

Let me just point out that the debate here is on the amendment not the other extraneous issues. We will debate when we reach, if we do, the Conyers amendment, the issue of publicity of intelligence authorization or authorizing numbers, but let me just point out that this amendment in essence implies that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in the 6 or 7 months that it has been working on its budget has not really done its work.

The fact of the matter is, as the chairman has mentioned, we have held numerous hearings, we have had plenty of hearings to discuss each and every line item as has been amply discussed. Every Member of the Congress, Republican or Democrat, could come up and examine these numbers in any level of detail.

The fact of the matter is, as the chairman has mentioned, we have held numerous hearings, we have had plenty of hearings to discuss each and every line item as has been amply discussed. Every Member of the Congress, Republican or Democrat, could come up and examine these numbers in any level of detail.

The fact of the matter is that it is surprising to me that any amendment that would be offered at a 10-percent reduction yesterday and then turn into a 5-percent reduction today can be called a responsible amendment. It only goes to show that when the chairman said, "What would you cut," that there is no real intention here of being serious about reducing this budget.

The fact is the committee has been responsible in dealing with this budget on a line-by-line basis over the last 7 months. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan calls this a Rip Van Winkle budget; I would point out that this amendment is probably a blind man's bluff amendment because we have absolutely no idea what the impact would be.

That is not responsible legislating, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire for doing that. I did want to point out on a serious note that any Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, of course, enjoys a very high privilege for serving here, but they also enjoy the opportunity to examine classified information, and I believe that that is a wonderful opportunity. I hope Members will take advantage of it; I mean that very sincerely because I think that they get a better impression of what our responsibilities in the area of national security are by examining classified information and material available to the committee then they do by reading various newspapers which inevitably have a slant or point of view and less than full information, or even watch-

ing C-Span which is always dramatic; excuse me, CNN which is always dramatic.

But that is not really the point. The other point I wanted to make is this:

We have clearly got a responsibility, the 15 Members of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. Oversight has come a long way, baby, since we first started to have oversight of the intelligence community. We needed oversight. It all started back, and my colleague has said a long time ago, but in the Second World War became apparent that we needed to deal with the oversight question and organize intelligence, and shortly after that we did. And oversight has become much more sophisticated, much more organized, I believe much more representative.

But it is true, the 15 of us on that committee have a responsibility to all of the other Members of this body to make the right decisions. We have brought forward a bill, 15 to zero, that we do not all agree with every item on to be sure, but, 15 to zero, we have brought our colleagues a bipartisan bill which we think is about right for where we are to go into conference with, and we are asking our colleagues to basically understand that we have not come out of thin air, that we have worked hard and deliberately, going time and time again into these programs dealing with these agencies, making them justify how they expend these moneys.

I am a fiscal conservative. I would not be voting for pork or waste. I assure that the Members who know me know that is true. As I say, I think we have got it about right, I think the members of this committee have done a very good job, and I think a straight across the board cut that is totally indiscriminate is going to do serious damage and not going to get the kind of benefits or savings that the well intentioned sponsors of the amendment has envisaged.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, in these days with the cold war behind us, Berlin Wall having come down, we find ourselves in a comparable era, as we did in the 1920's and the early 1930's where there was no known adversary on the horizon.

I support the bill as it is, and I oppose the amendment to reduce the authorization.

Serving on the Committee on National Security, and there are a few of us on this Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence that do, also as a member of this committee, I know the value of timely and accurate intelligence to military commanders as well as to the administration and the State Department. In these days where the predictability of the future is so cloudy, that is when, Mr. Chairman, it is all the more important for us to have the best, the finest intelligence network we can.

More than that, it is more than just being able to collect intelligence. We need the analysts who can give us that predictive analysis as to where we think problems may arise. Successful military operations, successful diplomatic operations which minimize the risk of problems and lives of American service men and women cannot, simply cannot be conducted without excellent intelligence and excellent analysis.

As a member of both of the committees that deal with this I pay particular attention to the needs of the military as well as the other. I believe this bill responds to those needs, I support it. A cut, I think, would be doing a disservice to our diplomats, it would be doing a disservice to those who serve in uniform, a disservice to those who want to keep our country free and our interests keen in the days and years ahead.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I understand this amendment originally suggested that we cut 10 percent of this budget. This amendment says we cut 5 percent. This is a very reasonable amount in this time when we are supposed to be working in tight budgets. Of course we can make the argument that rather than spending money on international spying activities that could be better spent here at home, and I think there is a lot to that argument.

But I am pleased with the amendment, and I am very happy that the amendment is brought to the floor because, if nothing else, the 5 percent of savings that we might get if we pass the amendment, we do not know the exact figures so we cannot even make that calculation, it is not going to make or break the budget even though it could be helpful. But the amendment allows us to come to the floor and at least express a concern, and we have heard many of these concerns already. It is just a chance to get on the floor and say to the Congress and to our colleagues, Whoa, let's slow up a minute, let's think for a minute what we're doing and what have we been doing.

It is now accepted that the activities of the CIA is they are proper and something that we have had for a long time, but the CIA is a rather new invention. It is part of the 20th century. It came up after World War II. But it was pointed out earlier that this is not exactly true because we have been dealing with intelligence for a long time, and that is true. But it has always been dealt with in national defense, it was strictly limited, and it was handled by the military. But since World War II, since the time that we have built and tried to run the American empire, we have to have our spy agents out there. Now we have a civilian international spy agency.

I might ask my colleagues really if they would even be inclined to read the Constitution in a strict manner where would they get this authority that we

have to go out, have an organization like this that is very poorly followed by the Congress? We know very little in general about what happens when it comes to our Government being involved in overthrow of certain leaders around the world. I would suggest that when the history of the 20th century is written that many of us will not be very proud of the history of the CIA and the involvement that they have been involved in over these many years. I think the activity of the CIA has gone a long way to give America a bad reputation.

This does not mean that we should not have intelligence and we should not be concerned about national defense, but if it were done in a proper manner it would be done without an organization such as the CIA. These very secret clandestine activities of the CIA really is very unbecoming of a free society. It is not generally found in a society which is considered free and open and that the people know what is going on.

It surprised me a little bit to hear it even admitted earlier that some of the activity of the CIA is involved with, business activity that we have to be thinking about business espionage, many of us have made this accusation challenge that, yes, we have the CIA that represents big business in many parts of the world. And I think this is the case. And not only do we have our business interests reaching out to many areas of the world and we have a very internationalistic interventionist foreign policy, we have troops in so many countries, over a hundred countries.

I would really like somebody to get up here today that is knowledgeable; tell me how many countries we have CIA agents in. If we have troops in 100 countries, we may have CIA agents in 200 countries. But I do not know that, and possibly it will be buried someplace, but I am not allowed to come down here and explain it to the American people.

The American people are responsible. They pay the bills. They are the ones who have to fight the wars if we go and do something nonsensical. And was the CIA involved in Vietnam? It certainly was. There was a killing of a leader in Vietnam that escalated that affair which led to war and killing and the death of many young Americans.

So we in the Congress should be more responsible so we can tell the people exactly what is going on, exactly what it is going to cost and exactly what the ramifications are when these agents are dealing in other countries.

□ 1630

I would say that the CIA does not have a very good reputation among many Members of Congress nor among many citizens of this country. They are concerned about it and would like to know a lot more about it.

Is there any chance the CIA could have funding outside of the so-called

normal appropriations process? I think there is a very good chance that is possible and that they may well have been involved in drug dealing.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I thought for the last several years that I would stay out of these debates about the CIA, but I am torn to come back and say a few words here.

I had the pleasure of serving on the Committee on Intelligence for a few years, and I finally resigned in disgust because I did not find either that the intelligence was very reliable, and certainly that the rules and regulations with which the process was conducted were utterly asinine.

We have had references here to statements in the newspapers about the level of funding and other things involving the CIA. I, as most Members know, have been involved with the space program for 30-odd years. I thought I knew something about space activities and the kinds of things that the CIA was doing in overhead collection. I was getting my information from scientific journals and some of the researchers who were doing the work on these kinds of collection systems.

I was precluded by the rules with regard to my serving on the Committee on Intelligence from reflecting not what I saw in newspapers but what I saw in scientific journals or scientific reports of various kinds. This is kind of asinine, to classify something that the most informed people have already published. Mr. Chairman, I thought this was something that we really ought to get away from, but I found that my loyalty to the country was questioned if I even brought this up for discussion, in many cases.

Now progress is being made, not very much, but some. The members of the committee are honorable people who are trying to do a better job, and I commend them for it, because it is frequently a thankless task. When I was on the committee, I served under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. LEE HAMILTON, and the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. LOU STOKES, and they were honorable people, wonderful people who were doing their best for the welfare of this country. Nevertheless, they were constrained by the same rules and practices that I was constrained by to sort of go along with the system.

I remember the time, for example, when we would be invited down to the White House, and Admiral Poindexter, at that time National Security Adviser, and Ollie North would lie through their teeth to us about what was going on. Every time a critical event came up, they would invent some new lie to explain it to us. Mr. Chairman, I did not particularly like that, but I suppose I could understand it.

Actually, the whole intelligence apparatus, or the CIA in particular, and

the National Reconnaissance Office, which I suppose we are still precluded from mentioning on the floor because it is classified, are actually a secret army for the President. They do what he says and they kind of protect him in the process, and we saw this occurring over long periods of time.

I am not sure that that really is what we need from an intelligence agency. We do need intelligence, without regard to the fact that the cold war is over. This is a dangerous world and we need intelligence. Going back to the writings of that great Chinese author, Sun Dzu, who wrote with regard to war, about war 2,500 years ago, good intelligence collection was the most important thing that any military commander could have, regardless. It is still true today, that it is essential.

But we are not getting good intelligence. If so, we would have known far more about the economic, social, and other conditions in the Soviet Union which led to its collapse. We would know far more about the kind of cultural and religious conflicts taking place in the Islamic nations than we know. We know practically nothing, as a matter of fact. We are not going to get it from the CIA.

I think the committee is beginning to understand that there are problems with our intelligence collection in certain vital areas, such as those that I have mentioned. Their suggestion that we might consider a civilian reserve corps may be the best idea that has come out of the Committee on Intelligence in a long time, because with a civilian reserve corps of people who understand the language and the culture and the economies of the areas that we have an intelligence interest in, we will get more and better intelligence than we have ever had before.

With regard to analytical capabilities, it has been known for two decades that the CIA was collecting huge amounts of information which they never bothered to analyze. We would apparently not give them the money to analyze it, and if we did, they cached it away to pay for a \$3 billion building, or whatever.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BROWN of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, the committee's report recognizes these things and lays them out specifically and then asks for more money. This is ridiculous. If we are getting inadequate intelligence and intelligence analysis today, why reward that with more money? Maybe it would be a healthy lesson if we would cut them 5 percent or 10 percent.

We have been doing this with another agency that I am very well acquainted with, NASA, for the last several years. I regretted it. I hated it, because I felt that NASA was doing a good job and producing huge benefits to the American people through the technology it