

in South Florida. The challenge of protecting against potential threats to security in Florida is unique due to the state's extensive coastline, vigorous international trade, and passenger cruise activities. Our geography dictates that we must be prepared as a front-line homeland defense point against terrorism, as well as illegal immigration and drug trafficking.

Florida seaports represent some of the busiest bulk cargo and container ports in the nation, and improved security at our seaports is critical for protection of the state's citizens and millions of visitors, as well as the state's continued economic vitality.

The treat of terrorism and other crimes to Florida seaports is well documented. A 1999 state-commissioned study found that the Florida port are highly vulnerable and recommended comprehensive security plans at each Florida seaport. In 2002, the State of Florida enacted legislation mandating that such action be undertaken.

As the Chairman of the Florida Congressional Delegation, I am pleased that this bill does not penalize the Florida ports that have been pro-active in taking the necessary steps to improve security. A shining example of such a port is Port Everglades in my district. Even before September 11, Port Everglades has laid out a comprehensive security improvement plan. Since that day, the port has expedited its efforts, turning a 48 month plan to improve security into an impressive, 18 month, \$37 million plan that is now near completion. I commend the Broward County Board of County Commissioners for their foresight. The fine work they've done should serve as a model for ports around the nation.

As one of the first Members of Congress to introduce comprehensive seaport security legislation, along with my friend and colleague Senator BOB GRAHAM, I am gratified that we are finally completing our work on this most important issue. It is overdue.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the U.S. Coast Guard's Armed Drug Interdiction (HITRON) Mission. The HITRON Mission is a unique and important weapon in the arsenal against illegal drugs and counterterrorism. The MH-68A armed helicopter, which was designed, assembled and maintained in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, is an integral part of the HITRON mission. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. COBLE, for his leadership on this matter. The gentleman from North Carolina and I have been deeply concerned that the short-term lease for the MH-68A expires in January of 2003, potentially jeopardizing the HITRON mission if the lease is not extended in a timely fashion. The Integrated Coast Guard Systems Group (ICGS—led by Lockheed Martin-Northrup Grumman) has recommended the Coast Guard fashion a permanent Deep Water Airborne use of force (AUF) program and test a heavier multipurpose helicopter for the drug and terrorist intervention mission. While this is certainly a reasonable approach, there must be no interruption in the program before a permanent fleet is fully deployed. I am pleased that the Coast Guard has agreed that there must be no interruption and is executing the lease extension. I join in congratulating the Coast Guard on a successful program.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LOBIONDO. 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 conference report on S. 1214.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2310

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WHITFIELD) at 11 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4628, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time to consider the conference report to accompany H.R. 4628; that all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration be waived; and that the conference report be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous consent request, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 4628) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2003 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 Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the conference report is considered as read.

(For conference report and statement, see prior proceedings of the House of today.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) each will control 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present the conference report for the fiscal year 2003 intelligence authorization bill. I believe that hard work and careful deliberation have produced a comprehensive bill that funds the critically important work of our intelligence community.

Mr. Speaker, the events over the past year remind us just how critical the intelligence community work is. As has been the longstanding custom of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, this conference report is a bipartisan product which reflects admirably on our committee's members and its highly professional staff. I want to thank all involved. Because of the late hour of the evening, I am not going to enumerate all of the staffers and members, but I think all of them will take satisfaction in knowing that we have had a good year.

At this point, I would like to mention one other important issue. With the conclusion of this conference, the committee will lose the talents of several valued members: the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), who led our Subcommittee on Terrorism and Homeland Security, and put out actually the first report on the counterterrorism situation; the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), who led our Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence and has dealt with some of the more challenging problems that confront the Committee on Intelligence; the gentleman from California (Mr. CONDIT) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) on the minority side, who have been heavily involved in some of the issues we will be talking about later; and in particular, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our esteemed ranking member.

She will graduate, I am told, to ex officio status. It will be a fine graduation. We know she is nearby when we need her. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has made a significant contribution to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence work during her 10 years of service on the committee. Most notable, however, has been her determination to work collectively to rebuild and reenergize our Nation's intelligence capabilities after the September 11 attacks. She has been willing to work energetically and efficiently in a fashion that puts national security first before politics or partisanship. I say to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), or Madam Leader, soon to be, we thank her very much for her efforts.

This conference report authorizes funds for fiscal year 2003 intelligence-related activities, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System.

I want to take a very short moment to highlight several provisions of the

report for the consideration of the Members. First, the bill includes several provisions designed to strengthen our Nation's fight against international terrorism, including a cross-agency foreign terrorist asset-tracking center to identify and disrupt terrorist financial support networks. I am pleased to report we have had some success at disruption, and I look forward to more.

It also establishes an ongoing notification procedure to assure timely congressional oversight of national security-related financial enforcement actions by the executive branch, something that we have had a lot of discussion about.

Other initiatives of note are several provisions intended to enhance the language-training capacity within intelligence and defense agencies to combat our language shortfalls; again, something that has been a pet project of our committee for a number of years. The bill will enhance the training capacity by establishing a flagship language initiative within the National Security Education Program.

The third area of focus is to strengthen the capacity of the national counterterrorism executive within the Office of the Directorate of the CIA. Several recent espionage cases, most notably the Aldrich Ames case, the Robert Hanssen case, the Ana Montes case, require that we place greater efforts in assessing our counterterrorism vulnerabilities with respect to hostile intelligence services, let alone terrorist-type activity that affect our men and women in the service, even on our own shores, as we are reminded tonight with the matter involving Mir Aimal Kasi.

This legislation recognizes the concern that insufficient attention has been given to the area of counterterrorism.

Finally, I wanted to commend all involved for their diligent work on reaching a compromise on the creation of an independent commission. It shows the American people that we can work together to reach consensus. Sometimes it takes a little longer than we hoped, but usually we get there.

Mr. Speaker, I barely scratched the surface regarding the many issues and investments contained in this bill that go toward protecting our national interests. As we all know, much of it is classified. The only way to be ready to address the diverse threats to our security, both at home and abroad, is by having a vibrant first line of defense, as the President has said, that provides indications and warning. This first line of defense has to start with our intelligence community, and we have to give them the support and the oversight necessary to do that job. This conference report directly helps to strengthen our capabilities, put them on target, and ensures the protection of our rights and liberties, now and in the future.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report and thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), our distinguished chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, for his very kind words of farewell to me as I leave the committee after 10 years of service there. It has been a privilege to serve on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; and as the gentleman said, we always put national security first, so our work there is generally conducted in a bipartisan way, and never more so than under the leadership of our chairman, who has been very bipartisan in his approach and given us the opportunity to air our differences, which largely are not partisan, but just differences of opinion that Republicans and Democrats may share.

In any case, the tenor of his leadership has been one that has been conducive to a very bipartisan atmosphere which is very wholesome for the work that we do, and that work is vital to our country.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thank him for his kind remarks. I congratulate the gentleman on his excellent leadership. It has been an honor to serve with the gentleman, and I look forward to working with the gentleman from the perspective of the Democratic leader.

Mr. Speaker, this is the last bill I will manage from appropriations or from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; and I, too, want to join the chairman in thanking our other departing members on the Democratic side, the gentleman from California (Mr. CONDIT) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), for their distinguished leadership on the committee.

We will all benefit from the work of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) tonight when we discuss the independent commission, which is in this bill thanks to his relentless leadership, and also bid adieu to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), who is going on to other work.

When I joined the committee 10 years ago, the Gulf War had been recently concluded. As I leave as a voting member, the threat of war has returned to the Gulf region. One of the primary purposes of intelligence is to enable U.S. military forces to wage any campaign successfully, with a minimum of casualties. Force protection is our primary responsibility.

Great progress has been made since the Gulf War in using intelligence to improve the accuracy and effectiveness of weapons and in hastening the flow of intelligence to military commanders. Those efforts are sustained appropriately in this conference report.

Equal in importance to the role of intelligence in making certain that wars are won is its role in preventing wars from being fought; some might even say, and I agree, even more important.

The conference report, particularly in the emphasis it places on strengthening the intelligence analytic function, should improve the quality of information policymakers and diplomats need to anticipate and resolve problems before they lead to armed confrontation.

The committee's work this year has been influenced greatly by the events of September 11, 2001. Our Subcommittee on Terrorism and Homeland Security, chaired by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), has been at the forefront of efforts to draw lessons from those events and fashion corrective measures which lessen the chances for successful future attacks.

□ 2320

The conference report has counterterrorism at its highest funding priority. Next year, I expect that with the benefit of the recommendations to be made in the report of the joint September 11 inquiry the committee and its Senate counterpart are conducting, significant changes will be proposed in the way in which the intelligence community conducts its antiterrorism activities.

As thorough as the work of the joint inquiry has been, the dimensions of the September 11 attacks demands an additional kind of review. I am pleased that the conference report will establish a commission to take a comprehensive, independent, I hope, look across the agencies of government at the preparation for, and response to, those horrific events.

I expect that the commission, which I mentioned is in this bill because of the leadership of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), will benefit greatly from the work of the joint inquiry and the Subcommittee on Terrorism and Homeland Security as it undertakes its critical assignment.

The brave and dedicated men and women of the intelligence community perform an invaluable service for our country, and I want them to know how impressed we have all been by the work they do under frequently dangerous and demanding conditions. They deserve our appreciation. The conference report should assist them particularly in the area of language training in ways which will improve their effectiveness in years to come.

Given the uncertainties and complexities of the threats we face, especially those posed by international terrorists and proliferators of weapons of mass destruction, it is imperative that the ranks of intelligence officers be as diverse as possible. Not enough progress has been made in this area despite repeated expressions of interest by members of the committee. I hope greater attention will be paid to this matter in the future.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I went on the committee 10 years ago. My interest there centered around stopping the

proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, protecting our civil liberties as we try to gain as much intelligence as possible around the world to protect our forces, and also the prevention of war, as well as protecting us from terrorism. I hope that as we go forward with homeland security, which is essential to our country's security, that we will recall that each one of us takes an oath to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, and as we protect and defend our country we must honor our oath to protect the Constitution and the civil liberties contained therein.

I am very pleased that President Bush has made stopping the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction a high priority. It is a pervasive problem, not only in Iraq but in other places in the world and it must have our attention. The United States must have a policy which is consistent to stop that proliferation.

Mr. Speaker, the capability to acquire intelligence is integral to the security of the American people. The conference report makes an important contribution to maintaining that capability. I commend the chairman for his leadership in putting this bill together and I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), the vice chairman of the committee and the chairman of the subcommittee that fuses capability and policy, a very challenging job these days.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report addresses a number of pressing intelligence needs. This Member will focus his remarks on only two.

First, the legislation takes important steps to strengthen the intelligence community's analytical core. In recent years certain circumstances have demanded that we focus on terrorists, proliferators and drug traffickers. These are far more difficult targets to track than was the old Soviet Union. Frankly, the intelligence community took far too long to adapt to these new threats. It did not reach out aggressively to recruit human intelligence sources that could have provided us invaluable information.

The community lost far too many skilled analysts whose job it is to provide early warning. This legislation provides much needed funding to build a dynamic, wide-ranging global analytical capability.

A second important component of the intelligence authorization relates to terrorist finances. One of the major intelligence initiatives in the wake of 9/11 has been an attack on the financial

assets of terrorist organizations and their supporters.

Terrorist networks such as al Qaeda obviously cannot function without significant financing. And al Qaeda, for example, is supported by, one, a shadowy network of fund-raisers, money lenders, and shakedown artists; two, businesses and charities serving as front organizations; and, three, unscrupulous facilitators and middlemen. However, with the decision of the executive branch to fully exploit the existing authorities to target terrorist finances and with the granting of additional authorities under the U.S. PATRIOT Act, we are now aggressively attacking the money flow. To date over \$100 million of suspected terrorist money has been seized or frozen by the United States and its allies and that is just the beginning.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important and powerful tool in the war on terrorism. In order to maintain responsible legislative oversight over this effort, the Intelligence Authorization Act will require semi-annual reports on the number of assets seized, as well as the number of entities or individuals found to have engaged in financial support for terrorism.

It will also require information on the total number of requests for asset seizures that have been granted, denied or modified. This important oversight will ensure the war against terrorism financing remains on track.

In closing, this Member would congratulate the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) and the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for the leadership they have demonstrated in bringing forth a genuinely bipartisan product. I will say in her existing capacity we will certainly miss the gentlewoman's long and very important experience and contributions on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

The conference report is a very serious effort. Each and every member of the committee dedicated long hours to the drafting of the legislation. Each member recognizes the importance of our action. This body can justifiably be proud of our efforts of the HPSCI, I believe, and particularly the leadership of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Finally, and of crucial importance, the staff of the committee is truly excellent in their knowledge and commitment to our oversight and our authorization responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, this Member strongly urges adoption of the conference report of H.R. 4628.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), a distinguished member of the committee and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report, but before I get started I want to express my own personal gratitude to the leadership of this committee, and most especially to the leadership of our ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), for the hard work she has done in leading the Democrats on this committee and the contributions that she has made to the committee as a whole.

I believe very strongly that her leadership has worked through the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence to make the world and our country a little more of hope, a little less of fear and a little better because she traveled here, and we are very grateful for her leadership and we will miss her very much. Although she has gone on to more responsibility and we expect equally great things from her there, I do want to say that we certainly are appreciative of her hard work, and we will miss her, and it has meant a tremendous amount to our country and our intelligence community.

The committee worked hard to provide the resources that our military forces and our intelligence community require to prevail in the war on terrorism and to safeguard all of our other national security interests. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), my counterpart on the Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) and all of the other committee members deserve great credit for this important bipartisan authorization act.

In addition, this conference report adds substantial funds to the budget of the National Imagery and Mapping Agency to enable NIMA to award a contract for a major modernization program. I remain very concerned that the administration failed to budget enough funds for this effort despite the large budget increases following September 11.

□ 2330

The capabilities that this modernization effort will provide are essential for the kind of flexible military operations on display in Afghanistan.

When our bill was being debated in the House earlier this year, I indicated my concern about the Department of Defense's apparent neglect of the communications and exploitation infrastructure needed to support the large fleet of unmanned aerial vehicles that the Department intends to procure over the next several years. These drones performed magnificently in Afghanistan, but this potential will never be realized without a larger investment in the means to get the data back from the aircraft and get it exploited. I had hoped the administration would signal its intention to fix these problems, but

this has not happened. Congress must address this matter next year if the administration fails to do so in the fiscal year 2004 budget request.

This conference report also requires that some changes and initiatives be undertaken to correct problems with respect to the sharing of information within and between the intelligence and law enforcement communities. There is more work to be done in this area, but the direction in this conference report, if implemented faithfully, should help. We understand the importance of protecting sources and methods, but believe that this can be done within a much more expansive information-sharing paradigm.

Finally, I wanted to speak to the implementation of the proposed compensation reform plan. Section 402 of the bill is similar to section 402 of the House bill. The Senate amendment had no similar provision. Section 402 delays implementation of the Central Intelligence Agency's proposed compensation reform plan until February 1, 2004. Prior to that date, the director of Central Intelligence may conduct a pilot project to assess the efficacy and fairness of a revised personnel compensation plan and report to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence 45 days after completion of the pilot project. Section 402 includes a sense of the Congress that an employee personnel evaluation mechanism with evaluation training for managers and employees of the CIA and the National Security Agency should be phased in first and then followed by introduction of a new compensation plan.

Mr. Speaker, this was a concern that was raised by the employees that has contributed to a great deal of consternation and perhaps some problems that we might anticipate if it were implemented, and I am happy that the conference report reflects the concerns raised on this issue, and that we will first, before having an en masse, grand-scale implementation, first have the pilot program instituted so any kinks or problems can be worked out.

With that, I think it is a good conference report. I think we have done good work, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Terrorism and Homeland Security, and acknowledge the valuable contribution that subcommittee has made to our national security.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, During this term of Congress, much of my time and passion has been devoted to the activities of this committee and the contents of this conference report. It is a great committee with great bipartisan leadership, membership, and staff. It is

with relief, pride and some sadness that I stand here at midnight to urge passage of the conference report.

My special appreciation goes to our ranking member, the esteemed gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who today achieved an historic first, and who over all of the years that I have served with her on this committee, has distinguished herself with fairness, probity, intelligence, and leadership skills. We will miss her, and we will welcome her back as an ex officio member.

I would also like to use my last statement of the 107th Congress to state my respect and praise for the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), another departing member. It is fitting that one of the last votes of this Congress will fulfill his promise to the families of the 9-11 victims. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) has worked tirelessly and passionately to enact an independent commission to investigate the 9-11 attacks. That commission will be part of this conference report. In fact, the bold actions of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) saved the commission, saved the bipartisan tradition of the committee, and reflects the vote a majority of this House took some months ago.

I would finally like to recognize that other colleagues are departing: the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the gentleman from California (Mr. CONDIT), and especially the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), who is moving to the other body where he will serve on its intelligence committee. I would advise the gentleman if he gets lonely over there, he can come home for advice and counsel.

Mr. Speaker, this is our first real chance after 9-11 to set new directions in the intelligence community, and we do that. We provide substantially more funding, more training, and more support to penetrate, prevent and disrupt the plans of terrorist organizations.

I would say that the Department of Homeland Security legislation that we passed yesterday provides for an integrated strategy to protect the homeland, but that strategy must be built on world-class intelligence. This bill provides that critical base. I urge its passage.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), a departing member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, yet one who has demonstrated leadership right up to the last day of the Congress to ensure that we have an independent commission and that it would be one that will make our country safer.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for those kind and generous words.

Abraham Lincoln, when he went from Springfield, Illinois, to Washington,

D.C. to take on a new job that he was elected to by the people of the United States, stood on a platform in Springfield, Illinois, and looked out at his hometown people and said to these people and their kindness, "I owe everything."

To the people of Indiana that I have served for the last 12 years in this distinguished body, I owe them everything, for the privilege and the humble responsibility of casting votes on their behalf with common sense and dignity, as we have and will tonight, to try to make this a more secure Nation and a Nation that works together in a bipartisan way to accomplish things.

When I talk about people, I want to commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), the chairman of the committee, for his distinguished leadership to bring this bill to the floor tonight in a most dangerous and precarious world.

I want to especially congratulate the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), my good friend and our leader. I have two buttons in my pocket tonight with the gentlewoman's name on them that I will give to my 5-year-old daughter, Sarah, and my 2-year-old daughter, Grace. I think the talent and the dreams of women and people around the world are boundless tonight because of what example she has set. It is not just getting elected, and not only being a woman; it is being a leader and bringing a bill to the floor and keeping this body working into the night to get these things accomplished, like an independent commission.

We do live in a dangerous world where planes can wreak devastation, and a vial of smallpox that can fit in a pocket can kill millions. Therefore, this bill tonight, as the last bill of the 107th Congress, is indeed vital for our Nation's security.

We outline new language, training and proficiency programs in this bill which are funded at higher levels. We improve information sharing to decrease the problems of communication and stove-piping between the FBI and the CIA, and we put more emphasis on human intelligence, which is the most important work that we could do, not just relying on satellites in the sky.

□ 2340

Finally, a great big embrace and thanks for the idealism and effectiveness and hope to the families of the victims of 9-11 who have worked so hard and been such a great example to me of how grassroots work can make this body function better. These families, led by people like Stephen Push and Kristin Breitweiser, have really led us to tonight's success on the creation of this independent commission. It is not everything, it is not perfect, but it has come a long way from opposition and dead-on-arrival predictions that it would go nowhere. We have that in a bipartisan way in this bill tonight.

It still has a lot of challenges, Mr. Speaker, and one is the subpoena power. The linchpin for me of an effective investigative body and a truly

independent commission is the ability for this commission to have subpoena power, to threaten the subpoena, to ultimately deliver on it and to get depositions and to pry open doors that want to remain closed. We have that in this bill, especially if Senator MCCAIN and Senator SHELBY can have the one appointment that has been promised to them out of the five Republican appointments and that helps us get to this level of six votes that can trigger subpoenas. That is crucial in this. I hope that that colloquy and that gentlemen's agreement and that codified promise is in this bill and in the legislation's intent.

I also hope that we will follow the good path of the joint inquiry. Led by that staff and this great staff here on the floor tonight, we have uncovered a lot of questions, we have a lot of suggestions and recommendations for fixing the problems that led to 9-11, but we have so much more to do in front of us, which this independent commission in a seamless way can undertake and make recommendations for.

In summing up, Mr. Speaker, there is a Shakespeare play where one character says to the other in a bragging way, "I can call spirits from the deep," and the other character says, "Well, anybody can do that, but will they come?" Will they come? I hope and I pray for this most distinguished people's House that we will call forth the very best in us and bring forth the very best ideas and challenge these people in this great country to vote in the next 2 years on great ideas put forward by Republicans and Democrats and some in bipartisan ways to keep this country strong, to move us in a positive direction and do it in the spirit of the founders of this great Nation.

I appreciate the service to this country and wish good things for the people of this body. Thank you very much and Godspeed.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), a very valued member of our committee and well known to the Members of this body.

Mr. LAHOOD. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there are two other people in the Chamber that I have more regard for than the chairman of the committee and the ranking member. Both people are very, very hardworking people. They have done extraordinary work for the country. The leadership of Chairman GOSS and our ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), has just been extraordinary, particularly given what happened after 9-11 and particularly given the events that we have been through in the House and as members of the joint committee studying what happened prior to 9-11. I have really enjoyed the opportunity for the last 4 years to serve with both of these people. I want to say a word about my friend from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) be-

cause I know he will be leaving and his service has been valued very much by all the members of the committee. I know that you will be missed, Tim, and I know that it will be a great loss to our committee. And also to you, Madam Leader, you will also be missed and thank you for your service to the committee.

I rise in very, very reluctant opposition to the conference report. As those people on the committee know, I have objected very strenuously to the idea of a commission. Almost from the very first day that this idea has been proposed, I thought it was a bad idea. I have thought it was a bad idea because what is going to happen is you are going to have people with little or no experience, and many of us on the committee have tried to gain experience over the years and tried to gain knowledge in terms of what the community is about, the intelligence-gathering community and how they do their work and what the failures are, and to have some kind of a concept of a so-called blue ribbon committee, I think, really is going to fall far short of what people's expectations are.

I know that some people think this commission is going to provide a lot of answers and provide a lot of opportunity to assuage the feelings of the family members of the victims. I think we are holding out a real, real big false hope for the family members. I have always felt that. Many of us on the committee have tried to become experts. It is difficult to do. But there are people who are experts. I consider Chairman GOSS and I consider Ranking Member PELOSI experts because of the time that they have devoted. I think the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) is an expert because of the time he has devoted. But to try and get 10 people from the outside to come in and understand all of this in such a short period of time I think holds out a very big false hope. It just does not make sense.

I really think this is a mistake. I want people to understand that this is a good bill, it is a good conference report in every other regard except for the idea of holding out a false hope to the families that are left behind of the victims, that somehow this blue ribbon commission is going to be the panacea, that is going to answer all the questions, that is going to lay the blame where it needs to be laid. You know I have characterized this as the blame game commission and I know you do not like to hear me say that, but that is how I feel about it. There are people here that want to try and find blame within the government, whether it is in the CIA or the FBI or within the administration. I characterize this as no more than that, an opportunity for 10 citizens to try and come together and understand something that is so complicated and so complex that it makes little sense to try and hold out hope to people that this will really give the answers to the families that have been left behind. It will not. It simply will

not. I think that hopefully our joint committee can offer some answers out of the kind of work that we have done for the last year and will continue to do until the final report is written.

The idea that this is a blue ribbon commission where people are going to be paid, I think, detracts from what kind of a blue ribbon commission is it. It is right in the bill that there are going to be people who are going to be paid for this. Why do we have to pay people to serve on a blue ribbon commission? I wish I would have had an opportunity to at least strike that out of the bill, but we do not have an opportunity to strike these kinds of things out of conference reports. I think the idea of compensation is nonsense. It degrades the commission; it degrades the idea that it is a blue ribbon commission.

The final thing that I would say to my friends here in the House and to colleagues is that this really is an opportunity, I think, for people just prior really to a political election to lay on the table some kind of a report to try and lay blame at the foot of an administration. That is how I see it. This report will come out maybe a few days or a month or two before the next Presidential election. I have no idea what the report will say, but I know there are people out there that want to find blame. I have the feeling that that is what this commission will be out to do, to look for those who made mistakes, to look for those, to find fault with institutions in our government that probably in some ways did not serve the interest the way they should have.

As one Member, and I hate to do it because I know a lot of work has gone into this bill, into this conference report, but I intend to vote against it. I think this is a terrible mistake. It sends a terrible message. I do not want the families out there to think that when this report comes in from some so-called blue ribbon commission, it is going to answer. It is not going to answer.

□ 2350

Some of these things are unanswerable and those of us that have served on the joint committee know that some of these things are unanswerable. So I thank the chairman for the opportunity to speak, and in no way do I want to be degrade any member of the committee, any member who supports this. I just think it is a bad idea, it is a bad time to do it, it does not make sense, and it is going to hold out a false hope that we are never ever going to be able to meet.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL), who is the ranking member on the Subcommittee of Human Intelligence, Analysis and Counterintelligence.

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

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to make the gentleman from Illinois

(Mr. LAHOOD), my good friend, feel better. I have tremendous respect for him, and he knows that and I think he does for me. But as I reflect on the time it takes for the efforts gone forth, and I want to commend, as the rest of my colleagues have, our chairman and ranking member for their efforts and the efforts of the staff, but as I have observed the time necessary to go into this kind of depth, I think the blue ribbon commission is very necessary to get the answers that we ought to be able to get. So we reflect on the joint committee and the ability of Members, all the other things that demand our time and so on. I think it becomes pretty clear that we need this extra assistance to give the country and to give those families the information that they need, and they will not be satisfied with anything less.

So I tonight rise in appreciation to support this conference report because its time has come, and the people in this country ought to know that this committee under this leadership, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Goss), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), have done everything that they can possibly do to protect our country to be sure that one of their principles of safety, principles of war and principles of safety, is to have good reliable intelligence and to be timely and to be accurate.

So I am very happy to support this conference report. I think it supports the global efforts to counterterrorism and other threats to international security, and the conference report, like the House bill passed in July, reflects a commitment of this committee to invest in the people of the intelligence community and intelligence disciplines across the board, especially human intelligence. The conference reports includes the provisions on language training and proficiency maintenance found in the House bill. The conference report unfortunately delays the effective date of the provisions found in the House bill, setting forth a new authorization for the innovative language training program known as the National Flagship Initiative under the National Security Education Program, NSEP. Although disappointing, it should be noted that both the House and Senate have endorsed the National Flagship Initiative and the conference report includes a provision to ensure that the delay does not affect the ongoing NSEP pilot to fund programs to develop competency at the superior level in languages critical to national security.

Over the last few months, the House and Senate intelligence committees have made significant progress in the joint investigation they have been conducting into the circumstances surrounding the terrorist attacks of September 11. The inquiry, however, has focused on U.S. intelligence agencies and must soon conclude its work. So I support the establishment of the independent commission. I have been dis-

appointed in how long it has taken for the agreement to be reached on whether a commission would be established and how it would be structured, but we are there.

While the final language on the commission may not be satisfactory to everyone, I believe it is important that a commission with a broad mandate and independent authorities be established by statute. I will follow with great interest its work, especially with respect to its investigation beyond the topics addressed by the joint inquiry. I urge the support of this report.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the members of this committee for the product and the way in which they have done it. I was particularly impressed by the very gracious remarks of the chairman of this committee about his opposite, the ranking minority member, and frankly at a time when there is some political sniping going on that seems to me wholly inaccurate, having him so generously acknowledge the important role the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has played on the single most important national security issue now before this Congress is a very impressive act, and I appreciate his doing that. I should underline that what we have here is the gentlewoman from California in her role on this committee having played a wholly responsible constructive role at the center of national policy. I would ask people to contrast that with some of the silly political assassination efforts that are going on.

Speaking of silly, I want to talk about an amendment we need. We have had a policy for driving gay people out of the military lest gay men and women be allowed to help defend this country, and it has been called the policy of Don't Ask, Don't Tell. We have a new name for it. It is called Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Translate, because the Army in its wisdom pursuant to a dictate given to it by this body in its wisdom has just thrown out over the past year nine linguistic specialists, six of whom were studying Arabic. Apparently the Army feels that worrying about what people do in their private lives is more important than enhancing our ability to translate from Arabic. As the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations said, it is a good thing for Lawrence Arabia they were not around when he was getting involved in the Middle East. The notion that they would take people who were studying Arabic, one member of this group had completed 30 weeks of training, he was getting very good marks, he trying to learn Arabic, in the process of learning Arabic, no, we do not want him because he is gay. I understand that anti-gay prejudice gets a certain leeway here. I have been

fighting against that, but to put it ahead of national security seems to me excessive. We have been told that we have a problem because we do not have enough skillful linguists. So when they kick out six Arabic speakers, two Korean speakers, and someone who speaks Mandarin Chinese, I am appalled. And let us be clear that while there is a policy on the books of which I do not approve, it is not self-executing. The military has the discretion not to apply it in some cases, and to expel from the military American citizens who are motivated by the most profound patriotism and are in the process of learning Arabic at a time when that is essential to national security, to kick them out because they are gay is preposterous, and while it is late in the session and late in the evening, too late I hope for my colleagues to bring up that bankruptcy bill they were playing with, I hope when we return next year we will look at this Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Translate policy, and the notion that the Federal Government at this time should deprive itself of skillful people who want to work for national security in translating from Arabic into English and from Chinese and Korean into English, the notion that we would deny ourselves this greatly needed asset because some people do not like people like me is as silly as I can think. We are not here talking about trivia. We are not talking about anything superficial. We are talking about prejudice being elevated over national security.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD at this point an article from the AP by Margie Mason and an article from the New Republic by Nathaniel Frank which document this particular piece of stupidity.

[From the Associated Press]
MILITARY DISMISSES 6 GAY ARABIC LINGUISTS
AMID SHORTAGE OF TRANSLATORS
(By Margie Mason)

SAN FRANCISCO.—Nine Army linguists, including six trained to speak Arabic, have been dismissed from the military because they are gay.

The soldiers' dismissals come at a time when the military is facing a critical shortage of translators and interpreters for the war on terrorism.

Seven of the soldiers were discharged after telling superiors they are gay, and the two others got in trouble when they were caught together after curfew, said Steve Ralls, spokesman for the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, a group that defends homosexuals in the military.

Six were specializing in Arabic, two were studying Korean and one was studying Mandarin Chinese. All were at the Defense Language Institute in Monterey, the military's primary language training center.

The government has aggressively recruited Arabic speakers since the Sept. 11 attacks.

"We face a drastic shortage of linguists, and the direct impact of Arabic speakers is a particular problem," said Donald R. Hamilton, who documented the need for more linguists in a report to Congress as part of the National Commission on Terrorism.

One of the discharged linguists said the military's policy on gays is hurting its cause.

"It's not a gay-rights issue. I'm arguing military proficiency issues they're throwing out good, quality people," said Alastair Gamble, a former Army specialist.

Harvey Perritt, spokesman for the Army Training and Doctrine Command at Fort Monroe in Tidewater, Va., confirmed the dismissals occurred between October 2001 and September 2002, but declined to comment further on the cases.

He said 516 linguists enrolled in the Arabic course this year at the Monterey institute and 365 graduated.

The military's "don't ask, don't tell" policy allows gays to serve provided they keep quiet about their sexual orientation.

Gamble and former Pfc. Robert Hicks were discovered in Gamble's room during a surprise inspection in April, Gamble said.

After their discharges, Gamble and Hicks applied for other federal jobs where they could use their language skills in the war on terrorism, but neither was hired, Gamble said.

[From the New Republic, Nov. 18, 2002]

"DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL" V. THE WAR ON TERRORISM

(By Nathaniel Frank)

On October 25, one week after CIA Director George Tenet warned that the United States now faces a terrorist threat every bit as grave as it did the summer before the September 11 attacks, the Council on Foreign Relations issued the most sobering report to date: "America remains dangerously unprepared to prevent and respond to a catastrophic terrorist attack. In all likelihood, the next attack will result in even greater casualties and widespread disruption to American lives and the economy."

The key to preventing that kind of calamity, most experts agree, is intelligence. And one of the basic requirements of good intelligence about the Arab world is the ability to speak its language. Unfortunately, study after study has indicated that the U.S. government faces a severe shortage of Arabic speakers. Less than one month after September 11, 2001, a House Intelligence Committee report criticized the FBI, CIA, and National Security Agency (NSA) for relying on "intelligence generalists" rather than linguists with expertise in a specific foreign language, culture, and geographical area. The report concluded that "at the NSA and CIA, thousands of pieces of data are never analyzed, or are analyzed 'after the fact' because there are too few analysts; even fewer with the necessary language skills. Written materials can sit for months, and sometimes years, before a linguist with proper security clearances and skills can begin a translation." According to a Government Accounting Office (GAO) study released in January 2002, in 2001, the U.S. Army, FBI, and State and Commerce Departments failed to fill all their jobs that required expertise in Arabic, Chinese, Korean, Farsi, or Russian. The GAO study concluded that staff shortages at these agencies "have adversely affected agency operations and compromised U.S. military, law enforcement, intelligence, counterterrorism and diplomatic efforts." As recently as last month, the Associated Press reported that the Army faces such a critical shortage of Arabic speakers that it is considering recruiting non-Americans from Middle Eastern countries into its Special Forces teams.

Which makes it all the more shocking that, in a two-month period this fall, the Defense Language Institute (DLI)—an elite training school for military linguists in Monterey, California—discharged seven fully competent Arabic linguists. The reason? They were discovered to be gay.

DLI is a language-training center run by the Army, but soldiers from all major military branches study there. Because of its battery of entrances tests and the intensity of its courses, DLI is reputed to attract students who are older and more skilled than most enlisted personnel. Its Northern California location also, it seems, attracts a large share of gay students. "There were way too many gay people at DLI for anybody to fear the 'don't ask, don't tell' policy," says one gay former student who arrived at DLI in 2001. While there, he was out to all his gay peers and to any enlisted personnel who seemed gay-friendly. "Nobody cared," he explains. "I knew someone who was a flaming queen in a uniform, and nobody cared. Sometimes we lived on halls that were more than 50 percent homosexual. ... I never even got a sideways glance."

Still, this tolerant atmosphere does not extend to commanders, who, when a soldier's homosexuality is clearly discovered, are forced by federal law to pursue and expel him. This includes highly trained linguists like Alastair Gamble, an Emory University-educated Army specialist fired from DLI this August after completing more than 30 weeks of intensive Arabic. (DLI's Arabic course requires 63 weeks for a basic knowledge, compared with only 25 weeks for Spanish, French, Italian, or Portuguese, and only the strongest students are selected to take it.) Gamble was a human-intelligence collector, a position the GAO report cited as one of the Army's "greatest foreign language needs." And Gamble was a catch for DLI in other ways, too. He had studied German for seven years in high school and continued in college, where he also studied Latin and linguistics. Once in the Army, he completed interrogation training, a nine-week intelligence course that trains a small number of soldiers to collect information through direct questioning techniques. He then spent six weeks working for the Foreign Area Officer program, which trains officers to work with U.S. allies, where his performance won him a Certificate of Commendation from his commander. He entered DLI in June 2001 to study Arabic and earned a perfect 300 on his physical fitness test. Gamble reports that his grades placed him at the top of his class and that several teachers told him they thought he was the strongest student in the class.

In April, Gamble was finishing his second semester of the Arabic basic course at DLI when, during a surprise "health and welfare" inspection at 3:30 a.m., he was caught in his room with his boyfriend, also an army language specialist. (In eight months of dating, the two men say they had never before broken visitation policies. But Gamble's boyfriend was nearing the end of his course and preparing to relocate to Goodfellow Air Force Base in Texas. As their separation approached, they decided they could risk one night of sleeping side by side.) After the two men were found in bed, nearly a dozen people searched the room while Gamble was escorted to his First Sergeant's office. Gamble says he was not yet thinking about being discharged. "I was just absolutely embarrassed," he recalls. "There's really nothing like having someone who's your age, but a slight rank above you, discussing whether or not lube is sufficient evidence to prove homosexuality. It's like getting felt up; it's horrible." The searched turned up a gay-themed, non-pornographic film, photographs showing affectionate, but not sexual, behavior between Gamble and his boyfriend, and several gift cards expressing romantic sentiments. Two weeks later, Gamble was officially notified that his unit was initiating an investigation into his sexual orientation. He was pulled from class and honorably discharged on August 2. About eight weeks later, his boyfriend was discharged as well.

Gamble and his boyfriend are no alone. The Servicemembers Legal Defense Network (SLDN), a legal aid and advocacy organization that assists men and women harmed by "don't ask, don't tell," announced in its latest quarterly report that it had assisted six other Arabic speakers recently discharged from DLI for being gay. Though only two chose to speak publicly, SLDN reports that all seven soldiers were fired while in the midst of, or having completed, the intensive DLI Arabic training course.

The army has cast the firings as routine enforcement of Army regulations. Harvey Perritt, a spokesman for U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command, says the expulsions of competent Arabic linguists are "not relevant" to the nation's current war against largely Arabic-speaking terrorists. He insists that discharges resulting from "don't ask, don't tell" are consistent with those for other violations of Army regulations. "If someone is enrolled somewhere and they don't pass the P.T. [physical training] standards," he says, by way of comparison, "they'll be discharged. There are policies and they are always in effect."

But, regardless of what you believe about gays in the military, that's just not true. Both during the Gulf war and after the September 11 attacks, the Pentagon authorized "stop-loss" orders, allowing branch secretaries to retain soldiers who would otherwise be discharged for committing petty crimes, minor physical shortcomings, or other reasons. What's more, the military even has a history of suspending personnel policies regarding gays and lesbians during wartime, when it needs maximum retention of soldiers. In 1991, The Wall Street Journal reported that the Pentagon had allowed homosexuals to serve in the Persian Gulf, despite a ban on all gay service, and only moved to discharge several gay veterans after the war ended. For his best-selling 1993 book, *Conduct Unbecoming*, the late San Francisco Chronicle reporter Randy Shilts interviewed two Arab-language specialists fired from the Army for being gay. According to Shilts, the NSA contacted the two when the Gulf war began, begging them to return to service to help the war effort. (The two men declined.)

In other words, the military implicitly acknowledges that, during wartime, the gay ban may undermine national security rather than protect it. And since its leaders have consistently argued that national security should be the only criterion for determining whether gays should serve, it may be time for a new look at an "interim" policy formulated nearly ten years ago. Today's war on terrorism is less about squadrons and battalions than about deciphering the behavior of a shadowy enemy who attacks in secret. For national security's sake, let's hope our leaders are finally ready to acknowledge in public what they're admitted privately for quite some time: It is this enemy that threatens our nation's freedoms and survival, not the open homosexuality of patriotic Americans standing ready to serve.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to associate myself with the concerns expressed by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) regarding putting national security second to anything. It is our first priority to protect the American people. It is in the Preamble to the Constitution first to provide for the common defense and we really must revisit this idea, especially at the time of such tremendous need for linguistic skills, especially in the languages expressed by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to thank so many people who made this bill possible, my distinguished chairman for sure, all of the members of the committee acting in bipartisan fashion, and I want to commend the wonderful staff that we have. I want to acknowledge on the Democratic side our counsel Mike Sheehy who heads up the Democratic staff. We do not really think in terms of Democrat and Republican. It just somehow breaks down that way.

□ 0000

But we act in a very bipartisan way, members and staff. Chris Healey, Beth Larson, Ilene Romack, Wyndee Parker, Carolyn Bartholomew, Bob Emmett, Kirk McConnell, Marcel Lettre and, again, Mike Sheehy, who heads up our side. I want to commend Tim Sample, who is the major honcho staff person of the Committee, Chris Bartow, Mike Meermans and all of the other members of the staff for all of their hard work.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just respond briefly, because the hour is late, very briefly, to the very serious concerns and the sincerity in which they were expressed by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD). The purpose of the commission is not to assign blame; it is to find out why and how 9-11 happened. I agree with the gentleman, if the purpose is to assign blame, we should not have the commission. That would not be constructive. But we must try our very best to make sure that a 9-11 or anything like it does not happen again; and in order to do that, we have to get to the bottom of it.

This commission will build on the work of the Joint Inquiry, in which this committee and the Senate committee have been engaged, and we are very pleased with the work of our staff director, Eleanor Hill, and the very, very able staff of the inquiry. It will build on that.

But this commission, the purpose of it is to have fresh eyes take a new fresh look at what happened and also to go beyond those agencies of government that the inquiry has looked at, to look at every agency of government that had any responsibility for protecting the American people from terrorism.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I would just say as we go into this commission, we are walking on hallowed ground. There is no place for politics or assigning blame here, but we do have a responsibility to reduce risk to the American people, to find answers as to why 9-11 happened, to prevent it from happening again, to provide comfort to the families who have been a source of strength. We try to console them. They are an inspiration and a source of strength to us, as the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) indicated.

Whatever we do, we must bring honor to the memory of those who lost their lives on September 11. I think our work in the Joint Inquiry is an excellent product, will be an excellent product

when the report comes out, and that this work of the independent commission will bring honor to the memory of those who died as well.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to support the conference report.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that we always have in the intelligence community many options and many things to consider; and while we do it on a bipartisan basis, we do not always agree on what are the best ways to proceed when you are dealing with some very complex questions of national security. Part of the richness of the judgment of our committee, I think, is we do have many perspectives, and we have heard some of them here tonight. I think that bodes well for our institution.

I would also, in addition to thanking the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) for his persistence and commitment to the idea of where we go next from the Joint Committee with our review process, like to underscore that other Members have been very helpful in the breakthrough. Certainly Members of the other body as well, but I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) in particular, who has been referred to already as the gentleman who led with the gentleman from California (Ms. HARMAN) the Subcommittee on Terrorism and Homeland Security effort, which was very important and a landmark piece for our work. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was also a man who was instrumental in the breakthrough on the compromise that we came through on the independent commission. So I think that he is owed a special thanks for that.

For the family groups, the survivors of 9-11, Stephen Push and Kristin Breitweiser and so forth, we referred to them and spent hours talking to them, I suppose, collectively between all of us.

We all know that we have a responsibility, and I totally agree with my distinguished ranking member about the hallowed ground involved. I do not suppose a day has gone by since 9-11 that I and other members of our committee and perhaps all of us in the room have not thought, is there something we missed? Should we have known? Did we fail in our oversight? Did something go wrong? Was there a smoking gun? Did we somehow fail the American people? Were we derelict in our duty? I can honestly look Kristin Breitweiser and Stephen Push or anybody else in the eye and say I know of no such failure. I know of collectively a lot of things we could have done better, but I see nothing yet that leads me to a smoking gun.

This year we have joined with the other body in doing a very intense review of the 9-11 event. It is not over. We will be issuing a report and that

will lead to further efforts. That is appropriate. We will see where that takes us.

The question still needs to be asked and will continue to need to be asked, did we miss something? Did we do our oversight right? I hope the next commission on oversight, on the 9-11 review, will in fact come back to the congressional oversight and find out if we did our job properly.

I think we are accountable on these committees. I am certainly prepared for that, and I would love the opportunity to answer questions and give the point of view of the committee, because I am very proud of the effort that our committee has put into that. But it does not mean we have all the wisdom or judgment in the world.

Besides that review, we have tried very hard to make sure we understand the nature of the threat we are fighting in the war on terrorism and anthrax and propaganda and all the other miscreants that we deal with now on the basis of whether they are terrorists or violators of law. We are not quite sure, but they need to be stopped in their tracks. So we are fighting a global war, and we have got men and women out there taking risks, taking chances, doing hard work and sometimes, sadly, getting killed. Those people we owe a responsibility to.

The oversight and the advocacy role of our committee is on their behalf as well, to make sure they have the tools, the training, the capabilities they need to do their job, to protect all of us and to make sure in this very specialized area of intelligence they are operating in bounds, because we have promised the American people, our constituency, that we will make sure that we never violate our pledge to the American people that we will not spy on the American people. We will preserve our liberty. So we take that very seriously as well.

Then I think we come to the next question, and that is the question of catching the perpetrators of 9-11. Certainly we have not got them all, and certainly we have learned in the past 48 hours or so that Osama bin Laden himself may still be alive. This is ongoing. It will require patience, and it will require commitment. I would thank the members of the committee, the members of the staff and all who have helped us in that commitment, because that commitment remains before this body.

On behalf of the American people, I urge support for this very important bill.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Intelligence Authorization bill, and I thank my friend and colleague from Florida for yielding me this time.

This is a very good bill. It addresses intelligence needs that were identified in past years by the Intelligence Committee. But only in the past year, after the deaths of innocent Americans, and innocent citizens of other countries,

are these needs getting the broad attention they deserve.

Throughout much of the 1990's, after the end of the Cold War, there was a debate about whether America really needed to spend so much money on defense. As for intelligence, some people even said there was no longer any need for the CIA. I believe that debate is now over.

The bill before you today will help the intelligence agencies increase and sharpen their effectiveness—especially against terrorist groups.

If you want to know the plans and intentions of terrorist groups you have to have HUMINT—"human intelligence". This is the information you get from human sources—also known as "assets" or "agents" or simply "spies". I want to emphasize that this year's intelligence authorization bill does a great deal to strengthen our HUMINT capability. For one thing, there is money to hire more CIA operations officers.

CIA's operations officers are doing a great job, but they are few and far between. We need more, and this bill will help ensure that there will be more. This bill also provides money to hire more intelligence analysts and linguists. Likewise, there is money for more foreign language training. It is not hard to understand that if your operations officers and analysts have not learned the language of your enemy, you will not succeed in learning his plans and intentions.

These HUMINT and foreign language-related items are just some of the good provisions of this Intelligence Authorization bill. They are long overdue.

The clock is ticking, and America's enemies continue with their planning. I urge your support for our intelligence professionals, and I urge your support for this bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITFIELD). The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 366, nays 3, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 483]

YEAS—366

Abercrombie	Andrews	Baker
Ackerman	Armedy	Baldwin
Aderholt	Baca	Barrett
Akin	Bachus	Bartlett
Allen	Baird	Barton

Bass	Gibbons	McDermott
Bentsen	Gilchrest	McGovern
Bereuter	Gonzalez	McHugh
Berkley	Goode	McIntyre
Berman	Goodlatte	McKeon
Berry	Goss	McNulty
Biggert	Graham	Meehan
Bilirakis	Granger	Meeks (NY)
Bishop	Graves	Menendez
Blumenauer	Green (TX)	Mica
Blunt	Green (WI)	Millender-
Boehlert	Gutierrez	McDonald
Bonilla	Gutknecht	Miller, Dan
Bono	Hall (TX)	Miller, George
Boozman	Hansen	Miller, Jeff
Boswell	Harman	Mollohan
Boucher	Hart	Moore
Brady (PA)	Hastings (WA)	Moran (KS)
Brady (TX)	Hayes	Moran (VA)
Brown (FL)	Hayworth	Morella
Brown (OH)	Hefley	Myrick
Brown (SC)	Herger	Nadler
Bryant	Hill	Napolitano
Burr	Hilleary	Neal
Burton	Hilliard	Nethercutt
Buyer	Hinchev	Ney
Calvert	Hinojosa	Northup
Camp	Hobson	Norwood
Cannon	Hoefel	Nussle
Cantor	Hoekstra	Obey
Capito	Holden	Olver
Capps	Holt	Ortiz
Capuano	Honda	Osborne
Cardin	Horn	Ose
Carson (IN)	Hostettler	Otter
Carson (OK)	Hoyer	Owens
Castle	Hulshof	Pallone
Chabot	Hunter	Pastor
Chambliss	Inslie	Payne
Clayton	Isakson	Pelosi
Clyburn	Israel	Pence
Coble	Istook	Peterson (MN)
Collins	Jackson (IL)	Petri
Costello	Jackson-Lee	Phelps
Cox	(TX)	Pickering
Coyne	Jefferson	Pitts
Cramer	Jenkins	Platts
Crane	John	Pombo
Crenshaw	Johnson (CT)	Pomeroy
Crowley	Johnson (IL)	Portman
Cubin	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Culberson	Johnson, Sam	Pryce (OH)
Cummings	Jones (NC)	Putnam
Cunningham	Jones (OH)	Quinn
Davis (CA)	Kanjorski	Radanovich
Davis (FL)	Kaptur	Rahall
Davis (IL)	Kelly	Ramstad
Davis, Jo Ann	Kennedy (MN)	Regula
Davis, Tom	Kennedy (RI)	Rehberg
Deal	Kildee	Reyes
DeFazio	Kilpatrick	Reynolds
DeGette	Kind (WI)	Riley
DeLahunt	Kingston	Rivers
DeLauro	Kirk	Rodriguez
DeLay	Klecza	Roemer
DeMint	Knollenberg	Rogers (KY)
Deutsch	Kolbe	Rogers (MI)
Dicks	Kucinich	Rohrabacher
Dingell	LaFalce	Ros-Lehtinen
Doggett	Lampson	Ross
Dooley	Langevin	Rothman
Doyle	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard
Dreier	Larson (CT)	Royce
Duncan	Latham	Rush
Dunn	LaTourette	Ryan (WI)
Edwards	Leach	Ryun (KS)
Ehlers	Lee	Sabo
Emerson	Levin	Sanchez
Engel	Lewis (CA)	Sanders
English	Lewis (GA)	Sandlin
Eshoo	Lewis (KY)	Saxton
Etheridge	Linder	Schaffer
Evans	LoBiondo	Schakowsky
Everett	Lofgren	Schiff
Farr	Lowey	Schrock
Fattah	Lucas (KY)	Scott
Ferguson	Lucas (OK)	Serrano
Filner	Luther	Sessions
Flake	Lynch	Shadegg
Fletcher	Maloney (CT)	Shaw
Foley	Maloney (NY)	Shays
Forbes	Manzullo	Sherman
Fossella	Mascara	Sherwood
Frank	Matheson	Shimkus
Frelinghuysen	Matsui	Shows
Frost	McCarthy (MO)	Shuster
Gallegly	McCarthy (NY)	Simmons
Gekas	McCollum	Simpson
Gephardt	McCrery	Skeen

Skelton	Thomas	Wamp
Smith (MI)	Thompson (CA)	Waters
Smith (NJ)	Thompson (MS)	Watkins (OK)
Snyder	Thornberry	Watson (CA)
Solis	Thune	Watts (OK)
Souder	Thurman	Weiner
Spratt	Tiahrt	Weldon (FL)
Stenholm	Tiberi	Weldon (PA)
Strickland	Tierney	Weller
Stupak	Towns	Wexler
Sullivan	Turner	Whitfield
Sweeney	Udall (CO)	Wicker
Tancredo	Udall (NM)	Wilson (NM)
Tanner	Upton	Wilson (SC)
Tauscher	Velazquez	Wolf
Tauzin	Visclosky	Woolsey
Taylor (MS)	Vitter	Wu
Taylor (NC)	Walden	Young (AK)
Terry	Walsh	

NAYS—3

Kerns LaHood Paul

NOT VOTING—62

Baldacci	Ganske	Oberstar
Ballenger	Gillmor	Oxley
Barcia	Gilman	Pascrell
Barr	Gordon	Peterson (PA)
Becerra	Greenwood	Rangel
Blagojevich	Grucci	Roukema
Boehner	Hastings (FL)	Sawyer
Bonior	Hooley	Sensenbrenner
Borski	Houghton	Slaughter
Boyd	Hyde	Smith (TX)
Callahan	Issa	Smith (WA)
Clay	Keller	Stark
Clement	King (NY)	Stearns
Combust	Lantos	Stump
Condit	Lipinski	Sununu
Conyers	Markey	Toomey
Cooksey	McInnis	Watt (NC)
Diaz-Balart	McKinney	Waxman
Doolittle	Meek (FL)	Wynn
Ehrlich	Miller, Gary	Young (FL)
Ford	Murtha	

□ 0042

Mr. KERNs changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ALLEN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. PASCHELL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 483, I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

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 H.R. 4628 and the conference report just considered and passed.

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

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO TERRY MORRIS

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

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor our friend, my neighbor, Terry Morris, the Tally Clerk of the House, who is going to retire this December after 33 years of service to the House of Representatives.