

trying again. To say the least, we will be watching the ledgers with an eagle eye. And committee members will be double checking out in the field as well.

Out there in the trenches, they also need a lot more language training. Indeed, this is a chronic deficiency throughout most of the Intelligence Community. This year, I was most pleased to work with my colleague across the aisle, Representative ROEMER, to increase funds for language training. Our people in the field need to be able to communicate and interpret accurately. This also is an area I intend to pursue in the future.

The Intelligence Committee provides very vigorous oversight and has a good track record for finding deficiencies, excesses and problems. We will continue to do our job, and we ask your support for our bill.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, as a member of both the Budget and Intelligence committees, I have been especially sensitive to what we call top line issues—how much money is available overall, and whether it is generally adequate.

Pressures to keep down the allocations for defense have also had an adverse “trickle down” effect on intelligence, since intelligence is funded within the defense top line. For the last decade, intelligence lost a large part of its buying power, after absorbing reductions both indirectly from inflation and directly from budget resolutions.

In this regard, we recently suffered several particularly bad years. The administration’s request this year increased somewhat, providing partial relief from the decline. Striving to remain within established financial boundaries, the committee gave the national intelligence agencies only slightly more than the request. The service portion of the budget, where we share jurisdiction with Armed Services, enjoyed greater increases. This willingness to sacrifice a share of the hard-pressed military budget acknowledges the heavy service dependence on tactical intelligence, and the need to improve it.

The situation among the national agencies is also problematic. Most of them have been squeezed for a decade and are showing the effects. Personnel numbers have been reduced significantly, but even if reductions continue, it is a struggle to keep personnel costs at the same budget percentage, because the costs per individual are climbing steeply. Personnel are used mainly to process and report the large amounts of collected information; but there are many fewer available to do this, even as much more data pours in from sensors that must become increasingly sophisticated in order to keep up with the targets. As a result, this “downstream” part of the business, and our overall efficiency, are suffering greatly.

Among the major intelligence agencies, the National Security Agency is particularly hard pressed, since targets and their communications, radar and telemetry technology have been changing at a dramatic pace. NSA requires nearly complete re-tooling to catch up and keep up, but this costs a lot of money. NSA’s budget has been in steady decline.

On the imagery side, the struggle to pay for exploitation and dissemination of the large volume of imagery required especially by military customers is pretty well known. This is another “downstream” problem exacerbated by declining numbers of human photo-interpreters.

Five years ago, the House Intelligence Committee warned the administration that we must find a way to make our satellite collectors much less expensive, or the NRO would take a growing portion of the declining intelligence budget, and we be unable to use effectively what they collect. We lost that budget battle. However, it is now clear that our predictions were accurate. And the situation is getting even worse because of cost overruns in NRO programs.

We realize that everyone wants a “peace dividend” that shifts money from national security programs to domestic priorities. We want one ourselves. However, the breakup of empires historically is accompanied by regional confusion and conflict such as we witness today. Continued U.S. involvement in regional stabilization efforts comes at a price, often a high price. In addition, the breadth and unacceptability of terrorism, narcotics trafficking, proliferation and other cross-border challenges present unique challenges at this particular time.

We are striving to make the Intelligence Community more efficient. We have done this within agencies and are suggesting a few precedent-shattering initiatives that cross agency boundaries, in both the communications and analyst areas. But there is only so much we can do, especially within the patchwork of compromises that makes up the congressional process. In several important areas, we are in trouble.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

1330

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4392) 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

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 the bill (H.R. 4392) 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.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 396

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of House Resolution 396?

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 22, 2000

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

WHO IS TO BLAME

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the White House announced that it would work to compensate the victims of the Los Alamos wildfire. Well, Mr. Speaker, how generous of the administration to compensate the victims of a wildfire which its own agency, the National Park Service, is responsible for starting.

Of course, neither the administration or the Park Service accepts responsibility for the environmental disaster that has left hundreds of people stranded, over 400 homes destroyed, and has burned almost 50,000 acres. Instead, they have pledged compensation, which will ultimately cost the American taxpayers millions of dollars.

Meanwhile, the local superintendent who has acknowledged responsibility for igniting the blaze, in spite of adverse weather warnings, was given a paid vacation. They might as well have said congratulations. Mr. Speaker, the National Park Service and its personnel need to be held responsible for their actions, especially when those actions result in such extensive environmental devastation.

I yield back the administration's disgraceful inability to accept responsibility for its own negligence.

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.

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

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MOST FAVORED NATION TRADE STATUS FOR PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I apologize for delaying the Chair, and I thank the Chair for its patience.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take to the floor this afternoon to continue our discussion on most favored nation trade status with the People's Republic of China.

As I have said before, the problem that we are faced with, the challenges and the choices that confront us here, are support for our basic cherished values; the right to practice one's religion; the right to assemble and organize and collectively bargain for a decent wage and benefits and health care, and all the things that many of our citizens enjoy; the right to form political organizations so that ideas, such as good wages, decent working conditions, health care, good educational opportunities, can flow from political participation. All of these rights are kind of central to this debate on China, because in China today they do not enjoy what we enjoy here, and that is the ability to do these things.

China is a brutal, authoritarian police state. If the government is disagreed with, if one tries to form a political organization, if an individual tries to form a religious organization, if someone tries to form a trade union, they will end up in jail. And that is where, my colleagues, literally tens of thousands of Chinese dissidents, freedom fighters, people who care about democracy are languishing today in prison, because they dared to try to speak out to better their human condition in these areas.

Why is it so important for us to stand with them and not with the government of China and their partners in this trade deal, the multinational corporations, most of whom are American? Why is it important to stand

with these heroes? It is important to stand with them because those values that we cherish, those first principles of our government, the right to be able to express ourselves in the God that we believe in, in the political organization that we want to affiliate with, in the worker organization that we want to band with in order to improve our economic lives, these are central tenets of what democracy is all about.

The State Department's Country Report on Human Rights, in their last report, said that China's poor human rights record deteriorated markedly throughout the year as the government intensified efforts to suppress dissent, particularly organized dissent; the government continued to commit widespread and well-documented human rights abuses in violation of internationally accepted norms.

Permanent Favored Nation Trading Status supporters can claim that the Internet and technology will help unshackle the Chinese people, but the evidence shows the opposite is happening. According to the State Department, and I quote,

Authorities have blocked, at various times, politically sensitive Web sites, including those of dissident groups and some major foreign news organizations, such as Voice of America, The Washington Post, The New York Times, and the British Broadcasting system.

Just yesterday, outside these chambers on the lawn of the Capitol, we had approximately 100 dissidents from China who are now in exile, many of whom have spent 3, 4, 5, 10, 13 years in jail. They were here with us, and we formed a line with a linked chain threading us as we marched around the Capitol grounds. And then we had them come and speak to people who were interested in hearing what they had to say, and they all spoke about the need not to reward China with this Most Favored Nation status by taking away an annual attempt to review their human rights record, their dismal record on human rights.

They asked us not to do it, because every time that we continue to have this debate, every time that we raise these issues, the Chinese are placed in a very hard, difficult position, a position they cannot defend, and we make progress each time we have this debate.

Wei Jingsheng, the great dissident and leader at Tiananmen Square and other activities in China, who is here now in exile in the United States, who spent years and years and years in prison, said do not grant permanent trade status to China right now. He said to continue to trade, continue to engage, continue to dialogue, but do not give them most favored trade status permanently; have the annual review. Because he knows how important it is for those who are still in the gulags, still in the prisons, still fighting for justice and freedom and liberty in China today.

So I would say to my colleagues, the news is always not good for workers in

China. The government continued to tightly restrict workers' rights, and forced labor in prison facilities remains a very serious problem, according to the State Department, and they give us some examples in the State Department report.

For instance, there is the case of Guo Yunqiao. He led a protest march of 10,000 workers to local government offices following the 1989 massacre. He is currently serving a life term in prison for doing that on charges of hooliganism. Imagine that: Protesting on behalf of 10,000 workers of local government offices following the massacre at Tiananmen Square, and this man is facing a life in prison.

In the case of Guo Qiqing, who was detained in Shayang County on charges of disrupting public order, he has organized a sit-in to demand money owed to the workforce.

Or the case of Hu Shigen, an activist with the Federation Labor Union of China, in prison in Beijing No. 2 prison, and has 12 years remaining on his sentence. He is seriously ill. He has been charged with counterrevolutionary activities.

And the cases go on and on and on.

Despite the considerable leverage that we have, with 40 percent of China's exports coming to the United States, our negotiators did not lift a finger to help on human rights or labor rights or religious freedoms. We can do much better than what we have done.

1345

I would say on the religious front, there is widespread religious persecution in China today against Buddhists, against Christians, against Muslims, against people who want to practice their faith.

If you do, if they indeed do, you cannot belong to the military, you cannot belong as a worker in the government, you cannot belong to the ruling party if you practice your religion in China; and to practice it in an organized way will often get you a long jail prison sentence.

Recently two Catholic bishops and archbishops have spent over 30 years in prison because of their leadership in our church.

Mr. Speaker, the list goes on and on and on and the repression goes on and on and on.

The distinguished gentleman from Northern Virginia (Mr. WOLF), a friend and colleague of ours, was successful, very successful, in getting a commission established. It is called the U.S. Commission on Religious Freedoms. And it was established in order to look specifically at the issue of whether people can practice their faith in China.

Seven of the nine people who were appointed to that commission were appointed by people who share the view that we should have unfettered free trade, most favored nation trade status with the Chinese. So the people on the Commission, for the most part, came