

road to an economic recovery. Yes, everyone who lost a job has not yet found one, but the good news is the fastest growth in 20 years, over a million jobs created within a year, we are on record pace to earn back and build back the jobs that we lost and that is good news for America.

THE AMERICAN ECONOMY IS STRONG

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with interest that some prominent Democrats have decided that part of their election strategy is apparently to scare the American people into believing that the economy is weak.

I hate to rain on their parade, but here are some numbers: Inflation is at record lows; interest rates have been at record lows; real GDP has grown 5 percent during the last four quarters, the fastest annual rate in almost 20 years; the unemployment rate is 5.6 percent, which is lower than the 30 year historical average. Real disposal personal income increased at 4.9 percent annual rate in the first quarter of 2004.

Mr. Speaker, it sounds to me like some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, including the presumptive nominee for President, have apparently failed to do their homework. I, for one, do not think the voters are going to be impressed by this nonsense.

THE REAL RECORD ON ECONOMIC GROWTH

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to set the record straight on the economic outlook in America and in my home State of Michigan. Let us look at the facts. Real GDP has grown 5 percent during the last four quarters, the fastest annual growth in almost 20 years. Inflation remains low, productivity has grown at the fastest 3-year rate in 40 years. Business investment surged 12½ percent in the last four quarters. Industrial production saw its largest quarterly increase in nearly 4 years during the first quarter of 2004 and increased further in April. Yes, even in Michigan we added 8,300 jobs just last month.

But more important than all of these statistics is that real disposable income is on the rise. That is more money in the hands of moms and dads all across the country who can invest in their family and buy the things they need. More jobs for our workers and more prosperity for our families. Now, that is a record we can be proud of.

JOBS AND THE ECONOMY

(Mr. PORTMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am here also to talk about our economy. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) just talked about all the positive economic indicators. I guess one could say the only economic indicator that is not positive are the statements from the presumptive Democrat nominee for President. And I do not know why he is doing it because it hurts the economy to badmouth the economy, to talk it down. It reduces consumer confidence at a time when we need to be sure that consumers are confident about where we are.

Before me, others talked about the fact that our unemployment numbers have gone from 6.3 percent down to 5.6 percent. That is lower than the average in the 1970s, 1980s, or 1990s. 1.4 million jobs have been created in the last 9 months.

Let me talk about those jobs. These are good-paying jobs. After tax income increased at a strong 4.9 percent annual rate in the first quarter of this year. Think about that. Hourly compensation in the last year has gone up 2.7 percent. That is faster than the 1.5 percent in the 1990s and people talk about its great growth. Average weekly earnings increased 2.5 percent from the same period a year ago.

So this notion that somehow we are creating jobs but they are not the right jobs or not increasing income are just wrong. Income is up. Productivity is up. Jobs are up.

Mr. Speaker, some politicians who are serving their own special interests are bad-mouthing this economy, but it is strong and good. It can get stronger if we take the right steps here in Congress.

UNFAIR ALLOCATION OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDS

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

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to protest the unfair practice by the City of Miami, Florida, in allocating Federal urban area security money to Broward, Palm Beach, and Monroe Counties. Under the current definition, Broward and Palm Beach and Monroe are integral partners with Miami and Miami-Dade County in protecting south Florida's over 5 million residents.

However, in the over \$30 million allocated to the south Florida urban area, only 10 percent was assigned to Broward County and zero dollars to Palm Beach and Monroe Counties, and, in fact, the other municipalities in Dade County.

Mr. Speaker, to neglect the necessary funding these other three counties deserve is simply outrageous. Both Palm Beach and Broward Counties have an international airport, seaport, and critical petroleum reserves. Let us not for-

get, Mr. Speaker, that this area was the home to al-Qaeda operatives prior to 9/11.

So I am here today to voice my unwavering support for the Department of Homeland Security, to create a new urban area for Palm Beach and Broward Counties. I am speaking for my constituents and will continue to do so until this outrageous offense is resolved.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4548, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 686 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 686

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4548) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2005 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PENCE). The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday the Committee on Rules met and granted a structured rule for H.R. 4548, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005. This bill would authorize appropriations for the fiscal year for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency retirement and disability system.

□ 1030

This is must-do legislation. It is also the most robust Intelligence Authorization Act the House has ever considered, and it is consistent with the Defense appropriations bill the House passed yesterday by an overwhelming vote of 403 to 17.

The classified annex to the committee report, which includes information on the budget and personnel levels, is available to all Members of the House of Representatives, subject to a requirement of clause 13 of rule XXIII.

This rule permits only those Members of the House who have signed the oath set out in clause 13 of House rule XXIII to have access to the classified information. Simply, this means they must agree not to release the information they see.

Intelligence has been, rightly so, recognized as a critical weapon in the global war on terrorism. Resources for, and demands on, the U.S. intelligence community have increased dramatically in the 2¾ years since September 11, 2001, and the attacks we all remember.

This increase is even more dramatic when one takes into consideration the depth of the cutbacks, underinvestment, and the near fatal loss of political support for the intelligence community in the prior administration.

That is why I am pleased that this bill authorizes more money than last year, even including the supplemental. This is the type of investment that our intelligence community deserves.

This legislation continues the sustained effort and long-term strategy to bring human intelligence, signals intelligence, imagery intelligence, and other intelligence systems and disciplines to life successfully.

H.R. 4548 also continues a similar commitment to build and maintain the analytic expertise and depth of coverage necessary to make wise and timely use of the information collected.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the CIA and all the members of

our intelligence community who do make a vital contribution to our Nation's security.

I agree with President Bush that this is a mission of service and sacrifice in a world of great uncertainty and risk. America's commitments and responsibilities span the world in every time zone. Every day our intelligence community helps us to meet those responsibilities.

This bill provides the President with the intelligence tools needed to win the war on terrorism; and to that end, I urge my colleagues to support the rule.

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

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

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that the American intelligence apparatus is broken is well-known. In the global war on terror, the most important weapon we have to protect the Nation and its people is intelligence. Today, more than ever, we must make the creation of a strong and flexible intelligence apparatus one of the highest priorities of this body. The terrorist attacks of September 11, combined with the continuing threat of further attacks, underscore the importance of this legislation.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the bill reported out of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence falls far short of what our intelligence community has requested and what the American people expect. Now listen up. This bill provides less than a third of the key operational funding the intelligence agencies have told us that they need to prevent the next terrorist attack. The scheme for funding the counterterrorism operations is to give the agencies, listen, I want my colleagues to hear this, they are going to give them a third of the money they need, and then after the election they will come back and ask for the other two-thirds. Does this sound like we are concerned about the intelligence community? Does it sound like we are worried that we are at war? The answer is no. The election is the deciding point on when we come back and ask for the money.

The plan will starve the counterterrorism efforts, leaves the intelligence community anemic. Funding the intelligence community in bits and pieces, a portion now and a supplemental after the election, is not only irresponsible, it is reckless. Senior intelligence community officials have said that operating this way could jeopardize key counterterrorism operations. That is what they tell us.

Sadly, this year the bill fell victim to partisanship and the cold hard fiscal

realities of tax cuts and spending caps. Every single Democrat member voted against favorably reporting this bill, and this is unprecedented. Typically, the importance of this bill trumps personal ideologies or the prevailing partisan winds; but knowing the ranking member and the other Democrat members of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I know that they must have very serious concerns to vote against the authorization bill.

Five dedicated distinguished Democrat members of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, including the gentlewoman from California (Ranking Member HARMAN), offered five important amendments to the bill. However, the Committee on Rules tossed out four of these vital substantive amendments. The Committee on Rules will not allow the full House to consider and debate and amend to withhold a portion of the funding until the Secretary of Defense provides all information concerning the dealings of the Department of Defense and Ahmed Chalabi. This is information to which Congress is entitled. This is information the American people want to know. Who was this man who had such an incredible effect and so much influence on whether or not we went to war? What did we do besides give him \$33 million?

Members will not be able to consider an amendment to restructure our dilapidated intelligence apparatus. Shockingly, the committee Republicans even made out of order an amendment to fully fund American counterterrorism efforts.

Yesterday, a member of the Committee on Rules tried to suggest that the amendments were proposed for political reasons. Far from it. Our Nation's security is at risk, and the integrity of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Democrats, and all Democrats, should not be questioned.

Reported out of committee on party lines, the rule does make in order an amendment to express the sense of Congress and support of the intelligence community and an amendment expressing the sense that the world is a safer place now that Libya has dismantled its weapons of mass destruction. These amendments were presumed to take precedence over the ones that really dealt with the committee and its budget. They do nothing to improve American counterterrorism operations.

Mr. Speaker, this is a seriously, fatally flawed bill; but, again, the Committee on Rules has muzzled debate on some of the most important issues concerning American intelligence operations. This is a double blow. It is another Committee on Rules strike against deliberation, discussion, and serious consideration; and it is a strike against the safety of America.

I am shocked at the rule and the underlying legislation before us this morning, and I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule so that the full House

can participate in a comprehensive debate on the most important issue confronting us today and to consider the vital amendments to improve the intelligence community.

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

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time, and I am glad that we are focusing on this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise as a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, having served in that very distinguished group of bipartisan members concerned about intelligence for 8 years.

I wish to rise in strong support of this bill we are presenting to our colleagues and to the American people, the Intelligence Authorization Act. This is a well-thought-out bill, developed over many months of comprehensive deliberation, which provides much-needed guidance and support for the global, and let me emphasize that, the global war on terrorism and efforts to combat the very real threats to our national security.

We live in a dangerous world. Reminders of that harsh fact of 21st-century life face us on many fronts. Threats that were unimaginable just a few years ago have now become reality. Suicide bombers, anthrax, dirty bombs, these are but a few of the litany of weapons our enemies threaten us with.

To meet this new threat, our Nation requires a much more flexible and responsive intelligence community. H.R. 4548 helps provide that flexibility; and, importantly, it provides the increased funding to aggressively wage war on terrorism. Make no mistake, H.R. 4548 dramatically, let me emphasize that, dramatically increases counterterrorism funding.

As a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence for the 8 years that I have been privileged to serve in that body, one of my greatest concerns has been the lack of sufficient numbers of intelligence analysts and officers fluent in the languages that our enemies speak. This capability deficiency has literally crippled our ability to independently gather and evaluate information. It means that we have increasingly relied on contract linguists and allied intelligence services to translate information and to follow up leads. It means, for example, that there are literally miles and miles of captured Saddam Hussein documents that are still waiting to be read, translated, and made available for our analysis.

We have made substantial investment in technology, and rightly so; but more investment is necessary in human capital, people who serve as our eyes and ears at far distant points on

the globe, and just adding to the numbers in our cadre is not enough by itself. We need individuals who are language proficient and possess an understanding of the culture being penetrated, who know and are able to appreciate not only who was saying what but also are conversant with the nuances and able to discern the true meaning of what is being said.

Of course, particularly in view of my position as chairman of the Committee on Science, I can appreciate the value of investment in technology; but that alone is not enough. There is no substitute for people. A satellite hundreds of miles in the heavens might be able to detect the movement of people or machines, and that is important; but it does not compare in value to someone inside a cell in Iraq or Afghanistan monitoring the words or actions of the bad guys.

For this reason, I have been part of a concerted effort over the past several years to place greater emphasis on and secure needed funds for a significant upgrading of our language program for the intelligence community.

Our committee has put together a broad and comprehensive package of language provisions. We establish a civilian linguistic reserve corps. We fund and expand existing programs that have demonstrated success. We look for creative ways to develop and utilize the vast talent pool that already exists in our country. We support the National Virtual Translation Center; and perhaps most importantly, we try to establish a culture in the intelligence community where language skills become an integral and necessary part of the job. It is the most important legislative effort on foreign languages since the Boren Act of 1992.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4548 is a worthy bill. It takes many of the necessary steps to ensure that our Nation's intelligence capabilities remain relevant in the 21st century. The gentleman from Florida (Chairman Goss) is bringing forward an excellent package in what is his final authorization as chairman. He has performed exceptionally well during particularly challenging times, and he has presented us with a bill that all Members can and should support.

I urge support of the rule and the base bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), the ranking member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership on the Committee on Rules and for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and to the previous question, which I understand will be offered, because it deprives our colleagues of the opportunity to strengthen the Intelligence Authorization Act.

Strong intelligence is our first line of defense in the war on terrorism; and make no mistake, we are at war. The gruesome beheadings of Danny Pearl, Nick Berg, Paul Johnson, and yesterday's murder of 33-year-old Kim Sun Il of South Korea are stark reminders of the nature of our enemy. Our brave men and women of the intelligence community are on the frontlines fighting that enemy.

□ 1045

They risked their lives for our freedom, and they deserve our unflinching support. Yet, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this rule deprives them of that support.

H.R. 4548 provides less than one-third of the key counterterrorism funding the intelligence community has told us it needs to fight the war on terrorism. Less than one-third. Members of our committee had proposed an amendment to fully fund counterterrorism operations. This rule denies us the opportunity to consider that amendment.

I think it is irresponsible of us to shortchange our counterterrorism efforts, particularly when we know al-Qaeda and other terrorist groups are planning attacks against us right now. By providing one-third of the counterterrorism funding, the majority's bill essentially says to the brave men and women of the intelligence community, you can count on operations for 3 or 4 more months, but after that, that is rough, until next April. That, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what this bill does, and that is not acceptable.

A better rule, a much better rule would have allowed the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL), and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER) of our committee to fix this bill with an amendment that would have provided for 100 percent of the funding that the intelligence agencies say they need. Their amendment would have done away with the dangerous practice of budgeting by supplemental, of saying let us kick this problem down the road. And in this case, let us kick it down the road until well after the November election.

A rule limiting amendments may be appropriate for other legislation, but this legislation is different, and here is why. As you know, Mr. Speaker, much of our work is classified and, therefore, is not discussed in the open. However, a large portion of our work on the intelligence policy is unclassified and is contained in the public portion of our legislation. This information does not compromise our intelligence sources and methods, and for that reason we asked the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Goss) to hold the markup of the public portion of our bill in public.

On a party-line vote, the majority refused. Therefore, these amendments have never been debated or voted on in public, even though they are not classified and even though they would, if adopted, be part of the public part of our bill.

Mr. Speaker, there is no secret law in the United States, and it is anathema to this House to stifle open debate about important policy issues. For that reason, it is important that the full House have the opportunity to debate these amendments. This rule kills that debate, shuts down any effort to fully fund counterterrorism, and tries to sweep this issue under the rug. Well, this issue is too important, too vital to our national security to be swept under the rug.

The Democrats on the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence offered five amendments, all of which were good, all of which would have strengthened the bill and strengthened our oversight. All but one were rejected by this rule. That is a shame, Mr. Speaker, because instead of having a rule that could bring us together under one bipartisan banner, we have a rule that ensures this bill will trigger a bitter partisan divide.

In case the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Goss) and the Republicans have not noticed, the terrorists did not check our party labels before launching their attacks against us on 9/11, and they will not check them when they launch the next attack. I would have hoped that we could debate the bill not just as Democrats and Republicans, but as Americans. And for the sake of the country and for the sake of national security, I am sorry that the majority let us down.

Again, I ask for a "no" vote on the rule and a "no" vote on the previous question.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD).

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

As a member of the committee now for 6 years, I want to say a special word of thanks to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Goss). This will be the last bill that he will present to the House of Representatives, as he is retiring from the House at the end of this year.

It is a great, great loss for the House of Representatives. I know it is a great loss for the people of Florida, who he represents, and it truly is a great loss for the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the intelligence community. As someone who served in the CIA prior to coming to the House of Representatives, he has done as good a job as anyone on the committee, and certainly been an exemplary Chair of the committee. We all owe him a great debt of gratitude for the time and energy and devotion that he has given to the intelligence community, to the CIA, to people, men and women, all over the world who work so hard to collect the information and do the good professional work. He has been dedicated to them, he has been dedicated for them. And so I say congratulations to PORTER GOSS, and I think all House Members should do that for the work

that he has done for the House and for the intelligence community.

As we debate the bill, I will obviously be speaking out on a number of things that I think are important, but let me just say this: I think it is unfortunate that bipartisanship has deteriorated. It no longer exists with this committee. Maybe our committee was the last bastion of bipartisanship, but apparently it is gone. And I think it really began a year ago when we considered our authorization bill.

I introduced into the record and put into the record a memo that came over from the other body that talked about a game plan on the part of the Democrats to politicize the intelligence process, not only in this body but also in the other body. And I am going to put that memo in the record again this year, because I think it was the beginning of the deterioration of bipartisanship for intelligence. That is unfortunate and sends the wrong message.

Congratulations PORTER GOSS, we have a good bill, and I hope all Members will support it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I find this rule very disappointing. It effectively shuts down debate on an amendment to fully fund the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence's key counterterrorism operations. It is unusual for me to speak out like this, but 4 or 5 weeks ago it hit me, the current intelligence authorization bill that we are going to consider today is just not strong enough. It authorizes less than a third of the funds that the intelligence agencies need for key counterterrorism operations next year. That is just not right at a time when our Nation is under threat of terrorist attacks.

The administration admits that this is not sufficient funding, and says it will seek more money after November. But there is ample evidence that al-Qaeda may try to strike before November. If there is another terrorist attack, do we want the next 9-11 Commission to find that we in Congress failed in our duty to fully fund counterterrorism in the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence?

We sit there day in and day out in closed session, windowless rooms, for hours on end listening to the intelligence agencies tell us how critical the funds are that the committee authorizes. They routinely criticize the practice of funding them in these small bits and pieces rather than in a full year, the way we are supposed to do it. They have told us how this prevents them from planning effectively, and they have told us they have to rob Peter to pay Paul while they wait for the additional funds to arrive. And they will probably not receive those additional funds that they need until April or May of next year, if at all.

This ridiculous practice of short-changing intelligence at the start of the year has also been roundly criticized on a bipartisan basis by members of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. The agencies have indicated with some precision the additional funds that they will need in the coming year for counterterrorism. There is no excuse for failing to make sure that the intelligence community has the resources it needs to protect against the next terrorist attack.

The amendment that I had intended to offer would have fully funded key counterterrorism operations in the next year for the agencies, as they have said they need them, 100 percent of the funding. And we had a detailed schedule of authorization to specify how the money should be spent. So this was not a blank check, as some have said.

The question before Congress is quite simple: Do we fully fund the global war on terrorism or do we want to take the chance that our intelligence community can make due until sometime next year? As it stands now, it is clear what the majority's answer is to this question. And with this rule the majority has made clear that they do not want to debate this issue. That is just not right, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), another member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

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

Mr. BURR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding me this time, and I thank both my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

The Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is a unique committee. We are selected by the leadership, we are asked to serve, we are asked to uphold the secrecy and the confidentiality of what goes on in that committee, and we are asked to reassure the Members of the House that do not have the type of access that we do that we are in fact doing our job. So let me assure every Member, Republican and Democrat, we are doing our job.

There is a difference today, and I do not hold the individuals on the other side of the aisle responsible. I think the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) put it well, politics is alive and well in Washington. It is an election year, and I think that strings are getting pulled. And I make a pledge to the Members on that side of the aisle: That when this bill has passed, and I hope you vote for it on final passage, that we will work together in that committee. We will make sure that the tools are available to our intelligence community. We will make sure that the workings and the oversight are good enough that we can look our fellow Members in the eye and say we are doing our job.

But I think today we need to look back at why we are here. Sure, we are here because of the intelligence threat that exists today and the need for intelligence to grow, but we are here because of the devastation to the intelligence community in the 1990s. We are here because human intelligence was not important to anybody in this town. We are, in fact, trying to rebuild. And when I heard Director Tenet stand up in front of the independent commission and talk about 5 years, here was a man being honest at what it took to recruit people that could infiltrate; that we could take individuals who could fluently speak Arabic.

We have to remember that we went from a Cold War need for linguistics, which was Russia and Eastern Europe, to now a need for Arabic and a lot of different tribal languages that exist, and you cannot do it overnight and you cannot do it for no money. The reality is that both sides suggest funding levels at about the same, and that is above where the administration's request was. We have differences on how we get here. That is leadership and it is politics mixed in with it.

I am confident we can put politics aside and we can get passed not only this rule debate but the debate on the bill. Because the important thing is that our intelligence community knows that this Congress is united. We are united behind them, we are united behind the effort, we understand the value of what they do as it relates to the safety of the troops that we have who defend this country every day.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to also highlight the leadership of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Goss). This will be a tremendous loss to the Congress, the entire Congress. The dedication of this man, the leadership, his experience and what he has brought to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is invaluable. I am sure his years of community service are not over with his decision to leave Congress. But with him we lose a tremendous resource in our ability to understand and to become better in the world as it relates to our intelligence.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me this time, and I rise today to support my colleagues, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) particularly, in opposition to the rule that shuts off debate on fully funding the intelligence community's counterterrorism operations. I do this reluctantly, and I do not do this very often.

I want to say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that this should have been the opportunity for us to fully debate this issue, because there is no real debate as to whether this bill, when we get to the bill, provides full funding to the intelligence community for this global war on terrorism. We all

know that this bill does not do that, and we have fallen into the trap ourselves. We are perpetuating the trap of continuing to fund the intelligence community in fits and starts, in bits and pieces.

The war in Iraq, as difficult as it is, is a war. The war on global terrorism, as unpredictable as it is, is a real war. Every day we are faced with warnings, with threats that we are going to be attacked, soon, between now and the elections.

□ 1100

Every administration, or at least the past several administrations, have fallen into this trap of using supplementals as a way to slowly but surely face the budget issues that we have to face. We are saying here today that we want to stop that, that we want to break that habit, that we want to up front tell the agencies what they will get and let them then tell us what they need so we can perform our oversight.

This is not a partisan issue. Both sides of the aisle have admitted through the hearing process, this year, last year as well, that we have got to stop this practice. The administration says this is not enough money this year; that later, whatever "later" means, we will get to the point where we will get to more funding.

This is not the way to do it. So today we must send a clear message that "business as usual" is no longer acceptable. Today we must put politics aside and do what is right for our intelligence community and for our national security. Today we must make sure the intelligence community has the resources it needs.

Oppose this rule.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the committee, obviously I follow these things very closely, and I wish to point out to all my colleagues that the other body, their version of this bill closely mirrors ours, but is less generous, and that bill passed the other body by a unanimous vote, minority and majority. They are following our lead. I would suggest that we should evidence that same spirit of bipartisanship in this body.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL).

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

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her hard work, and I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) for her hard work.

Mr. Speaker, I did take some notice of my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD). I appreciated his remarks about the gentleman from Florida (Chairman Goss). I agree. I think he has done an

excellent job. But none of us are perfect. I think there was an exception here. I actually thought that he would plus-up this counterterrorism budget.

But here we are, and I rise to oppose the rule on the Intelligence Authorization Act. In particular, I am surprised that a number of Democratic amendments were ruled out of order, notably those of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), mine and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER), which would fully fund the counterterrorism budget needs of the intelligence agencies.

I wish the Republicans had been willing to debate this issue head on, rather than hide behind a procedure.

As the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) has pointed out, the current bill authorizes less than one-third of the funds the intelligence agencies need to fight the war on terrorism. The intelligence agencies will have a tough time accomplishing their mission if they do not receive full funding for the counterterrorism operations.

At CIA, these funds do not go to the paper clips and photocopiers. They go towards mounting counterterrorism operations on every continent. They go towards collecting information on preventing terrorist attacks. They go towards funding operations in Afghanistan, to prevent resurgence of the terrorist sanctuaries in the remote mountains. They go towards working with partner governments on counterterrorism. They go towards capturing key al Qaeda leaders.

When there is uncertainty about funding, according to the agencies' testimony, it causes the agencies to hold off on operations, potentially putting lives in danger and ruining intelligence collection operations.

The administration officials have admitted they are not fully funding counterterrorism in this bill, but will send a request for the rest of the funds after the election, while at the same time urgently warning of a possible terrorist attack before the election. I say to my good friends and colleagues here today, what should the American people expect us to do? Is it acceptable to wait until after the election, when we already know what we need to do?

No, it is not acceptable. The American people expects us to debate these issues fully and openly and not hide behind procedures. If, as the administration officials keep warning us, there is a terrorist attack on the U.S. this summer, my colleagues in the majority will wish they had debated and settled the Peterson amendment, rather than squashing the debate. We will all wish that we had acted and fully funded counterterrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I fully urge the rejection of this rule, so that the important issues like the shortfall for counterterrorism in this bill can be properly debated.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule, and I thank my friend from North Carolina for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that obviously we are praising the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) in light of the fact that this is going to be the last intelligence authorization bill that he will be presiding over before his retirement from this institution.

We had a very interesting discussion in the Committee on Rules yesterday about this issue of funding. As I listened to my friend from Iowa speaking about the fact that if we possibly saw another terrorist attack on the United States, we would all bemoan the fact we have not provided adequate funding, it seems to me that the statement that was made by the chairman of the Intelligence Committee yesterday before the Committee on Rules is a very important one to note. He is not concerned about the issue of funding, he is actually concerned about the management of the level of funding that we have right now. This view that all you need to do is throw a tremendous amount of money at a problem and that somehow is a panacea, that it is an insurance policy, is, I think, unfounded.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is very important for us to note that the proper management over this program is the most important thing for us to do now, because we do feel that there is an adequate level of funding. So I strongly support this rule, I strongly support the underlying bill, so that we can come and work in a bipartisan way for what we all want to do, and that is ensure, ensure, that we never see another September 11, 2001, on our soil.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

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

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in congratulating the chairman, who has served so honorably as a Member of the House and for all of these years as chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and wish him our absolute best.

I join my colleagues today in standing up in support of stronger intelligence. That is what this debate is about.

This bill is simply too weak and dangerously underfunds the intelligence efforts that are so absolutely essential to preventing the next big terrorist attack. Every American will understand that 100 percent is 100 percent. You cannot be committed 100 percent to funding if you only fund 33 percent, one-third, of the entire counterterrorism budget.

Opponents of the amendment to fully fund counterterrorism intelligence throw around a lot of numbers to try to argue that the level of funding in this bill is adequate. But you need to know only one thing: The President knows this is not enough funding, and said in his transmittal letter of May 12 of this year that he will ask for the rest of the money "in early 2005." That is an admission that this is not fully funded, and that is what we are debating.

The problem is the terrorists are not waiting until early 2005. There are indications that they plan to conduct a major attack inside the United States before the end of the year, according to administration officials. The CIA cannot wait until early 2005 to plan its operations to prevent that next attack.

Senior officials testified repeatedly to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence that the practice of funding counterterrorism by supplemental makes it impossible for them to plan, this is what they said to all of the members of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and it forces them to rob Peter to pay Paul in an effort to make due.

Does this body really want to make the men and women of the intelligence community make do when so much is at stake? They are the tip of the spear. We have to give them the resources they need. It is our job now, not in early 2005.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I think it is ironic, some people up here on the floor say we are not spending enough. They have never served in the military. They vote to cut defense.

The last speaker, the gentlewoman from California, in 1993, the Frank amendment to cut Intel funding, she voted yes; in 1996, the Frank amendment to cut Intel funding, she voted yes; in 1998, the Iraq Liberalization Act, regime change, she voted yes; in 2002, authorization for military force, she voted no; in 2003, Iraq supplemental appropriations, she voted no; in 2003, intelligence authorization, to increase funding, she voted no.

This is a sad day, Mr. Speaker. I have got some very good friends on this committee. Some of them I hunt and fish with. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), during the Ronald Reagan funeral, I had tears in my eyes. She reached over and grabbed my hand to console me.

That is the kind of friendship that we have on this committee, and I think one of the saddest things I see is the partisanship coming out in election-year politicking. We will still be friends after this. You say, oh, this is not partisan. That is the spin. But it is, Mr. Speaker. It is sad, and I hate to see it.

All the way through, you have people that have fought the Republican Party

on prescription drugs, Leave No Child Behind, energy, tax relief, the environment. You think the Republicans are the meanest people in the whole world, no matter what we do. But never before on this bill has it been so partisan, and I think it is sad, a sad day on this House floor, and election year politics.

I think when you look at yesterday's vote on defense appropriations, which is the authorization for this bill, most of my colleagues voted for that. That was less funding than this. The Senate has less funding in the bill. But what our great chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) did, is restrict some of the flow of the funding. We have taken and analyzed and cut a lot of waste, fraud and abuse out of every bill, defense, education, all these bills, and we have put the money to good use.

I think it is even sadder right now that we have got folks that choose to go along with their Democrat leadership. When you all elected your liberal Democrat leadership, we rejoiced, because we know there is a bill to cut the tax break for the rich in the next Bill, and we knew exactly what was going to happen to show the differences between Republicans and Democrats from your liberal leadership. But what is sad is how that leadership is driving some of the good people within your party to be partisan, and I think that is even sadder.

The defense authorization, I sat clear through that thing, and the gentleman that is filing ethics violations, that is leaving this body this year, filing ethics violations, demanded he see the Taguba report. Well, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) just so happened to have it on the desk. And, guess what, that individual has not even read the report.

There are 11 investigations going on. The Ronald Reagan event stopped hearings. There has never been a hearing that any member of this committee has asked for that we have not gotten, whether it is on Chalabi, whether it is on the prisons, or whether it is on other issues within that party.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is one of the most bipartisan chairmen, and I think the gentlewoman from California would agree.

Mr. Speaker, I also sit on the Defense Authorization Committee, and one of the liberal members said, "Well, we want the Secretary of Defense to step down." He said, "You know, I pray for you every day, Mr. Secretary. You are a good, respected man, but maybe you ought to step down." And I told the Secretary, next time someone prays for me, I hope they are not trying to put a knife in my back in the partisanship that is going on.

I think it is sad here today, we hunt and fish together, we are friends. But this is wrong. Vote for this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time to rise in opposition to this rule.

First let me just say that like all of us in this House that represent communities around this great Nation of ours, I am proud of the job that our men and women are doing in the war against terrorism, whether they are in the military, whether they are in the intelligence community or civilians.

□ 1115

I am a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and a veteran. But to me, today, the issue is about oversight and about funding the effort.

I think debate is healthy. I think we should exchange ideas and, yes, maybe even political philosophies from time to time. We go to the intelligence community and we ask them, what is it that you need? How much money will it take to get the job done? They tell us, they give us a budget, they give us a proposal; and then we come back and say, we can only give you 33 percent of that money. Do they give us 33 percent effort? No. They give us 100 percent, so we should fund them at 100 percent.

So why are we doing that? I am sure that our men and women that are putting their lives on the line are asking that very same question: Why? To them, it is not about politics, it is not about budgets, it is not about deficits, or even supplementals. To them, it is about support for their effort. To them, it is about funding that effort at 100 percent, and not giving them 33 percent and an IOU or a check-is-in-the-mail promise. It is about support for our men and women in an effort that is very important to our country.

Mr. Speaker, we can do better, we must do better; and, most of all, to the men and women of this body, we must do our job.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I support the rule, and I support the bill and the fine work of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), the chairman of our committee; and I am certain that sometime today we are going to hear more about Abu Ghraib prison. I want to put things in context about the politics of what this town has become.

Mr. Speaker, I stand amazed and disappointed in the self-righteous, politically motivated diatribes coming from the other side about Abu Ghraib for the last several months. The guilty parties in the Abu Ghraib prison incidents are currently before the military justice system. They will be tried and justice will be carried out.

This House, the other body, the President, the Vice President, the Secretaries of Defense and State, and the National Security Adviser have all gone on record to express outrage over the abuses at the prison, as they should have.

But what I find especially appalling is the deafening silence from the other

side following the savage beheadings of American civilians Nick Berg and Paul Johnson.

These cowardly terrorist organizations seek to intimidate our people through barbaric acts of demonic cruelty on American citizens.

While members on the other side have mentioned Abu Ghraib by name, 45 times since January during recorded debate on the House Floor, only four times did a Democratic member utter the name Nick or Nicholas Berg. No Democrat, not one single Democrat, has even mentioned Paul Johnson, the Lockheed Martin employee kidnapped in Saudi Arabia, cruelly beheaded, and videotaped for the world to see.

We are a self-policing society. We will punish those who commit abuses at Abu Ghraib. However, I would expect the Democrats in this body to express equal outrage over the savage killings of Nick Berg and Paul Johnson.

I urge my Democratic colleagues to break their silence and end their indifference to the atrocious acts of cruelty perpetrated on innocent Americans.

Too many are playing politics with Abu Ghraib, trying to score political points, while we have 200,000 troops fighting the war on terror and standing strong for America in the Middle East and Central Asia.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am stunned at what the previous speaker has just said. What does he mean that no Democrat has expressed any outrage? Has the gentleman polled every Democrat in the country? Does he know that no Democrat has expressed outrage over the beheading of American citizens?

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will yield, not spoken on this floor. Not spoken on this floor. Not a word entered into the RECORD. I have checked with the Parliamentarian and the Clerk, not one mention of those names.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, let me reclaim my time. I just think that is an outrageous statement to make, and I do not believe that anybody in America is going to be impressed by that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER).

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the rule on the fiscal year 2005 Intelligence Authorization Act. In response to some of the comments made by our colleagues on the other side, let me just make this statement: this issue is not about politics; it is about national security.

Now, it is important in our work here in the House that we put America first. Equally important is a focus on ensuring that the men and women protecting us in the intelligence agencies and in the military have all the support and resources that they need.

I am surprised that a number of Democratic amendments were ruled out of order, notably the Peterson

amendment which would fully fund the counterterrorism budget needs of the intelligence agencies.

As the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) has pointed out, the current bill authorizes less than a third of the additional funds the intelligence agencies need to fight the war on terrorism. This one-third comes from the contingency emergency reserve fund that the President asked for on May 12, which is designed to bridge the gap between the budget request and a supplemental funding request that will not happen until after the election.

In his May 12 letter to the Speaker, President Bush said, "I have pledged to our troops that we will have all the resources they need to accomplish this vital mission." Yet, the intelligence agencies have told us in hearing after hearing that the current process of funding counterterrorism operations by supplemental has hampered their ability to plan and operate. And despite the President's lofty words, we know that the intelligence troops do not have all of the resources they need to accomplish the counterterrorism mission.

As a former county executive, I can relate to the agency's need to plan right to achieve success, and so I am concerned that these budgeting practices have to stop, for the good of the country and national security.

I was disappointed that the Republican majority on the Committee on Rules did not allow this amendment to come to the floor for debate. This issue needs to be debated. The public needs to know, we need to know, we need to debate this issue of national security.

If, as administration officials keep warning us, there is a terrorist attack this summer, we will all wonder if we could have done more to protect America. The answer to that question today is yes. For one thing, we could be debating the Peterson amendment today and finding a way to get the intelligence agencies the counterterrorism funding that they need.

I urge the rejection of this rule. It is so important that all of our intelligence agencies have the resources they need to deal with the issue of national security.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for allowing me this time to speak.

I do want to begin by giving my great congratulations to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) for tremendous service on this committee and for a tremendous bill which does exactly what this country's intelligence services need. It is actually a bill which should have been bipartisan but, for the first time, was not bipartisan in the committee.

I think I would like to begin with correcting some of the misstatements that have been made on the floor. First of all, this bill fully funds the base amount for every salary paycheck in the intelligence community. Not one intelligence community employee is going to go without a paycheck at the end of 3 months. It is just plain wrong to assert that, and I wanted to correct that.

I also wanted to say that, with regard to the funding of the contingent emergency reserve, this bill sets forth, I believe, the proper oversight for this committee. We have budgeted for one-quarter of the year, authorized for one-quarter of the year in order to give flexibility to the war on terrorism. This is an opportunity for us to exercise our oversight and exercise our oversight by giving smaller slices of the pie so we can control the money, where it is spent and how it is spent in our oversight authority, rather than giving a slush fund out there that can be spent without proper control.

We will fully fund the war on terrorism. I am struck by the dichotomy of each of the previous speakers on the Democratic side who voted yesterday in support of the Defense Appropriation bill which funds the war on terrorism to the same numbers that we have in this bill, and each one of my Democratic colleagues voted "yes," with the exception of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), who was absent.

So to stand here and say that you do not believe we are funding the war on terrorism when you supported the appropriation in the same amount strikes me as one of politics.

The last thing we want to do is have the intelligence community as a political wedge in the war on politics. They do not deserve it. This country does not deserve it. I am concerned that by what we are doing, by issuing these proclamations about not funding the war on terrorism, is giving aid and support to those people who are trying to attack this country.

More fiscal responsibility is certainly in this bill; more oversight by the Congress and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is exactly what this bill will do.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Intelligence, Analysis and Counterintelligence, I wanted to speak briefly about the points that are dealing with the analysis part of this bill because it is so critical and so important. This rule and this bill support the goals that our House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has expressed for years, and that is the importance of a well-trained, professional, and experienced staff.

Like many other components of the intelligence community, analysis is not a capability that can be developed overnight. It takes years of investment in people, technology, and training to create analysts capable of connecting

the dots. Today, with this bill, through this rule, we will have more dots to connect than ever before. We can collect all we want, but if there is nobody to synthesize, analyze, and look at this information and deliver the proper and correct message to our Nation's policymakers, then there is little benefit to this country by standing here and politicizing this bill and the intelligence community over what we are doing.

That is why I am pleased to stand here and support the rule, support this bill, and congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Goss) on what I believe to be a very fair and fundamentally correct bill to fund our intelligence community and to support this country's war on terrorism.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule.

The American public, the citizens of America, are looking to us, to the Congress, to provide oversight over the intelligence community. My colleague, the gentleman from California, said that our committee has never been denied a hearing that we wanted. That may be true if one defines "hearing" very broadly. Yes, members of the intelligence community from the various agencies have come to meet with us; but we never learned, for example, that Mr. Rumsfeld actually approved ghost detainees, detainees who would be kept out of the system. We never really got level answers about the search for weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. It is a long, long list of things that we have been denied because we just did not ask exactly the right question.

The debate this morning is not about how many billions of dollars precisely will be added to the counterterrorism budget; it is whether they are going to present the budget to us in such a way that it is impossible for the committee to exercise oversight. That is what is at issue. By funding these programs through supplemental appropriations rather than through the normal appropriations process with authorization oversight, they dodge responsibility. They dodge the oversight. That is what is at stake here today. That is what this rule is denying, the American public the oversight that they expect, that they need for our national security, denying that that will be carried out by the committee.

So we are talking about a much more fundamental, longer-term issue; and for that reason, this rule is very flawed and should be opposed.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON); and, I might add, she is the only female military officer in this body.

□ 1130

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from North Carolina for the time.

I rise to support this rule today. I have listened to this debate with some concern because I think there are things being said that just are not being straight with people. I want to talk about two of them in particular.

The first has to do with the funding levels that are authorized in this bill. The truth is here in the Congress, we have an arcane way of doing things some times. We have an authorizing bill that really sets the programs and the outlines of the programs that we intend to fund. But the money, the real money is put in the defense appropriations bill that we passed overwhelmingly yesterday from this House with what we call an open rule, which means anyone can come down this floor and move to change money around or increase counterterrorism funding. If one was serious about this, that is where the real money was, in the defense appropriations bill.

So what we hear this morning is more about posturing and politics than it is about policy. And that is really sad on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence that heretofore has been absent that kind of discussion.

And the second thing I wanted to raise is this issue of vigorous oversight. I have been an advocate for vigorous oversight in a wide variety of things. And I have been one of the principal advocates in the Committee on Armed Services for greater oversight of the Pentagon, including of Abu Ghraib, and cosponsored an amendment to do so with my colleague the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

In this Congress, there are some committees that are vigorous about it and some that are not. I served on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence a couple of Congresses ago, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is one that is. Its members work very hard, ask tough questions. Many of them are when the cameras are off, and that is the way it has to be. But I am also particularly pleased at their openness to non-members of the committee participating in that process.

I have, from time to time, requested special briefings and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has made that possible for me. No other committee in the House tends to be so open to that on the part of non-members.

The structure of this bill encourages the continued vigorous oversight by the Congress of expenditure in the intelligence world. This is the kind of bill that we should be proud of as a Congress, as an example of vigorous oversight of one branch of government over another. We have to rebuild our intelligence services, particularly human intelligence and analysis. But this is too important to make a partisan issue.

After this is all over today, I hope that my colleagues will reconsider their decision to inject partisanship

and election year politics into the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. It has always been above that and, for the good of the Nation, should remain above that.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I will close. I urge Members to vote no on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow the House to vote on a critical amendment that was defeated on a straight party line vote last night at the Committee on Rules.

The amendment by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) would fully fund the counterterrorism needs of the intelligence community by increasing by 100 percent the funds authorized in the contingency emergency reserve. What many Members may not realize is that the President's budget request covered just a fraction of the intelligence community's counterterrorism requirements, less than a third. They say the rest of the funds will be requested only after the November election.

Well, the Nation's intelligence agencies have indicated that they need additional funds and the Peterson amendment will make sure that they receive them now, not after November elections.

Mr. Speaker, fighting terrorism is not now and has never been a partisan issue. After 9/11, Republicans and Democrats stood side by side on the steps of the Capitol united in our effort to root out terrorists and to keep America safe. It is hard for me to understand why Republicans would now actively work to keep the House from adequately funding the counterterrorism efforts.

The intelligence bill has long been considered in this House under an open rule. Any Member who wished to bring an amendment to the floor could do so, but last year things began to change. Republicans started to pass rules that restricted amendments, that allowed them to pick and choose which amendments could be debated in the floor of the House. This year they have taken it too far.

The Peterson amendment is far too important not to be considered and is far too important to be subject to petty partisan games. It deserves a separate vote here on the floor today.

So I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to vote no on the previous question. Let me make it very clear that a no vote will not stop the House from taking up the intelligence bill and will not prevent any of the amendments made in order from being offered. However, a yes vote will mean that the House will not have the opportunity to fully fund the Nation's counterterrorism needs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to remind my colleagues in closing that there is more money in this bill than ever before. There is more money for counterterrorism than ever before. And whatever is needed will be provided, as always been the manner of this House and the other body to do.

I want to close by thanking the gentleman from Florida (Chairman GOSS) because he has always worked in a very bipartisan manner on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, which all of us appreciate greatly, and with his background in intelligence, of course, that has been extremely important to have him there. We are going to miss him greatly, both as a chairman and as a long-serving, well respected Member of Congress from Florida.

So we wish him only the best as he goes on whatever new challenges he may take on.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this structured rule, and thank my friend and colleague from the Rules Committee, Mrs. MYRICK, for yielding me this time.

H. Res. 686 is a structured rule that provides for the consideration of H.R. 4548, the FY2005 Intelligence Authorization Act of 2005. It is a fair and balanced rule that deserves the support of the House. It makes in order a total of ten (10) separate amendments to the underlying bill, three from members of the minority and the remainder from members of the majority. These ten amendments were more than half of the 18 amendments submitted to the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of the underlying measure, H.R. 4548, which authorizes funding for critical intelligence programs for FY2005.

I want to commend Chairman GOSS for bringing this legislation to the floor. As Chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence for the past eight years, the gentleman from Sanibel, Florida has served this country with honor, integrity, and distinction.

His tenure has been marked by a tireless effort to improve and reform our nation's intelligence capabilities. He has never wavered in his steadfast desire to invest in this critical government function, and while there is still work to be done, his leadership has helped the intelligence community deal with a turbulent global environment.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4548 provides the tools necessary for a strong and effective U.S. intelligence mission as we wage a war against terrorism.

Intelligence efforts serve as the first line of defense against terrorism and oppression. Without a strong commitment to this effort, our freedoms and this democracy are vulnerable to the fear and terror of others.

It is incumbent on us to ensure that the blessings of liberty afforded to the citizens of this great nation are preserved under any possible means. By passing H.R. 4548, we are

upholding this intention. As such, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 686.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR H. RES. 686—RULE ON H.R. 4548 INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FY 2005

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

“SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution the amendment specified in section 3 shall be in order as though printed after the amendment numbered 1 in the report of the Committee on Rules if offered by Representative Peterson of Minnesota or a designee. That amendment shall be debatable for 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

SEC. 3. The amendment referred to in section 2 is as follows:

At the end of title I, insert the following new section:

SEC. 105. INCREASE IN AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS TO FULLY FUND THE NATIONAL FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM.

The amounts authorized to be appropriated under section 101 for the conduct of the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the elements listed in such section for the Contingency Emergency Reserve, as specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102, are increased 100 percent.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later in the day.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2004, PART III

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4635) to provide an extension of highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a law reauthorizing the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century.