed his support for the general direction taken by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence on this matter.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for responding to me.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the telecommunications issue is a serious one. Obviously, we need to look seriously at the implications of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence's approach for the State Department.

I want to thank the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), for his willingness to work with the Committee on International Relations on this matter. I look forward to the two committees working out a resolution on this matter on a bipartisan basis.

Since I am the only Member on both committees, I hope to be in the mix. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GOSS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I can assure the gentleman he will be in the mix.

Mr. Chairman, with the understanding that the ranking member is in agreement, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), my colleague who is the chairman of our subcommittee that makes makes a lot of good things happen on the committee.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I appreciate the graciousness of the ranking minority member.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of H.R. 4392, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001. I want to again congratulate both the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DIXON) for the product out here. It has been a bipartisan product, as it usually is. The staff have done a great job of researching and developing very complex and important legislation.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Intelligence,

Analysis, and Counterintelligence, I am satisfied that the committee has achieved its goal of providing necessary support towards rebuilding our Nation's human intelligence capability.

As noted in the committee's unclassified report, we remain quite concerned that unexpected contingency operations, extended requirements for military force protection, poor planning, and community infrastructure problems have all conspired to take desperately needed funds from our front line intelligence officers in the field.

These management and budgetary limitations have substantially undermined the committee's multi-year initiative to help rebuilding our eyes and ears throughout the world. I expect that DCI Tenet will fulfill his recent commitment to the committee that resources allocated by Congress for human intelligence activities in the field will be made available to our field officers serving in harm's way.

On a more positive note, I want to recognize some impressive achievements of the intelligence community during the past year. In the counter-narcotics realm, the U.S. intelligence and law enforcement communities have shown an ever-increasing capacity to work together effectively against growing threats posed by narcotics trafficking and money laundering.

In 1999, the intelligence community played a key role in several major takedowns of narcotics kingpins in Latin America, the Caribbean, and Asia; the destruction of a major Colombian cocaine organization in Operation Millennium meant that some 30 tons of cocaine no longer arrives in the U.S. every month.

Improved analytical research by the intelligence community now provides us with a sobering and more accurate baseline of the volume of cocaine being produced in the Andean region and of the total narcotics tonnage reaching the United States.

I remain very concerned that the delay in approving the Colombia supplemental is undermining our national security objectives in that key South American ally, particularly with respect to urgent intelligence and military support needs against the growing threats posed by Colombian narco-trafficking and terrorist groups.

In the counterterrorism realm, the intelligence community also achieved some singular successes in 1999. What did not occur in that year and at the turn of the millennium gives some indication of the effectiveness of our counterterrorism efforts.

Cooperation between intelligence and law enforcement communities resulted in several significant arrests of individuals linked to Islamic Jihad and other terrorist groups associated with Usama Bin Ladin and any number of other incidences, but it does show we need to improve our border strength with Canada, and a number of other things that still remain deficient.

I do also want to express my deep concerns about the serious security failures of the State Department. There are a lot of procedures and systems that still need to be addressed there. I am not going to take the time today to discuss all of those.

There are a lengthy series of recommendations to both the Secretary of State and the DCI in the unclassified portions of the report of this committee. I certainly hope that the DCI will take the steps that have not yet been taken to exercise his authority in regard to enforcing these procedures, and to make sure that all security regulations concerning information security, personnel security, and counterintelligence measures are fully taken by the State Department.

I last want to comment on the pending receipt of the DCI's report, including the results of his review and recommendations, as well as the receipt of certification of States' full compliance with the security regulations.

The committee has recommended the fencing of a sizeable portion of those funds authorized to be appropriated through this bill for State's Intelligence Research Bureau. I wholeheartedly support the committee's action, and look forward to working with DCI Tenet and Secretary Albright to overhaul and rebuild those structures.

I, too, because he has worked so much with this subcommittee that I chair, want to commend Mr. Tom Newcomb, who is now leaving, as the chairman had indicated, to go to the executive branch of government. He has been a valuable aid in this endeavor of the committee, and we will all miss him.

What is more, I want to join the chairman and the gentleman from California (Mr. DIXON) for this bill that they have produced, and urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4392.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SISISKY), a member of the Committee.

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4392, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001.

First, let me take this opportunity to congratulate the chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) for his efforts in producing a bipartisan bill that addresses the intelligence needs of policymakers and our military.

Additionally, praise must be also extended to the ranking minority member, the gentleman from California (Mr. DIXON), for his work in helping to craft this important piece of legislation, and for his leadership in the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

The bill is very consistent with the request submitted by the President. The committee recommends additional funding in several areas resulting in modest increases over the President's request. Improvements to our intelligence, surveillance, and reconnais-

sance airborne platforms account for the largest portion of the increased funding.

These increases are crucial for overall military operational readiness. The bill funds additional training aircraft, eliminating the need to use some of our operational aircraft for training, effectively increasing the number of platforms available for operations. We cannot decrease the number of training aircraft because we also have a shortage of pilots.

The committee's Support to Military Operations hearing highlighted the need for more airborne platforms. During Operation Allied Force, the European Command found it necessary not only to dedicate all of its own airborne platforms to the campaign, leaving forces in Bosnia and Saudi Arabia vulnerable, but platforms also had to be borrowed from other theaters, with similar consequences to other missions. These aircraft were critical, providing threat warnings for our pilots, enabling the identification of targets, and finding downed pilots.

Even with these additional reconnaissance platforms, the European theater could not satisfy all of its intelligence, reconnaissance, and surveillance requirements. It is unacceptable to have significantly decreased readiness in theaters where our troops are deployed, and I, for one, am not willing to risk the lives of our deployed forces.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is a responsible and prudent measure. I am pleased to support it, and urge my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the Vice-Chair of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

(Mr. LEWIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express very strong support for this very fine product as produced by the committee.

Further, I, too, want to express my deep appreciation, as well as my compliments, to both the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DIXON) for creating an atmosphere within our committee on the floor that is totally non-partisan, a very important element to have the kind of support we need for this product that is so important to the future of our country.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4392.

Mr. Chairman, I have a unique responsibility when it comes to the Intelligence Community and the intelligence functions of the United States. I have the pleasure of serving as an authorizer on the Intelligence Committee as its Vice Chairman under Chairman GOSS. And, as Chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee I have the responsibility for the appropriations for our intelligence systems, people and missions. In these two capacities, I am privileged to have an excellent vantage

point from which to understand the U.S. Intelligence Community. Mr. Chairman, I have looked at this year's intelligence budget request from many angles, and I can tell you the bill before us today is a good one. Chairman GOSS, and the Ranking Member, Mr. DIXON have done a thorough and responsible job of looking at the capabilities of the intelligence community, its needs, and moreover, its problems that must be addressed and corrected.

This bill makes major recommendations for improving the ability of the individual Intelligence Community agencies to communicate and collaborate virtually anywhere in the world. This bill will also improve, and better secure the information technology infrastructures at the National Security Agency. Further, it makes a clear down-payment on improving the real-time tactical reconnaissance assets for the military services. Mr. Chairman, what this bill does is focus the limited funds that we are able to muster on the critical needs of the nation's intelligence functions.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, I would like to note the close working relationship between the Intelligence Committee and the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. In my many years as a Member of Congress, I have rarely seen, let alone been able to be part of, such a great working relationship between committees. This working relationship allows both committees to focus on the real problems and priority issues within the Intelligence Community.

That, Mr. Chairman, is what this bill does, and I recommend all my colleagues to vote for H.R. 4392.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), a member of the committee.

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

1315

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend from California, our ranking member (Mr. DIXON), for yielding me the time.

I guess I would start by extending my compliments and best wishes to Tom Newcomb as well, too. I wish him the best in his new endeavors, and also would be remiss if I did not compliment the entire staff on the Democratic and Republican side, which I think is extraordinary and gives just great help to us as Members with very complicated issues and a very, very important budget.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong bipartisan support of the fiscal year 2001 Intelligence Authorization Act. I believe this bill sets about the right level of overall funding for intelligence activities next year. The President requested 6.6 percent more in funding for national programs over last year's appropriated level.

Some have complained that the administration fails to request sufficient funding for intelligence activities. The testimony I heard during our budget hearings did not convince me that we needed to go beyond the relatively robust top-line increase in this request. Nevertheless, there was room for concern about some aspects of this request and the allocation of those resources.

I have been extremely critical of one highly-classified program of great cost and exceedingly doubtful impact. I have also been extremely concerned that the heightened pace of U.S. government counterterrorism efforts arising out of the threat identified over the new millennium could not be sustained to the end of the fiscal year and into fiscal year 2001.

Finally, through oversight and legislative hearings, the compiled evidence significantly increased my concern about the state of language capabilities of intelligence community personnel. I have found that not only are there too few people speaking the language in the country, but too often the ones who do are not sufficiently proficient.

I addressed these three concerns with an amendment to transfer some of the funding from the highly questionable classified program to areas of greater need involving terrorism and language proficiency. This was a bipartisan effort, and I thank our chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), and our ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. DIXON) for their strong assistance and help in crafting that legislation.

Mr. Chairman, later in the debate, probably next week, I will offer an amendment to require a yearly unclassified statement of the aggregate amount appropriated for the previous fiscal year.

It is my understanding that one of the reasons offered for why the intelligence budget should remain classified is that its disclosure may provide foreign governments with the United States Government's own assessment of its intelligence capabilities and weaknesses. This to me is not persuasive.

The fact of the matter is that in our great democratic country, there is considerable unclassified information openly published containing official assessments of intelligence capabilities and shortcomings.

The intelligence community has, in fact, published the 1997 and 1998 aggregate level of spending. There are legitimate concerns about protecting, through counterintelligence measures and enhanced security, our sensitive and classified information. An accurate report of the aggregate number appropriated for intelligence each year would cause no harm to national security and would clearly be a welcome addition to the public's understanding of the roles and missions of the intelligence community.

In addition, it could also provide some measure of accountability for the agencies themselves. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment next week.

We will have, I think, a healthy and vigorous and robust discussion about that amendment, and I want to reiterate that some have, in fact, recommended going further than my amendment on several occasions.

I would remind the body that the Aspin-Brown commission which took a

very serious look at whether or not to disclose an aggregate level of funding for the intelligence community, actually went much further in their recommendation than what I will propose in my amendment; the Aspin-Brown commission recommended that we publish the current year and the request.

I am simply recommending through the amendment that we publish the previous year's aggregate funding, and that we do so to make sure that we strive hard to protect our Nation's secrets, although suspected aggregate funding levels have been published many times in many publications.

Secondly, we must make sure that we have accountability from the agencies themselves. We conduct most of our hearings in a classified room, in top secret conditions, this is one small way of disclosure, of good government, of public accountability, especially in light of a 6.6 percent increase. Third, I think the general public deserves to know.

They know item by item in our defense budget that we just passed last night, what we spend on helicopters, personnel, submarines, Humvees, ships, everything we can imagine is boldly enumerated in our defense bill. We are not saying we want to do that in the intelligence bill. Although, we have item-by-item disclosure on joint intelligence and defense matters in our intelligence report, all I am simply saying is one aggregate disclosure level of what all the agencies were appropriated for the previous year.

I look forward to the debate, and I certainly respect the other side of this argument.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise also in very strong support of H.R. 4392, which is the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001. The gentleman from Florida (Chairman GOSS) and the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. DIXON) are to be commended for the outstanding leadership they have provided for the intelligence community during these difficult times.

In a strong decisive and bipartisan sense, they have, I think, been wonderful leaders and supported by a staff which exhibits the exact same characteristics, and those who also serve on it also appreciate it. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence, I understand the critical need to invest in and modernize our technical intelligence and intelligence-related systems. Unfortunately, investment in our infrastructure has declined over the years, and we have reached the point where the strains are showing through.

Over the past year, news headlines have told us the story over and over again, reminding us of the grave consequences of reduced funding to our in-

telligence capabilities. Here are a few that made it into the press: Outdated databases at the Defense Intelligence Agency led to the accidental bombing of the Chinese Embassy; major computer systems failures at the National Security Agency; and outdated systems at the National Imagery and Mapping Agency reduced the levels of support to key consumers of intelligence.

These events are stark indications of the condition of the community's basic infrastructure and testimony to the need for revitalization.

This year's Authorization Act begins to address these substantial problems, but we understand providing the country with the capabilities it deserves and needs will take years and will require continued and unwavering support from Congress.

Simply fixing today's headline problems of outdated and broken systems does not position our Nation well to manage the diverse challenges of the future.

Our President must have sufficient capabilities and tools to support his policies to enable strong leadership and proactive diplomacy and to assure our military maintains a significant advantage over its adversaries, if, and when, needed.

In order to continue to provide this country the intelligence required, the intelligence community must modernize its infrastructure, and this year's Authorization Act appropriately supports several community initiatives to address this very important issue.

I am also pleased that we have incorporated a provision into this year's act to address an ongoing concern within the National Reconnaissance Office and their launch program. This was the outcome of a number of hearings and briefings in my subcommittee. Specifically, the NRO has a long history of overestimating the costs of launches.

Our committee has been challenged to bring about appropriate discipline in this process in the past because of the confusing morass of contracts and relationships used by the NRO. A recently completed NRO Inspectors General report confirmed and intensified our concerns.

This provision will improve our ability to hold the NRO accountable for their activities and lead to significant savings for the government and American people.

Mr. Chairman, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 is a responsible, reasonable and appropriate request to fund our Nation's national security needs. Our President, our policymakers, our military and the People of the United States deserve nothing less, and I ask the Members of the House to give it their full support.

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

Mr. Chairman, when this bill comes back from conference, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) and I will have ample opportunity to thank not only the Members of the committee, but the

staff for their outstanding work. Today, I would like to join the chairman of the committee and other Members who say that they will miss Tom Newcomb. The Department of Justice is certainly getting another good asset there, and we wish him well in his new endeavors there.

I would like to take just a minute, Mr. Chairman, to single out someone who I have not given enough credit to, and that is the staff assistant Ilene Romack. She keeps the minority going and on schedule. It is not the most exciting job in the intelligence community, but it is a very important job. And I just want her to know, although, she does not come to the floor, that I appreciate her hard work and the efforts on behalf of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks with the distinguished ranking member about Ilene Romack. In fact, I would like to associate myself with all remarks about our staff today. I do that at some peril. We may have heard too many good things about staff today, but they do deserve it.

I also want to thank those who spoke for the kind words about myself and the gentleman from California (Mr. DIXON). It is very nice to have a committee that is working as smoothly as it does, and I will tell my colleagues, it has a lot to do with the membership of those committees. And we have wonderful Members on our committee.

Speaking from my side of the aisle, I know that everybody brings a contribution, we have heard some of them speak, various talents, various bridges to other committees, and I think that is the essence of why this is a permanent select committee that does so well. I congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. DIXON) for his Members as well for the same reason, that we bridge to the committees we need to. We do not always agree on everything.

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) has brought up one of the areas where we have a slight disagreement. We will have a little debate on that, but we do it in the best of deliberative debate forum trying to make the points, and then Members taking the positions they think are the appropriate ones.

Mr. Chairman, this is, I think, the right kind of assurance to provide to the United States of America and its people that there is good oversight of our intelligence communities. It works, and it is effective. The result is, I think we can stand here and assure the American people that our intelligence community are operating effectively and within the rules, but there is so much more to do in the world we face today with the type of challenges, which are very difficult, and the type of technology which is obviously very

different. And this authorization tries to move us in that direction.

I am not suggesting we are going to get all things done that need to be done for the community in terms of this authorization, but we are certainly doing, I think, a human part of the job. For all involved, I want to say thank you. We will do the amendments, I understand, next week.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 4392, the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2001.

But, Mr. Chairman, before I speak to the issue of the bill before us, I would like to take a moment to recognize the great bipartisan leadership that Chairman GOSS and the ranking member, Mr. DIXON, have brought to the Intelligence Committee and, moreover, to the creation of this bill. I have had the privilege of serving on the Intelligence Committee for the past 3 years, and I can attest to the commitment these two leaders make to the committee, our intelligence community, and the security of our country. Chairman GOSS, thank you for your leadership. And, thank you, Mr. DIXON, for your service to our intelligence community.

Mr. Chairman, as one of only 16 members of the Intelligence Committee, I fully recognize the trust placed on us by all Members of the House to ensure that the highly classified work we do is in the proper interests of the United States of America. I take the responsibilities of that trust very seriously. That said, I can tell you that the Intelligence authorization bill before us today is one that I strongly support, and one that I urge all Members to support.

Is it a perfect bill? No, it's not perfect. Truth is, I would rather that the bill were proposing a larger increase in spending for the national intelligence functions. It is not hyperbole to tell this body that the world is a much more volatile and unpredictable place than it was during the cold war. Crises around the world pop up literally overnight and are stretching our limited intelligence assets to the breaking point. These crises require a great deal of intelligence effort. Just because a hot spot doesn't threaten the very existence of the United States, doesn't mean that we can provide any less intelligence support if even one U.S. life is at stake.

A single nuclear, chemical or biological weapon can still do tremendous damage, as can one large truck bomb. Usama Bin Laden and his cohorts continue to terrorize parts of the world. These asymmetric threats to our national security are real and we must have the intelligence means to know as much about them as we can. To properly respond to these threats we need more human sources around the world, we need more and better technologies to help our intelligence analysts interpret the vast amounts of data they must work through, and we need better collaboration among the various intelligence disciplines. All this takes money.

Unfortunately, the budget requests we have been provided have not adequately addressed the proper funding necessary to ensure we have a strong "first line of defense"—our intelligence community. And, the small increase that we've made to the national intelligence effort does not do all we need to do. In that respect, Mr. Chairman, this is not a perfect bill.

However, is this a good bill? Yes, Mr. Chairman it is. We have made specific and, in

some respects, dramatic recommendations to improve intelligence system modernization, collaboration, and communication. On the tactical intelligence side, we focused a great deal of attention on the testimonies of the theater commanders in chief and have provided significant funding for critically needed tactical intelligence systems.

They told us often and loud that they required more intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance assets. To that end we have made recommendations for providing the military with badly needed reconnaissance aircraft and training systems. We have made recommendations for funding spare equipment and for providing commercial satellite imagery support. We have also recommended funding for improved imagery and signals intelligence systems.

In short Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill that addresses the most critical intelligence needs of our military and our national leadership. And, it does it with a modest increase to the overall request.

I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 4392.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 4392, the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2001. The intelligence agencies has been struggling to meet the many demands for information arising from chaos that reigns in much of the world, the conflicts that flare up in far flung corners, the unprecedented level of diverse U.S. military deployments, and a foreign policy that is often unclear. For the national agencies, this bill provides only a small amount above the President's request, to help our intelligence agencies meet these challenges.

One of the prime beneficiaries in the bill is the CIA. The CIA, contrary to popular belief, claims only a small percentage of the overall intelligence budget. I have become particularly interested in the challenges faced by Human Intelligence, or "HUMINT," as we on the Intelligence Committee call it. Although human beings—spies, if you prefer—are expensive, studies have shown that the money devoted to them is well spent, and that their productivity holds up well against that of the expensive technical systems receiving the lion's share of the intelligence budget. It may be old-fashioned, but it works. We may constantly be pushing for sophisticated and expensive new technology, but there is no substitute for the eyes and ears of human beings on the ground.

I have made a point to speak and more importantly to listen, to our operatives abroad. Like others on the committee, I have heard the consistent theme that there are very limited operational funds. If you want to recruit people to your cause, you need to get out there and meet them, earn their trust and then entice them into the fold.

Unfortunately, as our committee report states "contingency operations" have taken money from CIA espionage "limiting our efforts to rebuild our eyes and ears around the world."

Last year, the committee made sizable increases to operational funds, only to find that these were taxed within CIA to support other underfunded but, from our perspective, low priority, activities. When we checked this spring, the committee found a lot more "tail" but little more "tooth." We let it be known that we were most displeased. This year, we are



trying again. To say the least, we will be watching the ledgers with an eagle eye. And committee members will be double checking out in the field as well.

Out there in the trenches, they also need a lot more language training. Indeed, this is a chronic deficiency throughout most of the Intelligence Community. This year, I was most pleased to work with my colleague across the aisle, Representative ROEMER, to increase funds for language training. Our people in the field need to be able to communicate and interpret accurately. This also is an area I intend to pursue in the future.

The Intelligence Committee provides very vigorous oversight and has a good track record for finding deficiencies, excesses and problems. We will continue to do our job, and we ask your support for our bill.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, as a member of both the Budget and Intelligence committees, I have been especially sensitive to what we call top line issues—how much money is available overall, and whether it is generally adequate.

Pressures to keep down the allocations for defense have also had an adverse "trickle down" effect on intelligence, since intelligence is funded within the defense top line. For the last decade, intelligence lost a large part of its buying power, after absorbing reductions both indirectly from inflation and directly from budget resolutions.

In this regard, we recently suffered several particularly bad years. The administration's request this year increased somewhat, providing partial relief from the decline. Striving to remain within established financial boundaries, the committee gave the national intelligence agencies only slightly more than the request. The service portion of the budget, where we share jurisdiction with Armed Services, enjoyed greater increases. This willingness to sacrifice a share of the hard-pressed military budget acknowledges the heavy service dependence on tactical intelligence, and the need to improve it.

The situation among the national agencies is also problematic. Most of them have been squeezed for a decade and are showing the effects. Personnel numbers have been reduced significantly, but even if reductions continue, it is a struggle to keep personnel costs at the same budget percentage, because the costs per individual are climbing steeply. Personnel are used mainly to process and report the large amounts of collected information; but there are many fewer available to do this, even as much more data pours in from sensors that must become increasingly sophisticated in order to keep up with the targets. As a result, this "downstream" part of the business, and our overall efficiency, are suffering greatly.

Among the major intelligence agencies, the National Security Agency is particularly hard pressed, since targets and their communications, radar and telemetry technology have been changing at a dramatic pace. NSA requires nearly complete re-tooling to catch up and keep up, but this costs a lot of money. NSA's budget has been in steady decline.

On the imagery side, the struggle to pay for exploitation and dissemination of the large volume of imagery required especially by military customers is pretty well known. This is another "downstream" problem exacerbated by declining numbers of human photo-interpreters.

Five years ago, the House Intelligence Committee warned the administration that we must find a way to make our satellite collectors much less expensive, or the NRO would take a growing portion of the declining intelligence budget, and we be unable to use effectively what they collect. We lost that budget battle. However, it is now clear that our predictions were accurate. And the situation is getting even worse because of cost overruns in NRO programs.

We realize that everyone wants a "peace dividend" that shifts money from national security programs to domestic priorities. We want one ourselves. However, the breakup of empires historically is accompanied by regional confusion and conflict such as we witness today. Continued U.S. involvement in regional stabilization efforts comes at a price, often a high price. In addition, the breadth and unacceptability of terrorism, narcotics trafficking, proliferation and other cross-border challenges present unique challenges at this particular time.

We are striving to make the Intelligence Community more efficient. We have done this within agencies and are suggesting a few precedent-shattering initiatives that cross agency boundaries, in both the communications and analyst areas. But there is only so much we can do, especially within the patchwork of compromises that makes up the congressional process. In several important areas, we are in trouble.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

1330

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Dickey) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4392) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill (H.R. 4392) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 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.

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

There was no objection.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 396

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of House Resolution 396?

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

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 22, 2000

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

#### WHO IS TO BLAME

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the White House announced that it would work to compensate the victims of the Los Alamos wildfire. Well, Mr. Speaker, how generous of the administration to compensate the victims of a wildfire which its own agency, the National Park Service, is responsible for starting.

Of course, neither the administration or the Park Service accepts responsibility for the environmental disaster that has left hundreds of people stranded, over 400 homes destroyed, and has burned almost 50,000 acres. Instead, they have pledged compensation, which will ultimately cost the American taxpayers millions of dollars.

Meanwhile, the local superintendent who has acknowledged responsibility for igniting the blaze, in spite of adverse weather warnings, was given a paid vacation. They might as well have said congratulations. Mr. Speaker, the National Park Service and its personnel need to be held responsible for their actions, especially when those actions result in such extensive environmental devastation.