

I pause to thank those who are serving in the military and those who have served in the past.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2883, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2883) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2002 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 a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, since September 11, all Americans have witnessed our intelligence community at its best.

We have witnessed their loss, our first combat loss of an American hero in our war against terrorism, CIA agent Johnny "Mike" Spann. We must provide the resources needed to combat terrorism at the most basic level, intelligence.

This is a good bill. It provides significant resources to the intelligence community, which during the 1990s was underfinanced, understaffed, and underappreciated.

The 1990s was a "risk averse" period, during which the bullies of the world began to get the idea that the United States had gone soft, and no longer had a will to defend American lives and American interests.

The intelligence community often was not performing aggressively enough, though this was by no means the fault of the dedicated men and women who constitute the intelligence agencies' rank-and-file.

They are now doing a stupendous job of catchup, and they deserve the best support we can give them.

Regarding today's needs, we are providing logistical and technical resources for a worldwide campaign to root out terrorism.

Our intelligence officers are working on the ground in Afghanistan, as the American public is now aware—sadly aware with the news of our fallen CIA hero.

What the American public will probably never know is that American intelligence officers are working around the clock, worldwide, to neutralize terrorist cells and otherwise diminish the possibility of future attacks on innocent American citizens.

As for future needs, this bill provides resources for greater foreign language expertise, increased specialized training, increased analytical expertise to include measures to restore the intelligence community's ability to provide worldwide analytical coverage.

This administration and this Congress are acutely aware of the need for a strong intelligence capability. We on the Intelligence Committee have done our utmost to give the intelligence agencies what they need to do their job.

I urge your support on this motion.

□ 1030

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

The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the following conferees:

From the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. GOSS, REUTER, CASTLE, BOEHLERT, GIBBONS, LAHOOD, CUNNINGHAM, HOEKSTRA, BURR of North Carolina, and CHAMBLISS; Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. HARMAN, and Messrs. CONDIT, ROEMER, HASTINGS of Florida, REYES, BOSWELL, and PETERSON of Minnesota.

From the Committee on Armed Services, for consideration of defense tactical intelligence and related activities: Messrs. STUMP, HUNTER and SKELTON.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 76, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 76) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2002, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would first yield to the gentleman from Florida for an explanation of his request, after which I have a series of questions I would like to put to him about it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. This continuing resolution extends the current CR until December 15. The terms and conditions of the previous CR will remain in effect. All ongoing activities will be continued at current rates under the same terms and conditions as fiscal year 2001, with the exception of the agencies covered by fiscal year 2002 appropriations bills that have been enacted into law.

Mr. Speaker, this CR is non-controversial, and I urge the House to move the legislation to the Senate so that the government can continue to operate smoothly and efficiently and so that we can continue our work to finish those few regular appropriations bills that are still remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, continuing under my reservation, I would like to ask the gentleman several questions.

It is my understanding that the defense appropriations bill, and I do this because I think there are a lot of unrealistic expectations which are being directed at this committee by people who I do not think have sufficient appreciation for the detailed work that is required in order to produce legislation on, for instance, something as complicated as the defense bill.

My understanding is that that bill is 197 pages long and is expected, by the time the Senate is finished deliberating on it, to contain literally thousands of differences between the House and the Senate; is that not correct?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me ask another question under my reservation. Assuming that the Senate could pass the Department of Defense bill immediately, how long, in the gentleman's experience, does it usually take for the staff to put together the conference notes so that members of the conference understand what the differences are, and how long does it take usually after the conclusion of the conference for the staff to put together the required papers so that we know that what we vote on is what we actually agreed to in the conference?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. Surely.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the answer is, of course it depends on the bill and the situation with that bill. In the case of the defense bill that we are dealing with now, the basic bill, the \$317 billion defense bill, probably will not be that difficult to conference. Where there will be difficulty will be in the \$20 billion supplemental that we have dealt with here in the House and that the other body is now dealing with and is possibly changing considerably. So it could take 4 or 5 working days, or longer, just to get that bill ready to go to conference.

Once the agreements are actually reached in conference, it could take as many as 10 days in order to complete consideration of this bill. It is a major bill. Of our discretionary accounts, it is half of our discretionary spending. In most years we do not have a lot of differences going into conference on that bill, but this year, because of the \$20 billion supplemental that is a result of the September 11 attacks, there are substantial differences between the House-passed bill and what the Senate is probably going to consider today or tomorrow.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, continuing under my reservation, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I think that they are most accurate and, to me, what it demonstrates is that, under the most optimistic assumptions, if the Senate could proceed virtually immediately to conclude its action on that bill, we are talking about at least a

week after that point before we could possibly have this bill close to coming back to the House and probably a significant number of additional days.

I would add to that that, obviously, the Senate is not going to be in a position, based on what has been happening over there, to conclude this bill today.

So I have asked these questions, Mr. Speaker, in order to indicate my judgment that the date of December 15 for the expiration of this continuing resolution is incredibly optimistic. I do not think it, in fact, recognizes reality, and that it seems to me that if we are trying to extend this CR to the point where we think that the Congress will actually finish its work for this year that the date would have to be significantly later, I regret to say.

I would also say, continuing under my reservation, that with respect to the homeland security issue which the gentleman has mentioned, as I think has been obvious around this town for years, Congress often loses the off button at the end of the session. I do not know who has it, but, obviously, it is a whole lot easier to hit the start-up button for a congressional session than it is to find the off button at the end of the year, and whoever has that off button, I wish they would come forward, or we are going to be sitting here Christmas Eve still not having our work done.

I would also say that I think one of the keys to finding that off button is a willingness to compromise. I wish I thought I could see that on the part of the White House, especially on the part of OMB, with respect to the homeland security package. What is at stake in that package is, very simply, the security of every American citizen on the home front. With something that is that important, in order for Congress to finish its business on that item, for instance, we need a spirit of cooperation on both sides.

I must say I do not find that kind of spirit of cooperation coming from the White House on this item when we are called down to the White House for a meeting and, before we can get a word out of our mouths to explain what it is that our concerns are about home-based security, we are told immediately, "Fellows, no matter what you are about to say, we are going to veto anything that you are thinking before we have even heard what it is you are thinking of." I do not think that is a way to promote compromise, and I do not think that creates the right atmosphere for resolving differences.

So I would simply say that I believe that, while I am not going to object to this, Mr. Speaker, I think December 15 is unreasonably optimistic, unless we have a major attitude adjustment on the part of OMB, and I have not detected a spectacular capacity of that agency to provide that.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 76

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 107-44 is further amended by striking the date specified in section 107(c) and inserting in lieu thereof "December 15, 2001".

The joint resolution 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on three motions to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed yesterday.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Con. Res. 242, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3348, by the yeas and nays;

H. Con. Res. 102, by the yeas and nays.

H. Res. 298 will be postponed until later today.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

RECOGNIZING RADIO FREE EUROPE/RADIO LIBERTY'S SUCCESS IN PROMOTING DEMOCRACY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 242.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 242, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 404, nays 1, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 469]

YEAS—404

Abercrombie	Bereuter	Brown (OH)	Clayton	Hobson	Moran (VA)
Ackerman	Berkley	Brown (SC)	Clement	Hoefel	Morella
Aderholt	Berry	Bryant	Clyburn	Hoekstra	Murtha
Akin	Biggert	Burr	Coble	Holden	Myrick
Allen	Bilirakis	Burton	Collins	Holt	Nadler
Armey	Bishop	Buyer	Combest	Honda	Napolitano
Baca	Blagojevich	Callahan	Condit	Hooley	Neal
Bachus	Blumenauer	Calvert	Conyers	Horn	Nethercutt
Baird	Blunt	Camp	Cooksey	Houghton	Northup
Baker	Boehlert	Cannon	Costello	Hoyer	Norwood
Baldacci	Boehner	Cantor	Cox	Hulshof	Nussle
Baldwin	Bonilla	Capito	Coyne	Hunter	Oberstar
Ballenger	Bonior	Capps	Cramer	Hyde	Obey
Barcia	Bono	Capuano	Crane	Insllee	Olver
Barr	Borski	Cardin	Crenshaw	Isakson	Ortiz
Barrett	Boswell	Carson (IN)	Crowley	Israel	Osborne
Bartlett	Boucher	Carson (OK)	Culberson	Issa	Ose
Barton	Boyd	Castle	Cunningham	Istoak	Otter
Bass	Brady (PA)	Chabot	Davis (CA)	Jackson (IL)	Owens
Becerra	Brady (TX)	Chambliss	Davis (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Oxley
Bentsen	Brown (FL)	Clay	Davis (IL)	Jefferson	Pallone
			Davis, Jo Ann	Jenkins	Pascrall
			Davis, Tom	John	Pastor
			Deal	DeGette	Payne
			DeLauro	Johnson (IL)	Pence
			DeLay	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson (MN)
			DeMint	Jones (NC)	Peterson (PA)
			Deutsch	Jones (OH)	Petri
			Diaz-Balart	Kanjorski	Phelps
			Dicks	Kaptur	Pickering
			Dingell	Keller	Pitts
			Doggett	Kennedy (MN)	Platts
			Dooley	Kennedy (RI)	Pombo
			Doolittle	Kerns	Pomeroy
			Duncan	Kildee	Portman
			Dunn	Doyle	Price (NC)
			Edwards	Kilpatrick	Pryce (OH)
			Ehlers	Kind (WI)	Putnam
			Ehrlich	King (NY)	Radanovich
			Emerson	Kirk	Rahall
			Engel	Kleczka	Ramstad
			English	Knollenberg	Rangel
			Eshoo	Kolbe	Regula
			Etheridge	LaFalce	Rehberg
			Evans	LaHood	Reynolds
			Everett	Lampson	Riley
			Farr	Langevin	Rivers
			Fattah	Lantos	Rodriguez
			Ferguson	Largent	Roemer
			Filner	Larsen (WA)	Rogers (KY)
			Flake	Larsen (CT)	Rogers (MI)
			Fletcher	Latham	Rohrabacher
			Foley	Leach	Ros-Lehtinen
			Forbes	Lee	Ross
			Ford	Levin	Rothman
			Fossella	Lewis (CA)	Royal-Allard
			Frank	Lewis (GA)	Royce
			Frelighuysen	Lewis (KY)	Rush
			Frost	Linder	Ryan (WI)
			Gallegly	Lipinski	Ryun (KS)
			Ganske	LoBiondo	Sabo
			Gekas	Lofgren	Sanders
			Gephhardt	Lowey	Sandlin
			Gibbons	Lucas (KY)	Sawyer
			Gilchrest	Lucas (OK)	Saxton
			Gillmor	Luther	Schaffer
			Gilman	Lynch	Schakowsky
			Gonzalez	Maloney (CT)	Schiff
			Goodale	Maloney (NY)	Schrock
			Goodlatte	Manzullo	Scott
			Gordon	Markey	Sensenbrenner
			Goss	Mascara	Serrano
			Graham	Matheson	Sessions
			Granger	Matsui	Shadegg
			Graves	McCarthy (MO)	Shaw
			Grebble	McCarthy (NY)	Shays
			Hansen	McCullom	Sherman
			Harman	McCrery	Sherwood
			Hart	McDermott	Shimkus
			Hastings (FL)	McGovern	Shows
			Hastings (WA)	McHugh	Shuster
			Hastings (WA)	McInnis	Simmons
			Hastings (WA)	McIntyre	Simpson
			Hastings (WA)	McKeon	Skeen
			Hastings (WA)	McKinney	Skelton
			Hastings (WA)	McNulty	Slaughter
			Hastings (WA)	Meeks (NY)	Smith (MI)
			Hastings (WA)	Menendez	Smith (NJ)
			Hastings (WA)	Mica	Smith (TX)
			Hastings (WA)	Millender-	Smith (WA)
			Hastings (WA)	McDonald	Snyder
			Hastings (WA)	Miller, Dan	Solis
			Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary	Spratt
			Hastings (WA)	Miller, George	Stark
			Hastings (WA)	Miller, Jeff	Stearns
			Hastings (WA)	Mink	Stenholm
			Hastings (WA)	Mollohan	Strickland
			Hastings (WA)	Moore	Stump
			Hastings (WA)	Moran (KS)	Stupak