END BUSINESS AS USUAL ON DAIRY PRICES

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, if we can cut through the partisan bloviating we have just heard for a few minutes, I would like to note something else.

I have voted against every farm bill that has been in front of this House for the last 10 years because those bills guaranteed that the dairy farmers from the upper Midwest would receive significantly lower prices than farmers in other regions of the country. This week a Federal court struck down those milk marketing orders as being arbitrary and capricious. That court is right. They ordered the USDA to no longer enforce those milk marketing orders.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to end business as usual on this issue. Congress and the USDA and major dairy organizations need to recognize that major changes must be made in the milk marketing order system. Until those changes are made, the responsible thing to do is to vote against any other farm legislation that comes to this floor.

SCHOOL CHOICE

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, Jonathan Rauch writes on school choice in the November 10 edition of the New Republic. He says he has always found it odd that liberals have handed the issue to Republicans rather than grabbing it for themselves.

He says, and I quote:

It is hard to get excited about improving rich suburban schools. However, for poor children trapped, the case is moral rather than merely educational. These kids attend schools which cannot protect them, much less teach them. To require poor people to go to dangerous, dysfunctional schools that better-off people fled and would never tolerate for their own children, all the while intoning pieties about ''saving'' public education, is worse than unsound public policy. It is repugnant public policy.

Mr. Rauch, we agree.

GRANTING MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE PRIVILEGE TO EXTEND AND REVISE REMARKS IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD UNTIL LAST EDITION IS PUBLISHED

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have until publication of the last edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD authorized for the first session by the Joint Committee on Printing to revise and extend their remarks and to include brief, related extraneous material on any matter occurring before the adjournment of the first session sine die.

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

There was no objection.

□ 0915

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have a privileged motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PALLONE moves that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 38, nays 308, not voting 87, as follows:

[Roll No. 606]

YEAS—38

Andrews
Blumenauer
Bonilla
Bonior
Boucher
Clyburn
Conyers
Coyne
Delahunt
Deutsch
Doggett
Etheridge
Evans
Fazio
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Hastings (FL)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Kennelly
Lewis (GA)
Markey
McDermott
McNulty
Mink
Pallone
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Sabo
Smith, Adam
Thurman
Torres
Towns
Velazquez
Wise
Woolsey

NAYS—308

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Allen
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cannon
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Christensen
Clay
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Costello
Cramer
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Everett
Ewing
Fattah
Fawell
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Green
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Jones
Kanjorski
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Moakley
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pomeroy
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tierney
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (PA)
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wolf
Wynn

NOT VOTING—87

Ackerman
Becerra
Bono
Brown (FL)
Burton
Canady
Carson
Chenoweth
Clayton
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Davis (FL)
DeLauro
Dellums
Dingell
Dixon
Doolittle
Ehrlich
Engel
Farr
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Gilman
Gonzalez
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Hall (OH)
Harman
Hefner
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Kasich
Kleczka
Kolbe
LaFalce
Largent
Leach
Livingston
Manton
Manzullo
McCrery
McDade
McIntosh
McKinney
Meek
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Mollohan
Neal
Oberstar
Olver
Owens
Parker
Payne
Pombo
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rangel
Riggs
Riley
Rush
Sanders
Scarborough
Schiff
Serrano
Shaw
Skeen
Spratt
Stark
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)

Weller	Wicker	Young (AK)
Wexler	Yates	Young (FL)

□ 0940

Messrs. EHLERS, NETHERCUTT, HILL, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. PELOSI changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I was necessarily absent during rollcall votes 575 and 606. If present, I would have voted ''aye'' on rollcall 575 and ''no'' on rollcall 606.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 858, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous consent agreement of October 30, 1997 I call up the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 858) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1998 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 Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to the order of the House of October 30, 1997 the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Tuesday, October 28, 1997, at page H9586.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 858) that authorizes funds for intelligence and intelligence-related activities, and for other purposes, for fiscal year 1998.

All such conference reports are, Mr. Speaker, as this one is, a compromise that, unfortunately, represents a significant reduction in funding for intelligence activities from our authorization passed by this body in June. But these reductions, when combined with some of the actions we have taken in appropriations, will mean the intelligence community will do without some much needed resources in several areas.

That said, however, this conference report does set the stage for some work we will be doing over the next several years to ensure that this Nation has the intelligence capability it needs. Therefore, I strongly support the passage of this report.

I would like to thank the members of the committee who worked hard to craft this bill, particularly the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS], the ranking member. I appreciate, as well, the fine efforts of our subcommittee chairman and the ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM]. In fact, I thank all the members of the committee who played constructive roles throughout this process; and, indeed, that was every member of the committee.

Also, Mr. Speaker, special acknowledgment goes to the members of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence for their cooperation as we came together to make tough decisions on how best to invest in the future of our intelligence community for the benefit of our country.

□ 0945

Of course, there is no way we could be here today without the dedication, professionalism and perseverance of the staffs on both sides of the aisle and on both committees. I say that because we have a good working relationship, it is bipartisan, and bicameral, and it shows.

Finally, some applause most go to the Members and the staffs of the House Committees on National Security and Appropriations for their sustaining cooperation throughout this authorization's legislative journey. It has been a good working relationship and a good product as a result.

Mr. Speaker, this bill could not be more timely. Over the last few days, much time has been spent by Members deliberating very serious issues relating to the future relationship that the United States should have with Russia and with China. Indeed, we will be debating more on China today. Significant questions have been raised regarding these countries' roles in the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, proliferation that could result in placing our Nation at serious risk, thus comprising a direct threat to our national security.

I do not intend to get into the policy side of this debate here today. Whether we decide that sanctions should be imposed or continued on these countries is secondary, but there is a fact here that simply cannot be ignored. As a Nation, we will not be able to gauge the success or failure of our policies or know the threat without an effective intelligence community. We simply have to have the eyes and ears to let us know what is going on.

We are told that there are no Russian missiles aimed at American children as they go to bed at night. Mr. Speaker, how do we know that for sure? How can we make that statement with certainty? How long will it take to retarget such weapons? How can we know how tenuous is the chain of command in the Russian strategic rocket forces? And how are we to catch profiteers trying to steal and sell suitcase nukes, if indeed they exist? And how are we to uncover and disrupt the secret nuclear weapons programs underway in hostile rogue states we read about virtually every day in the paper and see on television every night? The answer to all of these questions is one word, ''intelligence.''

And then there is China, Mr. Speaker. We will soon begin the debate again on the certification of China. Hanging in the balance could be United States access to the Chinese nuclear reactor market, reportedly a $50 billion trade opportunity. Or is it an opportunity? To do this, though, we must have confidence that the Chinese have stopped proliferating weapons of mass destruction components, systems and technologies, something that the Chinese President has promised to do. How good is that promise? But how will we know? How will we know that the technology we provide has been secretly diverted to military programs or to rogue regimes? Again the answer is simple, intelligence. Intelligence is what we count on to answer these questions, and we want these questions answered.

Mr. Speaker, weapons proliferation is a sufficiently grave problem for me to argue the need for dynamic intelligence community capabilities. But there are other problems also at play. Terrorism, narcotics, and racketeering are some of the transnational issues we talk about that are endangering our Nation's well-being and for which we must have strong intelligence capability.

Also included in the need for intelligence is its crucial role supporting our military forces, our war fighters, mission one, whether they are deployed for war or for other less well-defined humanitarian or peacekeeping missions where we are doing force protection. Intelligence requirements have grown tremendously and intelligence-related technologies have revolutionized our defense and warfare doctrines.

As we know, it is intelligence that puts the smart in the smart weapons. But it goes well beyond that. Intelligence is the centerpiece of the doctrine of Dominant Battlefield Awareness, which has been endorsed by the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and by our Armed Services.

But, the Defense Department needs to make the hard decision to invest more for intelligence if it truly desires to achieve the capabilities it says it needs to support our forces. I encourage them to take that message during the next year. Indeed, I find it somewhat puzzling that if this is the direction that DOD wants to go, why are there continued efforts to, ''tax'' defense intelligence agencies and programs even more? Why has the Defense Reform Task Force apparently been talking about significant cuts to defense intelligence, up to 25 percent?