

President's request, over anything this House passed, and so we have the ability to rationally agree on some modest reductions from one agreed-on level and get this bill to the President. I hope that we can get an agreement before he leaves for Ireland so by the time he gets back we will have it passed and his signature on it very promptly. We owe it to those people who work for our government so they can deliver consistent quality service in a knowing, established context of supported funding.

I thank the gentlemen for their hard work on both sides of the aisle, and I ask that we move forward and this be the last CR we be asked to support because I will support it only reluctantly.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I know there might be some debate between the floor and the parliamentarian's office today and may demand a recount as to how many CRs we have done in this Congress. Is it 19 or is it 20? I hear from the parliamentarian's office it is 19. Regardless if it is 19 or it is 20, that is an all-time record in the history of Congress. That is a record that I do not think there will be a single press release on back in our districts. That is a record that I do not think we are too proud of, and that is a record I do not think future Congresses are going to want to break.

We need in the future to not only come together in this 106th Congress on an agreement on the budget but we need to do it in a bipartisan manner.

The second point I want to make is that when we do reach a bipartisan agreement on some of the most important issues that we handle in the 106th Congress, we should look at how these issues are treated in the waning days of this 106th Congress. How does this budget treat education with Pell grants? As education and the cost of education becomes more important and higher in costs, we want to make sure we get Pell grants to those that need it.

The second issue is how this budget treats the poor. In my home State of Indiana, we have seen natural gas prices go up by 50 percent, and our families are having a tough time, as it is snowing right now back in the Midwest, affording much of this. This budget deals with that. Let us look at how we treat LIHEAP.

Thirdly, the NIH budget, how do we treat research for Alzheimer's, research for Parkinson's, research on cancer? These are three issues that are highly important to me and my constituents and highly important to the country, and I hope we will arrive at a bipartisan solution in this Congress.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no other requests to speak on this turkey, and so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just suggest that, whether we like it or not, we need to vote for this continuing resolution today. As I said earlier, I hold out the hope and I am very optimistic that now that our leadership has arrived at an agreement with the President that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), and I are going to be able to work out a bipartisan solution that will take care of most of the concerns that we have heard expressed on this bill throughout the season.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). All time for debate has expired.

The joint resolution is considered as having been read for amendment.

Pursuant to House Resolution 670, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5630) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) will suspend temporarily while we consult with the minority.

□ 1745

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5630) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Senate amendments:

Page 3, in the table of contents, strike out "Sec. 501. Contracting authority for the National Reconnaissance Office."

Page 3, in the table of contents, strike out "502" and insert "501".

Page 3, in the table of contents, strike out "503" and insert "502".

Page 48, strike out lines 4 through 16.

Page 48, line 17, strike out "502" and insert "501".

Page 49, line 7, strike out "503" and insert "502".

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) so he might explain more fully how the legislation covered by his unanimous consent request differs from the bill sent to the Senate on November 13, 2000.

Mr. GOSS. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me, Mr. Speaker. I am very happy to explain to her why on December 11 the House is again considering the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001.

As Members will recall, the President vetoed an earlier version of the legislation on November 4. In doing so, the President indicated that his objections were limited to a single section of the bill, the so-called "leaks provision," and he asked Congress to return the same bill to him with the "leaks provision" deleted.

It had been my hope to do exactly that. In fact, the day the veto message was received by the House, Mr. DIXON, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), and I introduced H.R. 5630, a bill identical to the previous conference report, save for the leaks provision, which was removed in its entirety.

The same day the House passed H.R. 5630 and sent it to the Senate for what I had hoped would be speedy consideration, passage, and transmittal to the President for his signature.

I am deeply disappointed that this is not exactly what transpired. The other body did last week pass H.R. 5630, but in doing so removed an additional provision. That provision, which was agreed to in our House-Senate conference and approved by the full House and Senate, was designed to improve the performance of the National Reconnaissance Office's launch program, and to save millions of taxpayers' dollars in the process.

I hope we will have a chance to hear from our colleague, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), who is the author of the NRO language in just a moment. But I want to register my disappointment with the process.

In reviewing the record of debate in the other body, there is no rationale given for striking the provision about the National Reconnaissance Office, and it appears to me to be an unjustified and inexplicable action. Under normal circumstances, therefore, I would

absolutely refuse to agree to this amendment.

However as a practical matter, there is no real possibility of convening a second conference committee to resolve this problem before time runs out on the 106th Congress. Therefore, noting that the remaining parts of this legislation are still vital to the U.S. intelligence community and will contribute to improving our national security, I am reluctantly asking the House to pass H.R. 5630, which will, finally, send this bill to the President for his signature.

Still, I recognize much time and hard work went into developing the National Reconnaissance Office launch provision, and I do not want to see that work go to waste. I am pledging to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) and other Members that I am planning to make NRO launch issues, including all aspects of Air Force support for this activity, a top priority for the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in the 107th Congress.

Ms. PELOSI. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP. I thank the gentleman for yielding, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have concerns about the National Reconnaissance Office contracting issue, but I want to make it clear that nonetheless, the House should pass the bill, as modified by the Senate.

The original conference report included a House provision that would require the National Reconnaissance Office to contract for satellite launch vehicles separately from the Air Force. The committee's action was based on a substantial review of several expensive launch failures involving the loss of very valuable intelligence satellites, as well as Inspector General reports describing significant problems in the NRO's relationship with the Air Force.

I believe that the remedy that was fashioned by my subcommittee chairman and my colleague, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), was reasonable and would be effective.

The conferees debated this matter, and there were votes taken. The House position prevailed. It is more than a little galling that the Senate committee would undo that agreement by exploiting the procedural and time constraints that were imposed by the President's veto of the original conference report over a completely unrelated matter.

I fully appreciate and share the sense of wrong that is conveyed here today. Nonetheless, I think it is necessary to accept the bill now in the form in which it has been returned to us by the Senate because of the overriding importance of enacting an intelligence authorization measure.

The overall benefits to the Nation's security outweigh, in my opinion, the

loss of this particular provision. Instead, the committee should plan to take this issue up again next year as the chairman, (the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), indicated, and I would pledge to work with and support the efforts of the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) to correct the serious underlying problems in managing the launch of our critical intelligence satellites.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, as the gentleman from Florida (Chairman GOSS) has indicated, the President vetoed an earlier version of this bill because it contained a provision that would have further criminalized the intentional disclosure of classified information.

In my view, the notion that this so-called "leaks provision" was carefully crafted and targeted with laser-like precision on a small hole in the criminal code is simply wrong. I believe the provision had the potential to do great harm to civil liberties. I did not sign the intelligence authorization conference report because it contained the leaks provision.

I believe the President was right to veto the measure over this matter. In fact, I commend him for doing that.

The gentleman from Florida (Chairman GOSS) and our late distinguished colleague and friend, JULIAN DIXON, are to be commended for introducing a new bill which does not contain the leaks provision. I am pleased that the actions taken by the Senate on that bill, which is now before the House, did not attempt to add new language on the leaks issue. As the distinguished chairman said, it is entirely out of the bill.

Unauthorized disclosures of classified information can damage national security, and that type of conduct should have consequences. Administrative and criminal sanctions are available currently. The vetoed leaks provision, however, would have placed the full force of Federal criminal law behind a classification system which is based not in statute but in executive order, and therefore, it is changeable at the sole discretion of the President. That would have been a serious mistake, so I am very pleased on that aspect of the bill.

I also want to associate myself with the comments of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), concerning the provision in the bill of the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), and look forward to working with him in the next Congress.

It is just a strange way that the Congress operates that a provision that could pass the conference committee could be yanked from the bill in the manner it was. I am, however, prepared to accept the decision of the gentleman from Florida (Chairman GOSS) on how best to deal with the changes on the National Reconnaissance Office contracting matter made by the Senate,

although this issue was fully debated and I believe resolved by the conferees in October.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to underscore Mr. DIXON's remarks on November 13 when this bill was considered by the House, that the statement of managers on the vetoed conference report should be regarded as the expression of the intent of Congress on how the intelligence programs and activities authorized for fiscal year 2001 are to be conducted.

In referencing Mr. DIXON's remarks, of course, we cannot ignore the fact that our dear colleague is now lying in state. We take every opportunity we can to recognize his tremendous service to this Congress, to this country, and indeed, to this committee. One very high profile challenge we had in this committee was dealing with the labs, and Mr. DIXON was always the voice of reason and balance and fairness in those deliberations, and in fact, in every deliberation he was ever a part of.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to engage the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), the chairman of the Committee, in a brief colloquy.

I would like to thank first of all the chairman for the wonderful job with this year's intelligence authorization legislation. I congratulate him for it. Obviously, we congratulate Mr. DIXON for it, but his loss is immeasurable to this Congress, as so many people have said. It is sad he cannot be here today.

I will be brief, Mr. Speaker. As the chairman knows, I strongly support the overall bill, but have withheld my final support because of what I view as an egregious action by the chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee and perhaps others.

As Members are well aware, we worked hard to address the needed reforms to our satellite launch program, as over the last almost 2 years six rocket launch failures have destroyed or made ineffective important military communications and intelligence satellites, risking the national security of the United States and costing taxpayers over \$3 billion.

Our provision, approved by the House and Senate conferees and passed by both Houses of Congress, would have ensured more accountability for the launch program of the National Reconnaissance Office and the Air Force, promoting better acquisition practices.

A series of meetings, hearings, and briefings on the severity of these problems, with the help of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SANFORD), has made it obvious that our failures and problems were rooted in the morass of contracts used in the launch program and

exacerbated by a tangle of bureaucratic turf concerns.

The Senate's refusal to acknowledge that these reforms are needed is short-sighted and risk more problems in the satellite launch program. Unfortunately, the Senate Intelligence Committee did not see fit to include this provision. It stripped the measure out without debate or justification.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman, is it his understanding that the National Reconnaissance Office provision would greatly help streamline the satellite launch process, and that the Senate's refusal to acknowledge that these reforms are needed is short-sighted and risks more problems in our satellite launch program?

□ 1800

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

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, as I stated in conference, as I stated earlier, and as I would state again, I believe the provisions would have improved greatly the management and performance of the NRO's launch program. I, too, am extremely disappointed in the Senate's action, which I also concur is short-sighted.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS). I am glad we agree on this. As the gentleman from Florida is aware, while I am disappointed in the Senate's action on this, I have agreed to let this bill pass today and move the process forward.

Mr. Speaker, can we agree that the committee will, early next year, begin to look into this matter more closely with the National Reconnaissance Office so that we can place good reforms into our launch program and pursue what is best for our national security, let alone our taxpayers' best interests?

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

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Delaware has my commitment that, early in the 107th Congress, the committee will study and draft such reforms based upon the good work of the gentleman from Delaware, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), and others on the committee, which have been reflected in the bill. In fact, we have already done this. We have passed it, as the gentleman has said, both in the House and the Senate. I think we had good product, I think we had good process, and I am sorry we find ourselves in this predicament.

However, I think the best resolution, as has been outlined, is to go forward with the vital bill. The gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) has my commitment that we will go back, and perhaps

we can improve even more on the improvements the gentleman has already recommended to us.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida. I also would like to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), who spoke in favor of this, too. It is a shame we cannot get it done this year, but we do have to move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5630, the bill just considered and passed.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 13, 2000

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. December 13, 2000.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

IN MEMORY OF THE HONORABLE JULIAN C. DIXON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, when I had returned to my District, I received word of the death of JULIAN DIXON, and so I called this morning our cloakroom to set aside 5 minutes so I could make a few remarks. I was not here on Friday, and I know a number of Members did take the time to acknowledge the great work of JULIAN. I know that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) subsequently had an hour set aside this evening to do that also.

I really got to know JULIAN when I was a staffer working for Mr. Michel.

He did extraordinary work as the chairman of the Committee on Ethics and worked so hard to bring a lot of, I think, civility and order and fairness to a process that was mired in controversy.

Then after having been elected to this House in 1994, I had the great honor serving with JULIAN as the co-chair of one of our seminars at the first bipartisan retreat that was held in Hershey, Pennsylvania. JULIAN attended that bipartisan retreat, and he and I co-chaired or co-hosted a seminar with Members. Again, I got the opportunity to work closely with him.

As I had known before, I realized what an outstanding human being JULIAN DIXON really has been throughout his life, and I also learned of his ability to really bring people together and get people to understand the importance of working together.

Then I had the great opportunity 2 years ago to be appointed to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence by the Speaker of the House. JULIAN has been the ranking member of that committee during the 2 years that I have been on, and one of the most distinguished members of the committee, one of the most bipartisan members of the committee. He was a very, very thoughtful individual who cared very much about the importance of having a good intelligence-gathering capability in this country and worked very hard on the committee, worked in a very bipartisan way with the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Chairman GOSS).

So like all Members who have had the chance to work with JULIAN and to know his great talents, his wonderful talents, to know as importantly the fact that he is a marvelous human being, the House will miss him greatly. I know that all Members extend their sympathy to his family and to those who have worked with him, including his staff.

I know that he will be missed greatly, not only on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, but in the whole House, because he is truly someone who brings to this House the importance of working together, of cooperation, of civility, of decency.

So I am delighted to have this chance to pay my special tribute to a tremendous human being, someone who will be greatly missed, always admired, and really missed in the House and on the committee.

So it is with great sadness that I say my fond farewells to JULIAN DIXON. I intend, along with I know a host of other Members, to attend the service for JULIAN on Wednesday in California and to personally offer my sympathy to his family.

So I appreciate the opportunity to say my farewells to a wonderful human being, a great Member, someone who brought great distinction to this House of Representatives.