on the bill (H.R. 1555) to authorize ap-
propriations for fiscal year 2000 for in-
telligence and intelligence-related ac-
tivities of the United States Govern-
ment, the Community Management Ac-
count, and the Central Intelligence
Agency Retirement and Disability Sys-
tem, and for other purposes, and ask for
its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The
clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:
The committee on conference on the dis-
agreeing votes of the two Houses on the
amending Member Dixon to the bill, H.R.
1555, have agreed to recommend and do rec-
ommend to their respective Houses this re-
port, signed by a majority of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without
objection, the Senate will proceed to the
consideration of the conference re-
port.

(The Conference report is printed in the
House proceedings of the RECORD of
November 5, 1999).

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask
unanimous consent that there be 80
minutes for debate with the time di-
vided as follows: Forty minutes equally
divided between the chairman and vice
chairman of the Intelligence Com-
mittee; 20 minutes under the control of
Senator LIECHTENSTEIN.

I further ask unanimous consent that
following the use or yielding back of
time, which we anticipate, the con-
ference report be agreed to, the motion
to reconsider be laid upon the table,
and any additional statements relating to
the conference report be printed in the
RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without
objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise
today to ask that my colleagues sup-
port the conference report on the Intel-
ligence Authorization Act for Fiscal
Year 2000.

I want to thank my colleagues in the
House for their work on this legislation and especially Chairman Goss and
Ranking Member Waxman for their lead-
ership in the conference.

I believe that the conference com-
mittee put together a solid package for
consideration by the full Senate that
fairly represents the intelligence prior-
ities set forth in both the Senate and
House versions of the Intelligence Au-
thorization Act.

I am pleased to report that the con-
ference committee accomplished its
task in a bipartisan manner, and I
want to thank my colleague from Ne-
braska, Senator Kerrey, for working so
closely with me to produce this con-
ference report.

I believe that the conference report
embraces many of the key rec-
ommendations that the Senate adopted
in its version of the bill.

We recommended significant in-
creases in funding for high-priority
projects aimed at better positioning the
Intelligence Community for the
threats of the 21st century, while at
the same time reducing funds for pro-
gerated projects and activities that
were not adequately justified or redundant.

In doing so, we authorized a mod-
erate increase in overall funding for in-
telligence programs above the Presi-
dent’s request. This is a positive step.
I believe that the adminis-
tration will follow our lead and begin to
reinvest in our intelligence gath-
ering capabilities.

The conference report includes key
initiatives that I believe are vital for
the future of our Intelligence Commu-
nity.

These initiatives include:
1. bolstering advanced research and
development across the Community, to
facilitate, among other things, the
modemization of NSA and CIA;
2. strengthening efforts in counter-
proliferation, counter-terrorism, coun-
ter-narcotics, counter-intel-
ligence, and effective covert action;
3. expanding the collection and ex-
ploration of measurements and signa-
tures intelligence, especially ballistic
missile intelligence;
4. boosting education, recruiting, and
technical training for Intelligence
Community personnel;
5. enhancing analytical capabilities;
6. streamlining dissemination of in-
telligence products;
7. developing our ability to process,
exploit and disseminate commercial
imageries; and
8. providing new tools for informa-
tion operations.

I believe that the conferees have pro-
vided the funds and guidance necessary
to ensure that military commanders
and national policymakers continue to
receive timely, accurate information
on threats to our security.

At the same time, we have found
some critical areas within the Commu-
nity that are in need of major improve-
ments.

In the Senate, we had a distinguished
panel of Americans with a broad range
of expertise—our Technical Advisory
Group—that took a look at some key
areas within the Intelligence Commu-
nity and brought forward some very
important recommendations.

We thank all the members of the
Technical Advisory Group for their
time and efforts.

I will briefly summarize some of the
findings, to the extent that I can in
open session, along with some of the
other findings of our conference.

First, our ability to collect and ana-
lyze information on the proliferation of
weapon systems that could be used for
mass destruction requires renewed emphasis and innovative thinking.

As our potential enemies seek out
the ability to produce chemical, bio-
logical, and nuclear weapons, we must
continue to develop the ability to detect these ef-
forts.

Second, both the House and Senate
Intelligence Committees agree that our
Intelligence Community and our De-
fense Department must move quickly
to address what our Technical Advi-
sory Group identifies as a critical need.
In our assessment, the Defense De-
partment must move quickly to develop
properly integrated task, process, exploit, and disseminate
intelligence information collection by our
airborne and overhead imagery as-
sets.

As we modernize our Imagery
Intelligence or IMINT architecture, the In-
telligence and Armed Services Com-
mittees agree that we should not be
spending the taxpayers money on col-
collection architectures that we may not
be able to utilize fully.

Third, we have once again placed
strong emphasis on recapitalizing the
National Security Agency’s informa-
tion technology infrastructure.

As we demand more from our In-
telligence Community, our number of
areas, we also demand fiscal responsi-
bility. The conference report includes a
number of reductions to programs that
were not adequately justified or were
redundant with other elements within
the Intelligence Community.

The legislation contains some impor-
tant new authorities for the Intel-
ligence Community. I’ll mention some of
the highlights:

First, there are new protections for
the identities of former covert agents
and for the operational files of the Na-
tional Imagery and Mapping Agency or
‘NIMA.’

Second, there are new counterintel-
ligence authorities—these include pro-
visions allowing access to government
computers used in classified work by
executive branch employees. Also,
there are new requirements for the FBI
to begin its consultation with agencies
that they are investigating at a far
earlier stage than before.

Third, we have established a commis-
sion to study the role and missions of the
National Reconnaissance Office or
‘NRO.’ This commission will look at
the NRO from top to bottom—its find-
ings and recommendations to us and
the Senate Armed Services Committee
will serve to guide our committees on
the future funding and operations of the
NRO.

I look forward to working with the
chairman and ranking member of the
Senate Armed Services Committee to
ensure that the best candidates are
selected for membership on this very
important commission.

Any Member of the Senate wishes
to review the classified portions of the
bill, they are available off the Senate
floor.

Finally, Mr. President, there is a sig-
nificant piece of legislation in this bill
that is intended to go after foreign
international drug traffickers and
those that support their illicit activi-
ties.
Title eight of this bill, the so-called "Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Designation Act," is modeled after the Executive Order that targets the assets of foreign drug trafficking organizations. I have placed significant emphasis on counter-narcotics in this and every Intelligence Authorization bill since I became Chairman of this Committee. The record is clear.

The existing Colombian program has been highly successful. I would be the first to support the President if he chose to expand the program in a thoughtful and measured way. In fact, the Chief Executive already has the constitutional and statutory authority to do so. The President does not need this legislation to expand the scope of this program.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I, along with other Members of Congress, have expressed coal and with this legislation because it may have some very serious unintended consequences for innocent American citizens.

Although the express language of the "Kingpin" legislation deals exclusively with foreign persons and entities, it will affect American citizens. Lurking within the seemingly innocuous language is the real possibility of unwitting and innocent American citizens being caught up in its global net. For example, an American business owner may be a joint venture partner with a foreign company that has been designated as "supporting" the activities of a foreign narcotics trafficker. Although the American person may be completely unaware of the illicit activities of their foreign partner, their own assets will also be blocked if they are jointly held.

The "Kingpin" legislation does not provide an opportunity for an American person to seek judicial review of the blocking of their jointly held assets. The result is that Americans may be deprived of their property without due process of law. Let me repeat that, Mr. President, Americans may be deprived of their property without due process of law... and what no just government should refuse, or rest on inference," Mr. President, I also believe that our right to due process should not "rest on inference," but rather we should state it clearly and without equivocation. We do not do that in this bill.

Mr. President, I fear that in our earnest to pass a "tough drug bill" we may have sacrificed part of our freedom. I applaud the sponsors and proponents of this bill for their dedication to protecting our shores from the scourge of drug trafficking, but, however, that their enthusiasm may be dampened as the true implications of this legislation become known.

Notwithstanding my concerns, I am encouraged that the conference did agree to include a provision in the so-called "Kingpin" legislation that creates a panel to study whether these kinds of sanction regimes affect U.S. persons doing legitimate business with foreign partners, and whether there are adequate and fair remedies for honest U.S. persons.

I commend my colleague from Nebraska, Senator Kerrey, for suggesting this study and also for other areas of leadership on which I have worked with the Senator during my tenure on the Intelligence Committee. He will be leaving the Intelligence Committee at the end of this year whenever his term is up, and we will miss him because he has certainly been a friend, but he has also been a leader to put America's national security and foremost everywhere it comes up.

In my opinion, we have put the cart squarely before the horse dealing with due process. I am confident that such a panel as I alluded to earlier will confirm my concerns and the concerns of others and make substantive recommendations that my well-meaning colleagues will ultimately acknowledge and I hope will be accepted.

The conference committee worked closely together in a bipartisan fashion to produce the comprehensive intelligence authorization act. I urge my colleagues to support its adoption.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I would like to recognize and thank Senator Shelby and Senator Kerrey for their leadership and support with regard to the POW/MIA sections of the Intelligence Authorization Act that originally passed the full Senate earlier this year. I am pleased that the bill, though scarred has remained largely intact in the conference report we are now adopting. That provision (Section 308), will require a declassification review of two assessments of Vietnam's cooperation on the POW/MIA issue which were conducted in 1994 and 1995. Both of these assessments were prepared by my office and the other by the National Intelligence Council. Much of the information in both of these documents does not require continued classification, and I believe the interests of the POW/MIA families and our nation's veterans is best served by having as much information as possible in the public domain concerning Vietnam's performance on the POW/MIA question. As the Chairman will recall, there is a provision in Section 308 that allows the Director of Central Intelligence to withhold from declassification the names of living foreign individuals who have cooperated with U.S. efforts to account for missing personnel from the Vietnam War. I wish to make clear that the Congressional intent with respect to this provision pertains to individuals identified in the National Intelligence Estimate as "cooperative" with U.S. officials in Hanoi. Indeed, this specific area of concern was cited by the Director of Central Intelligence in a letter to the Senate on August 3, 1998. However, this is not meant to include information pertaining to the two former Vietnamese officials who are alleged to have prepared the so-called "1205" and "735" documents which we received through the Russian government which were reviewed in both of the above-referenced assessments. Is that the Chairman's understanding as well?

Mr. Shelby. Yes it is.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. I thank the Chairman for that clarification.

Mr. President, I also want to take this opportunity to express by personal disappointment that the other section concerning review of POW/MIA information to the Congress was not adopted by the Conference because of Member opposition from the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. This provision, previously adopted by the full Senate this summer with the support of the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, required our intelligence agencies to provide to Congress, within 120 days, a list of POW-MIA related documents that are still classified. This list would help the Congress exercise oversight on the POW/MIA issue on behalf of the families of missing personnel and our nation's veterans. I fail to see why such a reasonable provision could not have been adopted with the full support of the Conference. I plan to revisit this matter in the coming months, and would appreciate having the Chairman's views as to how we might proceed with respect to this important matter.

Mr. Shelby. I share the disappointment expressed by my colleague, the senior Senator from New Hampshire.
Congressional Record–Senate
November 19, 1999

30938

As he knows, I have worked steadily with him over the past several years to address the well-founded concerns with respect to the way the POW/MIA issue has been addressed by our Intelligence Community. I agree that the provision to which he refers would help us with our oversight responsibilities. That is why I supported his amendment, as did my colleague, Senator Smith. When our Intelligence bill passed the full Senate earlier this year, I want the Senator to know that I will work closely with him over the next few months to find a way to get the listing of POW/MIA reports he seeks provided to the Senate. He has a right to review these reports, as does every Member of the Senate. I would urge the Director of Central Intelligence and heads of each of our intelligence agencies to work cooperatively with the Select Committee on Intelligence. I also want the Senator to know that I will include his provision in next year's authorization measure if the information he seeks is not provided to the Senate in the next few months. I thank him for his leadership on this important matter.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, following my remarks, an editorial which appeared recently in the New York Times dealing with drug kingpin legislation, and specifically the due process problem I raised, be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See Exhibit 1.)

Carried Away by Drugs

The target of a new anti-drug initiative now speeding toward final congressional approval is a worthy one—big international drug traffickers. Sometimes too often happens when Congress collaborates with the Clinton administration to toughen law enforcement policies, civil liberties stand to suffer.

The measure, called the Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Designation Act, over-welmingly passed the House two weeks ago. A House-Senate conference committee incorporated the measure in the annual intelligence authorization bill that needs only a final floor vote in the Senate before going to the president's desk for his signature. All of this occurred without any public hearings or extended debate to explore the legislation's implications for due process and other constitutional values.

Under the measure, the government will be required to compile an annual list of those it determines to be "significant foreign narcotics traffickers" under standards that the bill does not articulate. The government would then have authority to freeze their assets in the United States without any chance for judicial review of the basis of their designation.

Americans who engage in financial dealings with a person or company on the list could have their accounts blocked, again without the benefit of full judicial review. The measure makes no exception for those investors or partners who thought they were dealing with legitimate businesses.

"Is this the America we want?" asked Representative Jerrold Nadler, Democrat of New York, as he waged a lonely and futile fight against the bill. "What is the remedy if the bureaucracy gets the wrong person?" Those pertinent questions were sadly lost in the rush to crack down on foreign drug lords before Congress adjourns.

Mr. SHELBY. I yield the floor.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I rise to join Chairman Shelby in urging my colleagues to vote in favor of the intelligence authorization conference report. This report is a culmination of the lengthy effort to fund intelligence activities for fiscal year 2000. It has not been easy to arrive at this point because the committee had to address many significant nonintelligence issues ranging from the reorganization of the NSA—now known as the es-tablishment of procedures for blocking the assets of drug kingpins. We have arrived at this point because we have reached several important compromises with our House colleagues, and the report deserves the Senate's full support.

This conference report supports many new initiatives. In my view, one of the most important new initiatives is to make the year 2000 a watershed year for intelligence. The watershed represents a turnaround in spending on intelligence activities. I believe it is time to increase spending because we now have a much better understanding of the threats facing the United States of America and the important role intelligence plays in meeting those threats.

One of the most difficult parts of my job as the Intelligence Community vice chairman has been to talk to people about the importance of intelligence. One of the most important initiatives in the bill is the Intelligence Community is extremely rare and discussing funding levels is almost impossible.

My colleagues are well aware that classified conference reports and the classified schedules of authorizations are available for their review in S–407 but you have to go there to get the details. We cannot talk about them now. Let me just say, however, that the Intelligence Community is stretched very thin. Our global reach is supported by intelligence as global coverage. Without adequate coverage, we see now what our President was able to see years ago about the Soviet Union during the height of the Cold War. This is the type of effort we have come to expect from NRO.

But the NRO has come under public attack in the recent past. Unfavorable news accounts have caused some to be unsure about the NRO and the path it is following. Others have questioned whether the NRO should remain an agency resting somewhere between the authorities of the Director of Central Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense. Moreover, the end of the Cold War has altered forever the nature of the threats we face. New threats mean a changed emphasis for intelligence. Furthermore, the explosion of information technology has created new opportunities for data collection and the delivery of intelligence. Thus, the conference concluded that there is a need to evaluate the NRO's roles and missions, organizational structure, technical skills, contractor relationships, abuse of commercial satellite imagery, acquisition authorities, and its relationships to other agencies and departments of the Federal Government in order to assure...
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Mr. President, I would like to comment briefly on the "Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Designation Act" contained in the conference report. This is a significant piece of legislation intended to attack drug traffickers at the heart by blocking all of their assets, either within the United States or that are under U.S. control. It establishes a procedure for the President of the United States to publicly identify drug kingpins and to block the kingpin's assets. As my colleagues may recall, a similar provision sponsored by Senators Coverdell and Feinstein was accepted as an amendment to the Intelligence Authorization Bill during floor action.

As I mentioned at the beginning of my statement, this provision has made the Intelligence Conference extremely interesting. Several of us joined the Chairman in being concerned about the right of judicial review for U.S. persons whose assets could be seized as a result of being involved in a joint venture with someone later identified as a drug kingpin. This was a matter of debate during discussions leading to the conference meeting and was addressed during the conference. The House Conference argued strenuously for their vision of the legislation which passed the House by a vote of 385 to 26. Further, the Administration supported the House version. Nonetheless, Chairman Shelby and several of us remained concerned about due process being afforded to those who might unwittingly get caught up in the kingpin designation and subsequent blocking of assets.

The Conference agreed the concerns were valid to warrant the appointment of a special judicial review panel to evaluate these concerns and report its findings. The Commission is charged with the responsibility of reviewing judicial, regulatory, and administrative authorities relating to the blocking of assets. It also is to report on its evaluation of the remedies available to U.S. persons affected by the Government’s blocking of assets of foreign persons. I believe their detailed and extended evaluation will provide the Congress insights into both the complexities of the Drug Kingpin legislation contained in the Intelligence Conference Report and the consequences to American persons when the assets of foreign persons are blocked under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I would like to note this is my last Conference Report as the committee’s Vice Chairman. My term on the Committee expires tomorrow, January 1999. I have had the privilege of serving under highly distinguished Chairmen and Vice Chairmen: David Boren, Frank Murkowski, Dennis DeConcini, John Warner, Arlen Specter, and Richard Shelby. In every instance, I have experienced a commitment to a bipartisan approach to legislation.

Throughout my time on the Committee, the members always have treated intelligence activities and intelligence policy as serious issues deserving their close attention. Because the issues have always been treated very seriously, committee members have had disagreements. But, Mr. President, in the end we always found a bipartisan answer to our differences. Bipartisanship has been a hallmark of the Committee because intelligence is not a partisan issue. If it ever should become a partisan issue, I believe we can look forward to a consequent politicization of intelligence.

This can be very bad for Congress and even worse for the American people.

Again, I thank Chairman Shelby for his leadership in delivering the conference report to the floor and for his commitment to finding bipartisan answers to some very complex questions.

I look forward to the opportunity in the future to speak more fully on the floor concerning intelligence and its values.

Lastly, I call to my colleagues’ attention and to the attention of the American people that the intelligence community is full of highly dedicated men and women who are working under some of the most difficult circumstances. Their professionalism, their patriotism knows no bounds, and I salute them for their excellent work.

Being the committee vice chairman has, indeed, been a great privilege.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I would like to commend the committee for its work on the Work Incentives legislation. This is a very important piece of legislation.

Mr. President, if I might, Senator Daschle and other colleagues sought to be a part of this colloquy, and they are not on the floor yet. I do apologize for this, but the Senate is currently in order. This will not go on very long, and I would like to express the gratitude to the committee for their work, and I do appreciate their assistance.

Finally, Mr. President, I would like to commend the committee for its work on the Work Incentives legislation. This is a very important piece of legislation.

Mr. President, if I might, Senator Daschle and I will work with Senator Kohl, Senator Feingold, and everybody who has been involved. I know how emotional and how strongly held these feelings are. I also share those feelings, and I will make that clear in a colloquy here in a few minutes.

Senator Daschle, do you want to do that now or in a few minutes?

Mr. President, if I might, Senator Daschle and I will work with Senator Kohl and Senator Reid and Senator Lugar and others and will be prepared to do our colloquy when the debate is concluded on this very important piece of legislation. Thank you for allowing us to interpret at this point. If you will complete your work, we will be ready to go.
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Mr. Daschle. Mr. President, I might also say, I heard the distinguished Chair talk about the service provided to this committee and to the Senate by the distinguished ranking member, the Senator from Nebraska. I will make a full statement at a later time, but let me say for the record now, no one has served this committee, this caucus, and this Senate more effectively, taking his intelligence responsibility more seriously, than the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. He has been an extraordinary leader, an extraordinary Member, and one who has taken his responsibilities as seriously as anybody has to date.

He departs with the actions taken today. He will leave the committee as a result of the statute requiring a certain limit of time for each Senator. I know I speak for all Senators in expressing our gratitude to him and our admiration for a job very well done.

Mr. President, if I may take a moment of my leader time to join Senator Daschle in those remarks. This is a very important committee. It is a committee that operates in the best tradition of total bipartisanship,