COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:


Hon. JIM WRIGHT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Speaker: I have the honor to transmit herewith a copy of the certificate of election received from the Honorable March Fong Eu, United States Representative in Congress from California, certifying that, according to the official returns of the Special Election held on June 2, 1987, the Honorable Nancy Pelosi was elected to the office of the United States Representative in Congress from the Fifth District of California.

With great respect, I am,

Sincerely yours,

DONALD K. ANDERSON,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, SECRETARY OF STATE
CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

I, March Fong Eu, Secretary of State of the State of California, hereby certify:

That according to the official returns of the Special Election held on the 2nd day of June, 1987, and the statement of the result thereof on file in my office, Nancy Pelosi was elected to the office of United States Representative in Congress, Fifth District, for the term ending on the 3rd day of January, 1989.

In witness whereof, I hereunto set my hand and affix the Great Seal of the State of California, at Sacramento, this 8th day of June, 1987.

MARCH FONG EU,
Secretary of State.

WELCOME TO THE HONORABLE NANCY P. PELOSI

(Mr. EDWARDS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, with great joy personally and on behalf of the California delegation, I welcome the new Member from the Fifth Congressional District, the historical district in San Francisco, Nancy Pelosi.

We are all very proud that Nancy was elected to this historic seat, and we promise you that she will be a wonderful Member of this august body.

We are also honored to have visiting us from the other body our senior Senator, ALAN CRANSTON, and both the distinguished Senators from the State of California, certifying that, according to the official returns of the Special Election held on June 2, 1987, the Honorable Nancy Pelosi was elected to the office of United States Representative in Congress from the Fifth District of California.

With great respect, I am,

Sincerely yours,

DONALD K. ANDERSON,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, SECRETARY OF STATE
CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

I, March Fong Eu, Secretary of State of the State of California, hereby certify:

That according to the official returns of the Special Election held on the 2nd day of June, 1987, and the statement of the result thereof on file in my office, Nancy Pelosi was elected to the office of United States Representative in Congress, Fifth District, for the term ending on the 3rd day of January, 1989.

In witness whereof, I hereunto set my hand and affix the Great Seal of the State of California, at Sacramento, this 8th day of June, 1987.

MARCH FONG EU,
Secretary of State.

S.WARING IN OF THE HONORABLE NANCY PELOSI OF CALIFORNIA AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. We have the great privilege of administering the oath of office to our newest colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Pelosi).

Will the gentlewoman from California, please come forward into the well of the House?

Ms. PELOSI appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

WELCOME TO THE HONORABLE NANCY P. PELOSI

(Mr. EDWARDS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, with great joy personally and on behalf of the California delegation, I welcome the new Member from the Fifth Congressional District, the historical district in San Francisco, Nancy Pelosi.

We are all very proud that Nancy was elected to this historic seat, and we promise you that she will be a wonderful Member of this august body.

We are also honored to have visiting us from the other body our senior Senator, ALAN CRANSTON, and both the distinguished Senators from the State of California, certifying that, according to the official returns of the Special Election held on June 2, 1987, the Honorable Nancy Pelosi was elected to the office of United States Representative in Congress from the Fifth District of California.

With great respect, I am,

Sincerely yours,

DONALD K. ANDERSON,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, SECRETARY OF STATE
CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

I, March Fong Eu, Secretary of State of the State of California, hereby certify:

That according to the official returns of the Special Election held on the 2nd day of June, 1987, and the statement of the result thereof on file in my office, Nancy Pelosi was elected to the office of United States Representative in Congress, Fifth District, for the term ending on the 3rd day of January, 1989.

In witness whereof, I hereunto set my hand and affix the Great Seal of the State of California, at Sacramento, this 8th day of June, 1987.

MARCH FONG EU,
Secretary of State.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. BENTLEY).

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, as a Marylander on the other side of the aisle who worked for many years covering Mayor D'Alesandro and his son, Mayor D'Alesandro, and knowing the family as well as I do, I particularly want to extend a welcome to you, Nancy.

We are all looking forward to working with you.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, the senior member of the California delegation.

There are many members from the California delegation on the floor, and they are rightfully proud of the fact that they have added another member to their delegation.

I am proud to rise, and our senior Member is not on the floor; but if she were, I know that she would rise to say how proud we, in the formerly eight-member delegation from the State of Maryland, now the nine-member delegation from the State of Maryland, are to share with our sister State, California, the newest Member to be elected to high public office of one of America's most distinguished public service families.

The gentleman from California has introduced two of the mayors of one of America's great cities, a father and son who served well, who are remembered now by their city, and who continue to play a significant role in the life of Baltimore City and in the politics of Maryland.

Nancy and I had the opportunity of working together on Capitol Hill some 5 or 6 years ago when we were in college.

Nancy probably comes to the Congress as well schooled and versed in politics and issues of our day as any Member ever.

We want to say to her on behalf of all Marylanders who love and respect and revere the D'Alesandro family, that we look forward with joy and great anticipation to serving with her and serving the Nation she loves so well.

Nancy, you are a great addition to our body. Welcome, Nancy.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland, the city of Baltimore (Mr. CARDIN).

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

I agree with my colleague from Maryland, Mr. Hoyte, that we are very pleased that the Maryland dele-
Speaker, I believe all of the 27 members of the California delegation are entering Congress a committed and caring person. Nancy D'Alesandro family has done much for the city of Baltimore, our State of Maryland and our Nation. Tommy D'Alesandro, Jr., Mr. Mayor, the person who planted the seed for the Baltimore that we love today, the person that our Governor Schaefer always points to with pride as the person who started the renaissance of the city of Baltimore, and Tommy D'Alesandro III, the mayor of Baltimore, who built up that reputation. I am honored to serve as the Representative from the Third Congressional District of Maryland. That district is much better because of the service of the D'Alesandro family; and Nancy, we welcome you here to join in building the reputation that your family has given to this Nation.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I believe all of the 27 Members of the California delegation are here; and at this time I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. Pelosi) to the Congress of the United States and to welcome her wonderful family here as well. This is such a proud moment for all of you. Congresswoman Pelosi, sharing the representation of San Francisco with you will be an honor for me. You are a veteran of political life and will add much savvy to the California delegation and to the entire Congress.

But most important to me and to the people of San Francisco is that you enter Congress a committed and caring person. I have been here 5 years and in that time I have had the privilege of serving with Phillip and Sala Burton—all too briefly. You come here with their fierce dedication to the issues they carried: You will work unceasingly for nuclear arms control; for an end to the Contra war; for labor and environmental protection. You will be a voice for the most vulnerable in our society and you will join and lead in the difficult and critical fight against AIDS—a fight that must unite this entire Congress as it hasn't been united in the past—to educate and to find a vaccine and do it in such a way that no one in this country feels the bitter sting of discrimination.

Nancy—we all welcome you today, all of your colleagues. But I want to put in a special word for a minority in this House. We make up just 5 percent of the institution but we try to make our voices heard. That is the Congresswomen. We welcome you to our ranks. Congressmen and Congresswomen alike know you will be an outstanding Member of this great House of the people.

Congratulations.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. BYRON).

Mrs. BYRON. First of all, let me say that as the dean of the Maryland delegation, I welcome you here to the House of代表s and a delegation that has always been known for the fact that we have a large number of females in our complement, let me say to our new Members of the House today that we welcome her as representing California and we also have to take a little bit of pride and borrow her every now and then for her Maryland heritage.

So we welcome her.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MFUME).

Mr. MFUME. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Nancy, let me just add my congratulations, as a native Baltimorean and one who has benefited from the wealth of political knowledge and understanding that your family has made available to all of us there. We are proud of your age. On behalf of the freshman class, we all want you to know it is nice to have someone here who has a little less seniority than we do.

Welcome again.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentlewoman from California have anything to say in her own defense?

SALA BURTON SENT ME (Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much, to you, the leadership of the House, both Democrat and Republican, to my wonderful colleagues in California, and to my friends, childhood friends in some cases. In the Maryland delegation: thank you very much for your kind remarks. To all of you, it is a very sentimental day for me. As you can see my father here, I was born when he was in Congress here. He made us all very proud in our family. He also taught us a tradition of public service, a tradition of commitment to making Government work for people. Out of that proud tradition sprang my brother, who became mayor of Baltimore. Never did I think that I would be a member of the House of Representatives, but that happened because of another proud tradition and that is the tradition of the Burton tradition in the Fifth Congressional District.

We are very proud of the Fifth Congressional District and its leadership for its commitment to civil rights, for its commitment, for equal rights, for rights of individual freedom and now we must take the leadership of course in the crisis of AIDS. And I look forward to working with you on that.

But I just want to say one thing. Mr. Speaker, because I only have a moment I know and that is I told the people of the Fifth Congressional District who sent me here that when I got here I would tell you all that I would change the circumstances under which I came if I could but I cannot. I wish Phillip were here, I wish Sala were here, but they are not and I cannot do anything about that except to follow that tradition of excellence, of commitment and of making Government work for people.

I told the people of the Fifth Congressional District when I got here I will tell you, "Sala Burton sent me." Thank you very much.

These flowers are from Governor Schaefer.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1827, MAKING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 1987

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1827), making supplemental Appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. Whitten, Boland, Natcher, Smith of Iowa, Yates, Obey, Roybal, Bevill, Chappell, Lehman of Florida, Dixon, Fazio, Hefner, Conte, McDade, Coughlin, and Regula, Mrs. Smith of Nebraska, and Messrs. Edwards of Oklahoma, Green, and Rogers.

LET US REWARD JAPAN FOR DEEDS, NOT WORDS (Mr. Pease asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. Pease. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my concern over the adminis-
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The first question was: "How justly does the government of Nicaragua treat the people—very justly, somewhat justly, with little justice or not justly at all." This is how people living in neighboring countries answered:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Costa Rica</th>
<th>Honduras</th>
<th>Salvador</th>
<th>Guatemala</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very justly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat justly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, justly</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With little justice</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No justice at all</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, unjustly</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion, no answer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now that's a somewhat different result than many would have expected from listening and reading the news. Consider question number 2: "Would you say the (Sandinista) government of Nicaragua represents the majority of the people or that it represents a minority." The answer will blow your socks off.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representing majority</th>
<th>Costa Rica</th>
<th>Honduras</th>
<th>Salvador</th>
<th>Guatemala</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Represents majority</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represents minority</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion, don't know</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It's interesting to note that Costa Rica and Honduras border Nicaragua. El Salvador doesn't, nor does Guatemala, which is the farthest away from Nicaragua of the four. The pattern is clear throughout the region. El Salvador: The closest neighbors of Nicaragua like it the least.

Here's the third question: "Which side of the conflict do you think the majority of the people of Nicaragua support—• • • the Sandinistas • • • or the Contras • • • • "

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority supports</th>
<th>Costa Rica</th>
<th>Honduras</th>
<th>Salvador</th>
<th>Guatemala</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandinista</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contras</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked if a country were to attack their countries which one would it be, the vast majority of those answering say Nicaragua, with Cuba in second place and the Soviet Union in third. The United States was not shown as even being mentioned!

Except when people were asked: "Which country, if any, would come to our aid immediately if we were attacked?" Over 80 percent answered: the U.S.

Then the question was asked: "In your opinion can the U.S. be relied upon to help us defend our country in case of future military attack." Note the answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Costa Rica</th>
<th>Honduras</th>
<th>Salvador</th>
<th>Guatemala</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These people have more confidence in us then we do in ourselves.

Who treats civilians better in the war zones? The Contras or the Sandinistas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Better treat</th>
<th>Costa Rica</th>
<th>Honduras</th>
<th>Salvador</th>
<th>Guatemala</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contras</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandinistas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you approve or disapprove of American military aid to the Contras?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Costa Rica</th>
<th>Honduras</th>
<th>Salvador</th>
<th>Guatemala</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After stating that it was their opinion that Cuba, the Soviet Union and Libya gave military aid to the Sandinistas, the people of the region were asked if they approved of such aid to the Sandinistas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Costa Rica</th>
<th>Honduras</th>
<th>Salvador</th>
<th>Guatemala</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In short in Central America the overwhelming majority of people approve of us not do feel threatened by the United States, approve of our aid to the Contras, and fear the Sandinistas and oppose aid from the outside to them.

In the last five years all the countries of South America, except Chile and Paraguay, have remained or become democracies. During the same period in Central America all but Nicaragua and Panama have turned to democracy, where only Costa Rica had democratic institutions before.

Among the countries that have adopted democracy during the last five years are Brazil, Argentina, Peru, Uruguay, Bolivia, Ecuador, (actually in 1979), Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador and Belize. Many never had democratic institutions before. This is both remarkable and unprecedented. Yet, amazingly, critics maintain our policy has failed or there is no policy at all.

Think of the further progress the region could make if we believe in ourselves as much as they believe in us.

INVOKE THE WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

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

(Mr. LAGOMARSINO. No. Speaker, opponents of U.S. policy in Central America are fond of pointing out opinion polls in the United States that indicate support among Americans for that policy is not overwhelming. Those same opponents, however, fail to acknowledge opinion polls conducted in those nations in Central America who are neighbors of Nicaragua and are the people most directly affected by the Sandinista threat in the region.

The results of a recent poll conducted by an affiliate of the Gallup organization in the countries of Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, and Costa Rica were reprinted in the Santa Maria, CA, Times, a prominent newspaper in my district.

I urge my colleagues to read the results of this poll and consider carefully the opinions of those people who fear the Sandinista regime in Nicaragua and approve of U.S. policy to aid the Contras.

WHAT NEIGHBORS THINK

By Senator Rudy Boschis tz)

Normally, it's your neighbors who know you best.

So I was particularly interested in a poll taken by the Gallup Organization's international group on Nicaragua's neighbors—Costa Rica, Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala. It was recently entered into the Congressional Record by Sen. Bob Dole and is enormously revealing.
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Mr. Speaker, Japan and Europe have
been riding an exclusive elevator for
too long while the American taxpayer
and its fighting men have been getting
the shaft. I think it is time for a new
global force in the gulf; they should
start paying their fair share and the
American Express card should stop
right here in the House of Representa-
tives today on the Persian Gulf Reso-
lution.

Think about it.

SIXTY-FIVE-MILE-PER-HOUR
SPEED LIMIT IS A SUCCESS

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given
permission to address the House for
1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, we have
now had one major holiday in which
drivers on the Nation's highways
found, in 20 States, that you had a 65-
mile-an-hour speed limit. It is interest-
ing to look at the statistics that have
come off that weekend.

Despite what was said on the House
floor about the increase of fatalities as
a result of the 65-mile-an-hour speed
limit, what we found in those 20 States
where the speed limit was raised to 65, there was, in fact, a 35-
percent reduction in the fatalities as
compared to 1986.

In 1986 in those 20 States there were
157 people who died; in 1987 there
were 102 people who died—a 35-per-
cent reduction in fatalities in those
States where the 65-mile-an-hour speed
limit was in effect.

Now, there may be other factors
that enter into this but one thing is
clear, that the claim of opponents to
the 65-mile-an-hour speed limit on the
floor that this would result in massive
new fatalities was just plain wrong.
Memorial Day statistics would seem to
indicate that the 65-mile-an-hour speed
limit is at least as safe, if not safer,
than the 55 miles per hour on
our highways.

SHAME ON YOU, JAPAN, SHAME ON YOU, JAPAN

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

Mr. RAVENEL. Mr. Speaker, in No-
vember 1984 the Government of Japan
entered into an agreement with our
Government that they would cease
commercial whaling by April 1988. Ap-
parently, the Japanese have no inten-
tion of honoring the spirit of that
agreement.

First, they employed a loophole in the
whaling convention to continue
whaling in the Antarctic under the
guise of science—now they have asked
the International Whaling Commis-
sion to redefine their commercial
coastal whaling operation as an ab-
original/subsistence hunt and request-
ed a quota of 210 minke whales.

Such action would be an affront to any
sense of the agreement are outrageous—
first, they turn their whalers into sci-
entists—now they are proposing to
turn another group of whalers into Es-
kimos.

Shame on you, Japan, shame on you.

America should not be the
only keeper of the peace
in the world.

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

Mr. TRAPICANT. Mr. Speaker, America
should not be the only keeper of
peace in the world.

Whenever a crisis erupts our so-
called allies say, "Leave it to the Yan-
kees," and 1 do not mean George
Steinbrenner's crew.

Japan and Europe get the bulk of
their oil from the gulf; we get little.
They benefit from it; we pay. In fact,
our foreign policy has turned into an
American Express card; Japan and
Europe submit the bill and in 30 days
we pay cash. And cash is not enough
anymore. Now we are starting to sacri-
fice the lives of our noble, gallant
fighting men.

Mr. Speaker, Japan and Europe have
been getting off the hook for too long while the American taxpayer
and its fighting men have been getting
the shaft. I think it is time for a new
global force in the gulf; they should
start paying their fair share and the
American Express card should stop
right here in the House of Represen-
tatives today on the Persian Gulf Reso-
lution.

Think about it.
dramatically wrong. The majority cannot agree to a budget resolution in private. We are constantly being faced with bills going to the floor which have received waivers for violations of the Budget Act. We’re considering authorizations and appropriations without a budget resolution. The 1986 supplement expired the limits on Federal spending set in last year’s budget resolution. How can we go on?

We need changes in the process by which we determine a budget. Mr. Speaker, it’s time for the budget. More importantly it’s time for budget reform.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO CREATE A SPECIAL COLLEGE PROGRAM IN THE PEACE CORPS

(Mrs. MORELLA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, the time has come to train for peace as we have for war. Today I am introducing legislation to create a special college program to increase participation in the Peace Corps.

The program would be modeled after the Reserve Officer Training Corps now in place in many colleges. Under the plan, the Federal Government would pay the education costs for qualified undergraduates during the last 2 years of school.

Just as ROTC students take military courses, these Peace Corps candidates would take courses designed to help prepare them for service in nations that have Peace Corps projects. They would study the language, culture, and history of the nations in which they would serve, as well as agriculture and economic development. After graduation, participants would serve 2 years as Peace Corps volunteers.

For this small investment, our Nation would receive manifold benefits. We would develop a strong sense of service through service. A major concern so often heard today, that today's students are selfish or disinterested in the world that surrounds them, would be simply and directly addressed. And, as is the case today, Peace Corps volunteers continue to serve their nation upon their return: In government, international relations, education, medicine.

Mr. Speaker, today thousands of students across the Nation compete for ROTC scholarships. This proposal would enable our best and brightest to compete for scholarships for peace as well.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1988

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 187 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 187
Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, decommission the Committee of the Whole on the House of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2112) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1988 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, for the Intelligence Community Staff, for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against the consideration of the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of sections 302(c) and 401(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended (Public Law 93-344, as amended by Public Law 99-177) and with clause 2(6) of rule XI are hereby waived, and all points of order against the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 5(a) of rule XXI are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill as considered, the bill shall be disposed of in the following manner: to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence since May 13. The bill it makes in order is a simple resolution. How can we go on?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] is seated.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes, for purposes of debate only, to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 187 is the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2112, the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 1988. It is open rule, providing for 30 minutes of general debate, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

The rule provides for the bill to be considered for amendment by titles, rather than sections, with each title considered as read. It allows one motion to recommit.

The rule also waives two provisions of the Congressional Budget Act: Section 302(c), which prohibits consideration of measures that would cause the appropriate subcommittee level or programmatic level to be exceeded, and section 401(b)(1), which prohibits consideration of new entitlement authority which becomes effective prior to October 1 of the year in which it is reported. And, the rule waives clause 5(a) of rule XXI, prohibiting appropriations in a legislative bill.

H.R. 2112 is an authorization bill and, as such, provides funding subject to appropriations. However, the bill does provide for direct payment of the expenses of the Commission on Intelligence Personnel, a three-member panel created by this bill which would report its recommendations 9 months after this bill's enactment. The funding for the Commission would violate the provisions mentioned above but, because of the temporary, short-term nature of that panel, the Rules Committee believes that direct payment is appropriate in this case and is thus recommending these waivers.

Finally, the rule waives clause 2(6) of rule XI, which requires a 3-day layover after the filing of the committee report. This waiver is needed to consider consideration of H.R. 2112 today, since the Armed Services Committee did not file its report on this measure until last Thursday, June 3. I would note, however, that report of the Intelligence Committee, which has principal jurisdiction over this bill, has been available to the House membership since May 13.

H.R. 2112, for which the Rules Committee has recommended this rule authorizes appropriations for the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the U.S. Government for fiscal year 1988. As I noted earlier, it would create a commission to study intelligence personnel matters so that Congress' intelligence committees will have an independent evaluation in this highly technical area to help them respond to requests from various agencies for incremental changes from year to year. It also contains a provision, identical to that in this year's intelligence authorization, requiring that any military or paramilitary assistance provided to the Contras be explicitly authorized and appropriated for that purpose by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 187. so that we can proceed to consideration of H.R. 2112.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule, and as has been ably explained, the bill it makes in order is a simple authorization of the Intelligence and Intelligence related operations of this Government. When the bill was presented before the Rules Committee, the testimony revealed that it was noncontroversial.
It is necessary to get the authorization bills behind us so that we can go on to the appropriation process. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Walker].

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a couple minutes here if I could to have somebody explain to me just exactly what it is we are doing with regard to some of these waivers. I think the gentleman from California had an explanation in his opening remarks, but I am not certain that I wholly followed it.

The waiver of 302-F of the Congressional Budget Act which prohibits consideration of measures which would cause appropriate subcommittee levels and program level ceilings to be exceeded, where in the bill is that a problem and for what reason was that waiver granted?

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, both budget waivers relate to the punitive administration and it is fact something which appropriates money, and program level ceilings to be exceeded, where in the bill is that a problem and for what reason was that waiver granted?

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that I wholly followed it.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, both budget waivers relate to the punitive administration and it is fact something which appropriates money, and program level ceilings to be exceeded, where in the bill is that a problem and for what reason was that waiver granted?

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that I wholly followed it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule. I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, either.

I would like to say in response to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that in a sense this is a technical waiver of the rules. It is a minimal amount of money that is involved. I would assure the gentleman that the reason that this Commission is being set up in the first place and the administration, the gentleman may say, is a individual amount to the setting up of the Commission, but the way in which the Members are to be appointed, I think they should be exclusively by the executive or the legislative branch, but it is to save money over the long run.

Our committee keeps getting assaulted, as I am sure others do as well, by various people in the various agencies of the intelligence community, asking that their retirement benefits or their pensions or whatever be raised. Once one is raised, then another comes and says, “Since you raised theirs, we want ours raised, too.”

We wanted to have for the first time some independent evaluation of this highly technical area so that we can make some sensible adjustments and some sensible arrangements and not come at all the time by these various commissions.

I would assure the gentleman that members of the committee believe and hope that in the long run, perhaps even in the short run, the setting up of this Commission will save the American taxpayers quite a sizable sum of money.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered. The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Frost). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the ayes appeared to have it. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 285, nays 115, not voting 33, as follows:

(A roll No. 168)
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The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Stokes) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Hyde) will be recognized with 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Stokes).

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2112, the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 1988. The principal purpose of this bill is to authorize appropriations for all of the intelligence or intelligence-related activities of the U.S. Government during fiscal year 1988. As in the past, the actual amounts authorized are contained in a classified schedule of authorizations which is incorporated by reference and which is available, along with a classified annex to the committee's report, in the Committee on Armed Services, chaired by Mr. Nielson of Utah.

Members who read both of the classified documents will recognize that, although the committee's recommendations are below those amounts requested by the administration, the committee has recognized the high priority which intelligence should enjoy within the larger national security budget. It has made appropriate recommendations so that all essential intelligence programs and activities have been funded. Most of the amounts authorized are in the defense budget.

Mr. Chairman, as it does every year, the committee has worked closely with the Committee on Armed Services to produce recommendations for the authorization of appropriations of intelligence-related activities over which the committees share jurisdiction. The amounts authorized by H.R. 2112 are therefore fully consistent with those authorized by H.R. 1748, the fiscal year 1986 defense authorization bill, as it passed the House. Both committees agreed on these amounts.

Cooperation and understanding between the two committees, which is fostered in large part by this cross-membership, is, I believe, one of the great unknown success stories of this body. I attribute it to the leadership of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, Representative Aspin, a former member of the Intelligence Committee and to former committee members such as BoB Stokes from Arizona, former ranking minority member, and, in particular, to the able representation which the Intelligence Committee receives from its two members of the Committee on Armed Services, Dave McCurdy and Dan Daniel.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to the authorization of appropriations, H.R. 2112 contains a number of legislative provisions. There is a provision identi-
cal to that which was enacted in the fiscal year 1987 act that would limit assistance to the Contras to that specifically authorized by law.

There is a provision which effectively codifies the specification of section 502 of the National Security Act of 1947, requiring that all intelligence expenditures have been authorized by law. This same provision also provides authorizations for a number of projects for which funds were appropriated in fiscal year 1987 without authorization. The provision also requires that, in the case of two programs, funds may not be spent unless they have been reprogrammed.

Finally, the bill would provide retirement and death-in-service benefits for certain former spouses of CIA personnel and extends authority for certain personnel management authorities at the Defense Intelligence Agency.

Last, the bill would establish a Commission on Intelligence Personnel Systems to review and analyze the personnel management authorities at the Defense Intelligence Agency.

The bill would establish a Commission on Intelligence Personnel Systems to review and analyze the personnel management authorities at the Defense Intelligence Agency.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2112 enjoys strong bipartisan support within the committee and represents, I believe, the product of an excellent working relationship by both members and staff to carefully assess the needs of intelligence and make recommendations that are consistent both with the national security and the state of the Nation's finances. I want to pay tribute to the ranking minority member of the committee, Henry Hyde, for his thoughtful and cooperative approach and a strong vote of thanks to Dick Cheney, the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Program and Budget Authorization who has worked tirelessly and extremely effectively in the long hours of deliberations and hearings that have produced this bill.

And, last, I want to pay tribute to the hard work, dedication, and high professionalism of the committee staff, particularly that of the Subcommittee on Program and Budget Authorization.

Mr. Chairman, this past year has marked one of upheaval for the U.S. intelligence community. William Casey, the Director of Central Intelligence, passed away. The Iran-Contra Committees of both the House and Senate have been investigating the activities of the intelligence community, among other actors, in the conduct of those operations. And, it is fair to say, I believe, that some very serious questions have been raised about the conduct of certain intelligence officers and the adequacy of the control, direction and guidance given the intelligence community on such matters as the Boland amendment.

Judge William Webster, formerly Director of the FBI, is now the Director of Central Intelligence. He is a man whose integrity and intellect are unquestioned and whose straightforward adherence to the rule of law has been demonstrated over years of public service. In many ways, he may be just what the U.S. intelligence community needs at this juncture.

But, Mr. Chairman, he faces a series of very difficult problems—foremost among them the reclamation of trust between Congress and the executive branch. The state of relations between the committee and the Central Intelligence Agency is, at the moment, not good, nor is there any easy fix. It will take genuine and significant effort over the long haul by both branches to regain what has been lost.

Equally as serious, U.S. security and counterintelligence capabilities have been severely questioned in the past year or so. Improvements and renewed emphasis are in order. Last, the repercussions of the Iran/Contra investigations are likely to produce a number of recommendations for improvements in several aspects of intelligence operations and oversight.

Mr. Chairman, all these problems will take the best efforts of both branches and the continued appointment of qualified professionals of integrity to the Central Intelligence Agency. It is at this point that I believe that the recommendations of the committee are necessary, that the Central Intelligence Agency must diligently and cooperatively work with the committee to regain the confidence of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.
tion to this bill and to the work of the committee is invaluable.

Mr. CHENEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join with my colleagues in thanking the chairman of the committee for the fair and objective and impartial way he presides over a very difficult task. This is a fascinating committee on which to serve in part because everything we do takes place in executive session for obvious reasons. So there is not always the public accord and approval that many Members experience when they serve on more public committees.

It has been possible for us to come together from a wide variety of backgrounds and with widely differing philosophies and opinions on the issues of the day, to come together in an extended effort and address some very difficult and complex issues and put together what I think is an excellent bill.

Last year's bill receded into the history books. It provided any benefits for the very few CIA retirees who were, neither one of the public accord and approval that many Members experience when they serve on more public committees. It closed what we all hoped was a chapter in history.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered under the 5-hour rule. Each Member may make a statement of 15 minutes, and each title shall be considered as having been read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2112

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Intelligence Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1988."

TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 101. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1988 for the conduct of the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the following elements of the United States Government:

(1) The Central Intelligence Agency.
(2) The Department of Defense.
(3) The Defense Intelligence Agency.
(4) The National Security Agency.
(5) The Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force.
(6) The Department of State.
(7) The Department of the Treasury.
(8) The Department of Energy.
(9) The Federal Bureau of Investigation.
(10) The Drug Enforcement Administration.

CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS

Sec. 102. (a) The amounts authorized to be appropriated under section 101, and the authorized personnel ceilings as of September 30, 1988, for the conduct of the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the elements listed in such section, are those specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations for Intelligence and Intelligence-Related Activities presented by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence to accompany H.R. 2112 of the One Hundredth Congress. That Schedule of Authorizations shall be made available to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives and to the President. The President shall provide for suitable distribution of the Schedule, or of appropriate portions of the Schedule, within the executive branch.

(b)(1) In computing the number of nonheadquarters personnel required to be reduced under subsection (b)(2)(A) of section 605 of Public Law 100-202, the Secretary of Defense shall exclude person nel of the Defense Intelligence Agency and the Defense Mapping Agency, and in carrying out that subsection the Secretary shall allocate such reduction (under the authority of the Secretary under subsection (d) of that section) so that none of such reduction is applied to personnel of the Defense Intelligence Agency or the Defense Mapping Agency.

(2) For purposes of paragraphs (1), the term "nonheadquarters personnel" means members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the Defense Activities of the Department of Defense Field Activities, other than members and employees assigned or detailed to duty in management headquarters agencies or management headquarters support activities.

PERSONNEL CEILING ADJUSTMENTS

Sec. 103. The Director of Central Intelligence may authorize employment of civilian personnel in excess of the number of nonheadquarters personnel authorized for fiscal year 1988 under sections 102 and 202 of this Act when he determines that such action is necessary to the performance of important intelligence functions. The Director shall keep the Committee informed of any such action and of any Such authorization made under this section shall not affect any other ceilings or limitations on personnel ceilings.

RESTRICTION ON SUPPORT FOR MILITARY OR PARASYLLIC OPERATIONS IN NICARAGUA

Sec. 104. Funds available to the Central Intelligence Agency, the Department of Defense, or any other agency or entity of the United States, that is engaged in intelligence activities specifically providing such funds, materiel, or other assistance to the Nicaraguan democratic resistance to support military or paramilitary operations in Nicaragua only as authorized in section 101 and as specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102, or pursuant to section 502 of the National Security Act of 1947, or pursuant to any provision of law specifically providing such funds, materiel, or assistance.

UNAUTHORIZED APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 105. (a) Notwithstanding sections 9125 or section 9133 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1987, (as contained in section 101(c) of the Joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1987, and for other purposes" (Public Law 99-591), only funds specifically authorized by the Congress in accord
TITLE IV—RETIREMENT AND DEATH IN SERVICE BENEFITS

Sec. 401. (a) Part C of title II of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act of 1964 for Certain Employees is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN FORMER SPUSHS OF A PARTICIPANT"

"Sec. 225. (a) Any individual who was a former spouse of a participant or a former participant on November 15, 1982, shall be entitled, to the extent of available appropriations, and except to the extent such former spouse is disqualified under subsection (b), to benefits—

"(1) if married to the participant throughout the creditable service of the participant, equal to 50 percent of the benefits of the participant;

"(2) married to the participant throughout such creditable service, equal to that former spouse's pro rata share of 50 percent of such benefits.

"(c) Those intelligence or intelligence-related activities for which funds were appropriated in the Defense Appropriations Act, 1987 and which are listed in that part of the Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 101(a) entitled "Unauthorized Appropriations, Fiscal Year 1987" shall be considered specifically authorized by Congress pursuant to section 502 of the National Security Act of 1947.

(2) Those intelligence or intelligence-related activities for which funds were appropriated in the Defense Appropriations Act, 1987 and which are listed in that part of the Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 101(a) entitled "Unauthorized Appropriations, Fiscal Year 1987" shall be considered specifically authorized by Congress only for the purposes of section 502(a)(3) of the National Security Act of 1947.

TITLE II—INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY STAFF

AUTHORIZATION OF APPOINTMENTS

Sec. 201. There is authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Staff for fiscal year 1988 the sum of $134,700,000.

AUTHORIZATION OF PERSONNEL END STRENGTH

Sec. 202. (a) The Intelligence Community Staff is authorized 237 full-time personnel as of September 30, 1988. Such personnel of the Intelligence Community Staff may be permanent employees of the Intelligence Community Staff or personnel detailed from other elements of the United States Government.

(b) During fiscal year 1988, personnel of the Intelligence Community Staff shall be selected so as to provide appropriate representation from elements of the United States Government engaged in Intelligence and Intelligence-related activities.

(c) During fiscal year 1988, any officer or employee of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces who is detailed to the Intelligence Community Staff from another element of the United States Government shall be detailed on a reimbursable basis, except that any such officer, employee, or member of the Armed Forces shall be on a nonreimbursable basis for a period of less than one year for the performance of temporary functions as required by the Director of Central Intelligence.

INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY STAFF ADMINISTERED IN SAME MANNER AS CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Sec. 203. During fiscal year 1988, activities and personnel of the Intelligence Community Staff shall be subject to the provisions of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) and the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 403a et seq.).

TITLE III—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

AUTHORIZATION OF APPOINTMENTS

Sec. 301. There is authorized to be appropriated for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability Fund for fiscal year 1988 the sum of $134,700,000.
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Page 11, line 17 insert "to the extent of available appropriations," after "shall be entitled."

Page 12, strike out line 20 and all that follows through line 25 on page 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

TITLE V—DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE PERSONNEL IMPROVEMENTS

DIA CIVILIAN UNIFORM ALLOWANCE

Sec. 501. (a) Comparability With State Employed Employees.—Chapter 83 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§1606. Uniform allowance: civilian employees

"(b) Notwithstanding section 5901(a) of title 5, the amount of any such allowance shall be the greater of:

(1) The amount provided for employees of the Department of State assigned to positions outside the United States and required to wear a prescribed uniform in performance of official duties.

(2) $360 per year.

(c) An allowance paid under this section shall be treated in the same manner as is provided in subsection (c) of section 5901 of title 5 for an allowance paid under that section."

CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"1666. Uniform allowance: civilian employees."

EXTENSION OF SPECIAL TERMINATION AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN DOD INTELLIGENCE EMPLOYEES

Sec. 502. (a) Defense Intelligence Agency.—Section 1804(e)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting before "during fiscal years 1986 and 1987," and inserting in lieu thereof "during fiscal year 1988,

(b) Military Departments.—Section 1590(a)(1) of such title is amended by striking out "during fiscal years 1986 and 1987" and inserting in lieu thereof "during fiscal year 1988."

EFFECTIVE DATE

Sec. 503. The amendments made by this title shall take effect on October 1, 1987. "
Mr. STOKES (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered as read and printed in the Record, and that they be considered adopted as read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, these amendments, which have been cleared with the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Illinois, are technical in nature.

The amendment to title IV adds language contained in section 401 that was inadvertently omitted from section 402. The language is necessary to cure what the Budget Committee deems to be a technical violation of section 401(b)(1) of the Budget Act, concerning new entitlement authority.

The amendment to title V, which is a technical redraft of title V, as reported, corrects style errors and postpones the effective date of the provision until October 1, 1987. To avoid a technical violation of clause 5 of rule XXI, for which the rule adopted for consideration of this bill granted a waiver.

The amendment to title VI curbs what the Budget Committee deems to be a technical violation of section 302(f) of the Budget Act, concerning program level ceilings.

The last amendment adds a new title VII to the bill, containing general provisions heretofore included in each of the previous intelligence authorization acts going back to fiscal year 1979, and inadvertently omitted from the bill as reported.

In regard to the amendments correcting technical violations of the Budget Act, the appropriate technical waiver letters were sent to the Rules Committee, and the Budget Committee and the rule adopted contains the requisite waivers.

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

Mr. STOKES. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the minority agrees with the statement of the committee chairman and asks for adoption of the technical amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES).

The amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROOMFIELD

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROOMFIELD:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE VII—MOUNT ALTO EMBASSY SITE

ASSESSMENT OF SOVIET ELECTRONIC ESPIONAGE CAPABILITY

SEC. 701. (a) REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT.—

The Secretary of Defense shall review and assess the present and potential capabilities of the Government of the Soviet Union to intercept United States communications involving diplomatic, military, and intelligence matters from facilities on Mount Alto in the District of Columbia. The Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on such review and assessment not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) DETERMINATION OF CONSISTENCY WITH NATIONAL SECURITY.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include a determination by the Secretary of Defense as to whether or not the present and proposed occupation of facilities on Mount Alto by the Government of the Soviet Union is consistent with the national security of the United States.

(c) CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in both a classified and unclassified form, except that the determination required by subsection (b) shall be submitted in an unclassified form.

(d) LIMITATION ON DELEGATION.—The Secretary of Defense may not delegate the duty to make the determination required by subsection (b).

Mr. BROOMFIELD (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have discussed this with the chairman and the ranking member, but I would like to take a moment or two to explain briefly what this amendment does.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment requires the Secretary of Defense to assess the communications security impact of Soviet use of Mount Alto in the District of Columbia, and to report therein to Congress.

The amendment is identical to the amendment I offered that the House adopted 3 weeks ago as part of the Defense Authorization Act.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I am happy to yield to the committee chairman.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Michigan has noted, this amendment was adopted by the House during consideration of H.R. 7128, the Department of Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1988. It is acceptable to the committee.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee.

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I yield to the ranking minority member.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We, too, have examined this amendment. It is an excellent amendment, and we are pleased to accept it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any additional amendments to the bill?

Mr. BEILINSON, 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. 2112) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1988 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the U.S. Government, for the Intelligence Community Staff, for the Central Intelligence Agency Re-
tirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 187, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

FEDERALLY MANDATED EMPLOYEE BENEFITS

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

Mr. FLOPPY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to House Resolution 186, which promises responsible consideration of small business and the overall economy whenever federally mandated employee benefits are enacted.

As an original sponsor of this resolution, I strongly support the ideal that Congress should always seek to promote economic growth and improvements in our country's quality of life. Yet, to advance these goals, Congress must be fully informed of the effect of Federal legislation on the Nation's economy and our competitive position in international markets.

Since the Federal Government cannot afford to fund new employee benefits because of current budget deficit burdens, it is a seeming advantage for the House to have a legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GARCIA) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BEECHER. For 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FLOPPY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PEASE, for 5 minutes, on June 9 and June 10.
Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, for 5 minutes, on June 10.
Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, on June 10 and June 11.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GARCIA) to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BEECHER. In two instances.
Mr. PACKARD.
Mr. PUSELL.
Mr. HYDE.
Mr. GINGRICH.
Mrs. SAIZ.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. GARCIA) to include extraneous matter:

Mr. GARRISON.
Mr. MONTGOMERY.
Mr. MCGRATH.
Mr. WAXMAN.
Mr. TALLON.
Mr. FASCHEL.
Mr. BERMAN.
Mr. PEISE.
Mr. FASCHEL in three instances.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 412. An act to clarify the congressional intent concerning, and to codify, certain requirements of the Communications Act of 1934 that ensure that broadcasters afford reasonable opportunity for the discussion of continuing views on issues of public importance.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 10, 1987, at 10 a.m.

CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS, CALENDAR YEAR 1986, TO FACILITATE NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Clerk of the House of Representatives submits the following report for printing in the Congressional Record pursuant to section 4(b) of Public Law 85-804:
A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting reports on commercial and governmental military exports, together with a list of all security assistance agreements, or agents of foreign countries for the second quarter of fiscal year 1987, January 1, 1987 through March 31, 1987, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 308. Joint resolution designating November 14, 1987, as "National Philanthropy Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. Res. 189. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should not assist directly or indirectly groups engaging in an insurgency or other act of rebellion against the Government of Nicaragua if such groups engage in the illegal traffic in drugs and that certain congressional committees should investigate reports of such traffic to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

106. By the SPEAKER. Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to comprehensive health care services to native Hawaiians; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

107. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to legislation which would provide comprehensive health care services to native Hawaiians; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 363: Mr. Atkins, Mr. DeLuga, Mr. Pelle, Mr. Fazio, Mr. Wolfs, Mr. Boykins, Mr. Robinson.

H.R. 637: Mr. Atkins, Mr. DeLuga, Mr. Pelle, Mr. Fazio, Mr. Wolfs, Mr. Boykins, Mr. Robinson.

H.R. 678: Mr. DeLuga.

H.R. 689: Mr. DeLuga.

H.R. 916: Mr. Packard.

H.R. 954: Mr. Pepper, Mr. Gonzalez, Mr. Martinez, Mr. Daniel, Mr. Chisholm, Mr. Conoley, Mr. Grossman.

H. Res. 1076: Mr. St. Germain.

H.R. 1173: Mr. Hall, Mr. Miller of California, Mr. Kildee, Mr. Lewis of Georgia, Mr. Lewis of California, Mr. Gephardt, Mr. Owens of Utah, Mr. Clarke, Mr. Green, Mr. Petri, Mr. Frank, Mr. Bellon, Mr. Neal, Mr. Schuette, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Akins, Mr. Bates, Mr. Mrazek, Mr. Oakar, Mr. Stark, Mr. Morhi-
son of Connecticut, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Krockett, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Buehner, and Mr. Coelho.

H.R. 1202: Mr. Stallings.

H.R. 1242: Mr. Fawwell, Mr. Lancaster, and Mr. Lewis of Georgia.

H.R. 1353: Mr. Schuler, Mr. Daub, Mr. Lagomarsino, Mr. Nichols, Mr. Fawwell, Mr. McCollum, Mr. Mcelwee, Mr. Hunter, Mr. Weber, Mr. Nielson of Utah, Mr. Delay, Mrs. Byron, and Mrs. Bentley.

H.R. 1372: Mrs. Collins.

H.R. 1386: Mr. Fauntroy, Mr. Kolder, and Mr. Rangel.

H.R. 1701: Mr. Edwards of Oklahoma, Mr. Ose, and Mr. Lantos.

H.R. 1728: Mr. Roberts and Mr. Archer.

H.R. 1734: Mr. Kildee, Mr. Mineta, and Mr. de Lugo.

H.R. Res. 17: Mr. Bentley.

H.R. 1769: Mr. de Lugo, Mr. Hoey, Mr. Crockett, and Mr. Garcia.

H.R. 1782: Mr. Kastenmeier.

H.R. 2247: Mr. Mclaren, Mr. Broomfield, Mr. Garcia, Mr. McCloskey, Mr. Wise, Mr. Frank, Mr. Lagomarsino, Mr. Bustamante, Mr. Foster, Mr. DeWine, Mrs. Boxer, Mr. Pugh, Mr. Martin, and Mr. Stark.

H.R. 2318: Mr. Gunderson.

H.R. 2469: Mr. Lagomarsino, Mr. Mclaren, Mr. Broomfield, Mr. Garcia, Mr. McCloskey, Mr. Wise, Mr. Frank, Mr. Lagomarsino, Mr. Bustamante, Mr. Foster, Mr. DeWine, Mrs. Boxer, Mr. Pugh, Mr. Martin, and Mr. Stark.

H.R. 2482: Mr. Gonzalez, Mr. Smith of Florida, Mr. Kofus, Mr. Lagomarsino, Mr. Roe, and Mr. Bates.

H.R. 2514: Mr. Spratt and Mr. Tallon.

H.R. 2584: Mr. Lantos and Mr. Solare.

H.R. Res. 17: Mr. Flippo, Mr. Wolfe, Mr. Fauntroy, Mr. Mclaren, Mr. Bernard, Mr. Herman, Mr. Roe, Ms. Slaughter of New York, Mr. Sabo, Mr. Perkins, Mrs. Owens of Utah, Mr. Terry, Mr. Wyden, Mr. Pepper, Mr. Sisk, Mr. Smith of Iowa, Mr. Lancaster, Mr. de Lugo, Mr. Wolfe, Mr. Donnan of California, Mr. Cowen, Mr. Faio, Mr. Gonzalez, Mr. Garcia, Mr. Lowry of Washington, Mr. Lewis of California, Mr. Atkins, Mr. Nelson of Utah, Mr. Mack, Mrs. Boxer, Mr. Aspin, Mr. Barton of Texas, Mr. Bagg, Mr. Coleman of Texas, Mr. Dixon, Mr. Destrick, Mr. Tausin, Mr. Nichols, Mr. Lujan, Mr. Frenzel, Mr. Weller, Mr. Daniel, Mr. Folligeto, Mr. Vander Jagt, Mr. Whitten, Mr. Lungren, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bone of Tennessee, Mr. Rhodes, Mr. Worsley, Mr. Lehman of Florida, Mr. Young of Florida, Mr. Fascell, Mr. Craig, Mr. Grant, Mr. Brooks, and Mr. Shumway.

H.R. Res. 52: Mr. Nichols, Mr. Miller of California, Mr. Moorhead, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Lantos, Mr. Stump, Mr. Tauke, Mr. Roybal, Mr. Bernard, Mr. Dixon, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Dornin, Mr. Torres, Mr. Hoey, Mr. Trakas, Mr. Herstel, Mr. Sikorski, Mr. Scheuer, Mr. LaFalce, Mr. Dorgan of North Dakota, Mr. Rose, Mr. Shumway, and Mr. Packard.

Kolder, Mr. Kandorski, Mr. Walgren, Mr. Sabo, Mr. Mcdade, Mr. McHugh, Mr. Sisk, Mr. Dyson, and Mr. Wise.

H.R. Res. 55: Mr. Walgren, Mr. Udall, Mr. Vento, Mr. Miller of Ohio, Mr. Kolder, Mrs. Boxer, Mr. Lungren, Mr. Buehner, Mr. Dyson, Mr. Araka, and Mr. Robinson.

H.R. Res. 134: Mr. Goodling, Mr. Gunderson, Mr. de Lugo, Mr. Rose, Mr. Anthony, Mr. Beeman, Mr. Ballenger, Mr. Boland, Mr. Broomfield, Mr. Pawell, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Foglietto, Mr. Hatcher, Mr. Duncan, Mr. Spratt, Mr. Rodine, Mr. Paschay, Mr. Pickle, Mrs. Lloyd, Mr. Kandorski, Mr. Jontes, Mrs. Morella, and Mr. Kastenmeier.

H.J. Res. 152: Mr. Udall and Mr. Hutto.

H.J. Res. 302: Mr. Ackerman, Mr. Armstrong, Mr. Dorgan of North Dakota, Mr. Dyson, Mr. Edwards of Oklahoma, Mr. Fluke, Mr. Gray of Illinois, Mr. Gray of Pennsylvania, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Kleczka, Mr. Lewis of Georgia, Mr. Thomas A. Lukken, Mr. Mineta, Mr. Mrazek, Mr. Neal, Mr. Nelson of Florida, Mr. Roe, Mr. Russo, Mr. Saltz, Mr. Schroeder, Mr. Saks, Mr. Tausin, Mr. Volker, Mr. Williams, Mr. Wolfe, Mr. Yates, Mr. Yatren, Mr. Dicks, Mr. Benton, Mr. Moreison of Connecticut, Mr. Ford of Michigan, Mr. Hunter, Mr. Upton, Mr. Wortley, Mr. Lowry of Washington, Mr. Berman, Mrs. Morella, and Mr. Edwards of California.

H.J. Res. 98: Mr. Lipinski, Mr. Bateman, Mr. Hatcher, Mr. Roe, Mr. Oakar, Mr. Dennis Smith, Mr. Carper, Mr. Coelho, Mr. Araka, Mr. Jones of North Carolina, Mr. Slaughter of North Carolina, Mr. Hamm, Mr. Weyn, and Mr. Moakley.

H. Con. Res. 21: Mr. Moakley.

H. Con. Res. 97: Mr. Frost, Mr. de Lugo, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Nelson of Utah, Mr. Wortley, Mr. Herstel, and Mr. Gunderson.

H. Con. Res. 129: Mr. Hickey, Mr. Barton of Texas, Mr. Emerson, Mrs. Bentley, Mr. Bham, Mr. Petri, and Mr. Miller of Ohio.

H. Res. 110: Mr. Towns, Mr. McEwen, and Mr. Dykema.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

44. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the City Council, Coconut Creek, FL, relative to the disparity in benefit levels of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

45. Also, Petition of the Alabama League of Municipalities, Montgomery, AL, relative to an appropriate legislative response to acid rain; jointly, to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology and Energy and Commerce.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1777

By Mrs. Kennelly.

—Page 70, after line 16, add the following:

TITLE VII—NEGOTIATIONS WITH FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS ON THE DISCIPLINE OF DEFENSE AND COMMERCIAL OFFSETS

SEC. 701. NEGOTIATIONS CONCERNING THE LIMITATION OF DEFENSE AND COMMERCIAL OFFSETS.

(a) Negotiations.—The President is directed to enter into bilateral or multilateral negotiations with appropriate foreign governments which supply offsets for the purpose of disciplining direct and indirect offsets as a condition for the sale of commercial and defense-related goods and services.

(b) Conduct of Negotiations.—In the conduct of such negotiations the President shall utilize the services of the United States Trade Representative, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 702. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this title—

(1) the term "direct offsets" means contractual arrangements which involve goods and services which are the subject of the sales agreement, including coproduction, licensed production, subcontractor production, overseas investment, and technology transfer; and

(2) the term "indirect offsets" means contractual arrangements which involve goods and services unrelated to the exports which are the subject of the sales agreement, including foreign investment, technology transfer, and countertrade.

By Mr. Peterson:

—Strike all of section 130, relating to an official residence for the Secretary of State (and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly.)

By Mr. Shumway:

—After section 191, insert the following new section:

SEC. 192. FAILURE OF UNITED STATES TO PLACE CUBA ON ITS HUMAN RIGHTS AGENDA.

(a) Findings.—The Congress finds that the United Nations and the United Nations Human Rights Commission have acted selectively in addressing fundamental human rights violations in various countries.

(b) Cuba.—The Congress disapproves of the failure of the United Nations General Assembly and the United Nations Human Rights Commission to place Cuba on its human rights agenda despite overwhelming evidence of the continuing disregard and systematic abuse of the most fundamental rights by the Government of Cuba.

By Mr. Solomon:

—Page 19, after line 2, insert the following: "(d) Annual Report.—Not later than February 1 of each year, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the Congress discussing the implementation of this section during the previous year."