

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, March 1, 1993

The House met at 12 noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Drive from each of us, O God, all that which hinders from experiencing Your presence and from doing those good things that help each other. We repent of any selfish ways even as we pray for a new focus of justice and respect toward each other. Give us, we pray, a new vision so we believe and think and act in ways that demonstrate that we are created in Your image and responsible for our deeds. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause I, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] if he would kindly come forward and lead the membership in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MONTGOMERY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### EMERGENCY PROCEDURES FOR CAPITOL HILL

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy which occurred in New York this past weekend at the World Trade towers could have been much worse had there not been engineering in those buildings for emergency situations.

However, while the smoke was still coming out of the buildings, the experts were trying to assess ways to improve emergency evacuation, perhaps to improve stairway lighting, perhaps to improve the way smoke is removed from those buildings.

We are fortunate here in the Capitol complex to have relatively low-rise buildings. However, there are some with six or seven stories. Many of our buildings have activities underground, and many of our buildings are historic, such as the Capitol, in which we have a

warren of small nooks and crannies which have been converted into rooms. All this poses problems in emergency evacuations.

In my 22 years in Congress, I cannot remember a fire drill or an emergency evacuation drill here in the Capitol complex, although in Louisville, in the Federal building, there are frequent such drills.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time for us to develop, here on Capitol Hill, adequate emergency procedures for evacuation in the case of fire or some other emergency. This might be a precaution we will never need to act upon, but it is a precaution which probably would be useful under the circumstances.

### PAY ATTENTION TO MIDDLE-CLASS, WORKING AMERICAN TAXPAYERS

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

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton keeps saying that the only people who are opposing his economic agenda are the special interests. And of course, we are supposed to think the President is referring to high-paid lobbyists with big black cigars and limousines.

But that is not the kind of special interest I am hearing from. The folks I am hearing from who are opposed to the President's program are not Washington lobbyists at all. They are middle-class, working taxpayers who simply do not believe that raising taxes will reduce the deficit.

That is the special interests I am hearing from—middle-class, working taxpayers. And their message is simple and clear. They are saying, "We don't believe higher taxes are the answer. We've heard that 'tax and spend' song before, and it doesn't work."

Middle-class taxpayers have good reason to question the President's plan. He is asking them to pay for a lot of it.

And I think that this is one special interest we should be listening to very carefully this time—middle-class, working American taxpayers. It is time the President paid a little attention to them.

### THE GREAT NATIONAL DEBATE OF 1993

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

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, the great national debate of 1993 should be about the economy and the deficit. We should ask ourselves and the folks at home a couple of basic

questions: Do we have enough government? Is it big enough? Do we pay enough taxes? The answer to those questions is yes.

Proposed revenues from the new stimulus and deficit raises is an important issue for a true deficit-reduction package. If we need to raise revenue, then it should be earmarked for actual deficit reduction. We should earmark new revenue to reduce the national debt and then limit spending so it does not come back through deficits.

I have cosponsored legislation that will do just that. The bottom line in the entire debate on the deficit is you have to hit it head on. If you are going to reduce the deficit, earmark real revenue for the deficit reduction.

There are a number of reasons why this is important. The principal one is in the 1990 deficit-reduction package for every dollar of new revenue Congress spent \$2.37.

Some of my constituents have said they support the plan to reduce the deficit believing that earmarking is already taking place. That is not true as of today. The Congress should earmark additional revenue. Not earmarking revenue, Congress shirks its responsibility to children like those in Sheridan at Highland Park Elementary and Mrs. Rassmusen's class of sharp students.

Mr. Speaker, Congress needs to change its way, come to the snubbing post, and earmark revenues for deficit reduction.

### AMERICA WILL PAY THE PRICE IN BOSNIA

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, American pilots were sent to fly into Bosnia. Europeans are killing other Europeans. But who flies in the relief? Americans, that is who, while Europe's leaders pretend they can do nothing.

Once again, U.S. diplomats willingly play the fool letting other governments manipulate U.S. foreign policy.

Now we are on the slippery slope. Bosnia is, thanks to our diplomats, becoming America's problem.

Has no one learned the lessons of Somalia? Two months ago our forces in Somalia were treated as heroes. Now they are targets. And the same will happen in Bosnia.

The American diplomats never seem to learn. Do we not learn from Beirut, and do I dare say Vietnam?

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

The tragedy is that before this is over Americans will die in Bosnia because our Government has never learned to say no. Every time a picture appears on TV of some unfortunate incident anywhere in the world, Americans are drawn to it like a moth to a flame. Americans do not have the good sense, the common sense to stay away.

The really unfortunate thing is that before this is all over, while the American diplomats are the ones who make the mistakes, the American taxpayer and the American young men and women will end up paying the price.

PROVIDE OPEN DEBATE

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton will not hold a news conference, and the House Rules Committee will not permit reasonable and open debate on bills the Democrats are cramming through Congress.

Of 20 amendments I propose to the motor-voter bill, not one was permitted to even be debated on the House floor.

The Hatch Act came to us on suspension, without extensive debate on any substantive differences.

What is the matter with the Democrats? Do they not believe in their programs?

Come on President Clinton, if your proposals are so great and fair, as you say, defend them in a news conference. And tell your friends in the House to provide open debate on them in this body. Or do you not think they can stand the heat?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The Chair would remind Members that all comments on the House floor should be directed to the Speaker.

GLOBAL ECONOMIC COOPERATION

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, at American University President Clinton gave a timely, important speech on the relevance of the global economy to growth and economic recovery here in the United States.

The President's speech called on the world's economic leaders to do their part in promoting economic growth. He warned both developed and developing countries to honor their international commitments and promises of a liberalized trade environment.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the task of implementing this trade philosophy is most difficult. As world trade liberalizes, industry winners and losers rise and fall at ever-increasing rates. This economic dynamism, in turn, often results in national policies to protect or foster local industries.

Mr. Speaker, such national policies which are purely protectionist efforts to save obsolete businesses or industrial sectors must be resisted and discouraged. Global economic cooperation and the creation or opening of new markets for U.S. goods and services abroad will do more for our Nation's prosperity than any tax-and-spend economic stimulus package.

Therefore, this Member strongly supports the President's stated commitment to require our global competitors to open their markets, follow established trade rules, and commit to further liberalized international trade. Such a commitment by our trade competitors and trade partners—though difficult to pursue—is absolutely necessary for the economic prosperity of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, demanding and leveraging access to markets now shielded by excessive tariffs, quotas, and ingenious, subtle, or overt non-tariff barriers is an area where most Republican Members of the House can fully support President Clinton. We encourage the implementation of that type of policy by the Clinton administration.

□ 1210

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
February 26, 1993.

HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY,  
The Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit two sealed envelopes received from the White House as follows:

- (1) One sealed envelope received at 4:18 p.m. on Thursday, February 25, 1993 and said to contain the annual report on mine safety and health for fiscal years 1990 and 1991; and
- (2) One sealed envelope received at 3:11 p.m. on Friday, February 26, 1993 and said to contain the third special message requesting three new deferrals of budget authority for fiscal year 1993.

With great respect, I am  
Sincerely yours,

DONALD K. ANDERSON,  
Clerk, House of Representatives.

ANNUAL REPORT ON MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ACTIVITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with Section 511(a) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, as amended ("the Act"), 30 U.S.C. 958(a), I transmit herewith the annual report on mine safety and health activities for fiscal years 1990 and 1991. This report was prepared by, and covers activities occurring exclusively during, the previous Administration. The enclosed report does not necessarily reflect the policies or priorities of the current Administration. Indeed, under the Act, these reports should have been submitted long before the change of Administration.

This Administration is committed to working with the Congress to ensure vigorous enforcement of existing mine safety and health standards. We are also intent on improving these rules where necessary and appropriate to better protect worker health and safety.

The 1992 Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) annual report is due in May 1993. This report will identify strengths and deficiencies in MSHA's performance during the previous Administration and discuss steps the new Administration intends to take to ensure the agency is adequately protecting mine worker safety and health.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON,  
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 25, 1993.

DEFERRALS OF BUDGET AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 103-52)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report three new deferrals of budget authority, totaling \$354.0 million.

These deferrals affect Funds Appropriated to the President and the Department of Agriculture. The details of these deferrals are contained in the attached report.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON,  
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 26, 1993.

### REORGANIZATION OF THE HOUSE— SELECT COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, we have been debating the issue of select committees over the last several months. A lot of people wonder, "Well, what are select committees?"

The committees have been created by Congress over the last 20 years, 4 of them in the House. They were created out of the frustration with the current committee system, in many cases.

You take the Committee on Aging, it was created in 1974 and has spent \$21.9 million over these 18 years. The aging issues overlap 11 standing committees which deal with those issues. Out of frustration with those 11 committees not being able to get their arms around an issue and to bring some consensus about, they have believed that the select committee ought to be put together.

The Narcotics Select Committee, created in 1976, has spent \$10.5 million over these 16 years.

Children, Youth and Families, created in 1982; Hunger Committee, created in 1980, the newest of them. These committees have no legislative jurisdiction in the House of Representatives. They cannot bring legislation to the floor, and as a result, what they have done is they have acted as ad hoc committees to consider the area of interest created by each of those select committees.

Over the years these committees in total have spent some \$52 million. Today, they employ 95 staffers, and their total authorization for 1993, this fiscal year that we are in, which ends March 31, the total amount appropriated was \$3.7 million.

Now, the fact is, in today's environment, when we are trying to reduce the cost of Government, many of us believe that it is time to eliminate the select committees.

In fact, on Tuesday, January 26, the House did vote to abolish the Select Committee on Narcotics, by a vote of 237 to 180. The other three select committees that were to follow with votes were suddenly pulled from the calendar because it became clear that the majority of the House was unwilling to again fund these select committees.

Now, we all understand why they are there and they are all set up for good intentions; that is, to try to bring some consensus, to try to get our arms around really important issues in our country. But the fact is the real problem that we have is that the current committee system does not work as efficiently as it should.

The current committee system was put in place in 1946, and over these last 46 years what has happened is that issues end up in all different types of committees.

I pointed out before that the aging issues are considered by 11 committees. The Committee on Children, Youth and Families, that select committee, its issues show up in 13 different committees. The Hunger Committee, their issues are dealt with by 10 standing committees. The Narcotics Abuse and Control Select Committee, those issues are spread around through six other committees.

What we really need to do is we really need to revise the committee system, and the Hamilton-Gradison Committee on Reorganization of Congress is meeting and are due to have recommendations later on this year. But the fact is, in my opinion and that of many others—it is that if we are going to ask the American people to pay more for their Government, it is time for Congress to lead the way. Those of us who are interested in reforming this institution believe that this is an important first step, by eliminating the select committees, forcing the standing committees to begin to look seriously at how they deal with those issues and, frankly, putting pressure on the Committee on Reorganization of the Congress to look at the committee system, the current committee system, and begin the process of making recommendations that will put these issues in one committee so that the committee itself can come to grips with the issue.

Now, although I want the select committees gone, let us not kid ourselves, the work that they have done has been important. The Members that serve on them do it for a lot of well-meaning reasons, although, quite frankly, there are some on those committees that used them for nothing but political purposes.

□ 1220

But the fact is it is time to bring these committees to an end. It is an important first step, and if we cannot take this one small step toward reforming the way this institution works, how serious are we about the reform of this institution, how serious are we about making this a more deliberative body, about having a Congress that is more accountable to the American people, about having a Congress that is more responsive and effective to the real issues in our society?

I believe it is time to take that first step, and we ought to eliminate these select committees, and we ought to do it soon.

### FIFTY WAYS TO CUT THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Madam Speaker, I think most people understand that today is a traditional travel day which is why a

lot of Members are not available to be on the floor to get on with the pressing business that this Nation has to deal with our budget problems and to deal with our deficit and to deal with President Clinton's proposed program on how to approach these problems.

I am standing here today, Madam Speaker, directly in response to the challenge that the President levied to this body to be specific about the areas of waste, redundancy, and inefficiency in Government expenditures that demand attention to be chopped out of the budget, and thereby give a savings hopefully in an amount enough to preclude the need to raise any further taxes. I think it is very important that every Member go through the exercise that we have gone through in our office of trying to find where the areas of waste are. It is not hard to find waste in Washington. The particular list of cuts that I have proposed in a piece of legislation entitled "50 Ways To Cut the Budget" gets very specific, and the highlights of the legislation I have introduced earlier today include 50 specific spending cuts. Those cuts actually total \$191 billion over a 5-year period. Of course that is estimated in today's dollars, subject to some adjustment, but it is in that range.

Perhaps one of the more remarkable parts of my list is that it does not, in fact, involve any cuts in Social Security or Medicare. All of the cuts that we have talked about, by and large, come from savings in discretionary areas that the Government is undertaking right now. And also remarkable about the list to achieve the \$190 billion plus or minus in savings over 5 years is that it is not necessary. I repeat not necessary to raise taxes.

There is nothing magical about this list of 50 cuts. In fact, they were compiled from suggestions that have been made by many others who have been reviewing the way Congress goes about its business, and the way the Federal Government goes about its business as part of their daily chores. The Congressional Budget Office is one source. The Grace Commission is another source, and the unemployment of the recommendations of that Commission which have now been virtually before us for 10 years without any action. Grassroots organizations that have credibility such as the Citizens Against Government Waste have looked into the many ways that waste seems to appear in our Government. We have taken some of the suggestions that they have made. The Heritage Foundation, certain bills and resolutions from this Member and other Members have been inspiration for some of the other entries onto our list.

The whole purpose of this exercise, and I hope other Members will pursue it also, is to focus the mechanisms of the U.S. Congress on spending cuts. It seems to me if we were of one mind in

the U.S. Congress, that cuts and waste are a problem that deserve our highest attention, that every Member will join in, and I am sure could come up with a list of their own which would in every case be different than every other Member, no doubt, but which would cumulatively add up to focusing on the areas of a common denominator where there is clean-cut waste that most of us agree on.

I will not challenge to say that my list is the only list or the right list, but I would challenge to say that there is probably not a Member in the United States of America that does not understand that the U.S. Congress wastes money. In fact, I do not think in the 4 years I have been here that I have ever heard any Member of this body seriously suggest that we do not waste money. I have heard Members support individual programs, but I have never heard anybody collectively get up and say that we are doing such a wonderful job in Congress that there is absolutely no waste in our budget. And frankly, I do not expect to ever hear anybody say that.

I think that it is important to look forward to what kind of criteria we would use to make a list that has to be fair and has to observe certain points, and I think each Member could make those judgments very well for himself or herself. I have included in my list criteria that I think are appropriate for the situation we find ourselves in today with a staggering national debt, with an annual deficit in our budget that exceeds hundreds of billions of dollars, and with, unfortunately, no end in sight for the fact that we are spending more than we are taking in, that is getting us deeper in the hole every year.

Included in my criteria for eligible projects that ought to be looked at are Federal programs and activities that are duplicative. We have many cases of what we will call turf guarding in Washington, jealousies, prerogatives in various departments who will not give up a little bit of turf in the interest of efficiency to another department. There are many such programs there. We have identified some on our list.

Federal programs that subsidize groups, individuals, corporations, or industries that can take care of themselves. Why should the Federal Government, why should Government be involved in enterprises that are properly the business of business? It makes no sense at all for us to be spending taxpayers' dollars in what should be marketplace enterprise. Federal programs that could be more efficiently and effectively run by the private sector fall under that area. There is no question that Government is not particularly good at business. We are not even particularly good at regulating business, it turns out. For those who would make the case, I would offer the S&L's as the place to start.

Federal programs that benefit only local or limited regional interests; that is, pork projects. I am not interested in trying to pick out any particular area and say this area is benefiting or this local community's project is so outrageous. What I am trying to suggest is that we ought to focus in Washington on national matters and national priorities, and all of these little special interest pork projects that sneak in one way or another in the process of legislation need to be identified and chopped out, and so we have many such projects on my list.

Federal programs that have outlived their original purpose, and thus their usefulness. In fact, some Federal programs have never worked very well anyway and are included in this list.

Federal programs and activities that directly interfere with the free market by raising consumer prices; that is, going exactly the wrong way, having unintended consequences to make things happen that cost more money for the consumer where there is no potential benefit for the consumer or for the Nation, but only a benefit for a very narrow special interest. There would certainly be some agricultural programs in this area.

Programs that constitute waste, that add to the bureaucratic bloat or that are just plain abusive of the perks and privileges that we enjoy in this town have also been identified, by all means not all of them, but enough I think to gain attention. And I am sure if we put it out to a test across this country they would have the support of most Americans, that we frankly are taking better care of ourselves in the U.S. Congress than the people we serve.

And finally, the last area of my criteria that I wanted to look at very closely was the area of affordability. We need to understand today in America that there are not endless taxpayer dollars to fund every idea, every enterprise, every wish, every thought, every inspiration that every Member of Congress and the executive branch have on a given day.

□ 1230

That has been happened too long, and the consequence is we have discovered there are indeed limits to our affordability, and now we have to find a way to implement measures so that we can get back in under the limits of what this Nation can reasonably afford. And remember, when we say, "this Nation," we must recall that it is the backs of the taxpayers that primarily we are addressing ourselves to.

These are the types of criterias we have used on the list that I have submitted for legislative action. We have created what I call a new test. It is called the sacrifice test, and it replaces the laugh test, and the question is this: We have been asked to sacrifice, so are you willing to sacrifice so that your

hard-earned tax dollars that you are now going to sacrifice are going to be spent for this individual outlay? And if the answer to that question is, "No, I would not sacrifice for that," then that is a project that should be on my list or somebody else's list if there are enough people who feel that sacrifice is not worthwhile, because we do have some areas of agreement where sacrifice is clearly justified for all Americans, and that, of course, would be broadly in the area of reducing the deficit. And I believe every American is willing to accomplish that and is willing to sacrifice.

What most Americans are not willing to do is send more money to Washington to waste, and that is what this list and, I hope, other lists will be about.

The legislative mode that I have used to address this matter, to put it in simple terms, simply directs to the Budget Committee the list of projects I have selected which add up, as I say, to about \$190 billion over 5 years, and it says that these programs and expenditures would be terminated unless the Budget Committee determines that terminating them would be unjustified. In other words, the Budget Committee will have a decision to make to save these projects if in the eyes of many these projects should be saved and if I have erred and failed to find the benefit of some of these projects.

What we have created is sort of a mandatory mini-line-item-veto process for our Budget Committee, and the beauty of it is that it gives the legislative process the opportunity to work. It allows testimony by affected and interested parties at hearings and in other ways we go around our legislative business. And I believe that would allow anybody who is an impacted individual or an impacted area or an impacted interest in any one of the cuts I have proposed to have fairly their day in court, as it were, to argue their side as to why such a program continues to be justified.

But the overall purpose of my legislation shifts the burden to make a positive finding that a program should be continued rather than the process we use now of having to make a positive finding to cut out waste, and I think it would be very, very beneficial to proceed in this manner and in this way.

I have 50 specific projects or programs on my list, and I will render a sampling of them now, as I have already included them in the public record, all 50. They are there for the world to see, and I hope the world will see them, and I hope the world will respond and say indeed that many of these are waste, if not all, and on those that are worthwhile, where I have been in error, will point out the error of my ways and say, "No, this is a good project and because," and then we will know it is indeed a good project and measures up in today's marketplace to

the test of—is this worth sacrifice to the American taxpayers? And the test is: Is it affordable under the conditions we have in the United States of America today?

There is no magic in the particular order I am starting these in. It is the order we listed them in, but there is no magic to the order they are in. The first cut is to cancel the aerospace plane. During the 1980's DOD embarked on a joint effort with NASA to design and build a hypersonic aircraft to deliver payloads into orbit from conventional runways. Since then, however, the national aerospace plane has experienced significant technical difficulties, management changes, and, of course, severe cost escalation. The program will cost three times the original estimate of \$3.1 billion, and the launch date will be at least 3 years later than planned. This is a litany we have heard before: That it is going to cost more, it is going to take longer, and it will not work the way we thought it was going to happen.

How many times in the past with Defense Department contracting have we run into this type of problem? And I believe everybody in the country is aware of cost overruns in these areas.

None of the Government entities involved in this program appear to be strongly committed to the program. DOD has not budgeted for the plane in its future year's defense program, and the NASA Advisory Committee concluded that it did not merit high-schedule urgency. Now, that is not to say they are not for it, and I do not want to misspeak for them, but they have not rated it as a high priority. And at a time when we are trying to make a distinction between nice-to-have and need-to-have projects, I would suggest this does not fall into the need-to-have category. And in particular we note that DOD could accomplish most of the missions intended for the plane with the space shuttle and the Titan VI rockets. The savings on this over 5 years is \$650 million, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

The next one we have is to continue the partial civilian hiring freeze for the Department of Defense through 1997. The civilian work force at DOD provides support services to military forces that range from payroll administration to maintenance of weapons systems. I think most people understand what a DOD civilian is. With a substantial reduction in troop strength over the next 5 years, it is reasonable that civilian support can stay either at the same level or, in fact, be reduced. If we are going to have less forces, perhaps we need fewer civilians to support them.

These views are, in fact, consistent with former Secretary Cheney's view that support services need to be streamlined and made more efficient. In addition, the size of the military in-

frastructure is decreasing. We know we are having base closings. This provides for additional rationale and provides opportunities for cost savings in this area. In other words, we are dealing with a system where changes in the world have caused us to think that maybe some of our past practices in this area are now outdated, and what we are doing is contributing to bureaucratic bloat rather than efficient good Government services that we need. Obviously we need a strong defense, and we want our Defense Department to function well. I think most would agree that, maybe, we are a little overloaded right now, and that this freeze is reasonable. It is certainly reasonable to discuss it because we are talking about \$8.5 billion over the next 5 years.

The next is another space area question. It is the advanced solid rocket motor. I must say that the first debate I heard as a Member of this body indicated that nobody really wanted this except those involved with the jobs of producing it. So in effect I think it has become sort of a jobs program issue rather than something that is of great interest to the Nation. According to NASA's own safety panel, the redesigned booster rocket that we are using on the shuttle is beginning to operate satisfactorily and safely—in fact, I saw testimony on the television as to that not too long ago—and any savings could be better spent elsewhere. The problem is that the ASRAM, the advanced solid rocket motor, is really not doing all the things it is supposed to be doing anyway and is not being developed as rapidly and as simply as its progenitors thought it might be. So we have got a way to solve the mission that it was going to accomplish. We have got an engine that works, and we should not be donating \$1.650 billion over the next 5 years to a jobs program if there is not anybody who wants or needs that engine, and I suggest that is the case.

The superconducting super collider. This is a 54-mile high-energy particle accelerator. The SSC is a pure research project, and when I say, "A pure research project," that means that right now there are no particular revenues associated with it. It is intended to expand scientific knowledge of subatomic particles, and it is a great part of our need to know what is going on, to better understand our environment, to better understand our world and our galaxy and all the things that makes things tick. That is great. But the question of affordability comes into it right now, and it is a question of the disproportionate share of the affordable dollars we have for space research and other types of research going to one project. That also comes into question because we discover that 6 percent of all funding over the next 5 years has been aimed for this particular project, and the Department of Energy has con-

sistently underreported what the total cost of this project would be, perhaps to avoid any wrath on the Hill. At any rate, it is always a bad surprise to hear that it is going to cost more to get there, and that is something that is beginning to be associated with this project now.

□ 1240

The GAO now projects the total cost of this will be in excess of 12 billion 1990 dollars, and that was against an early original estimate I believe of about \$5 billion. So we have more than doubled the cost. Even though we have got a project that has got a tremendous amount of appeal in terms of science and getting on with knowledge and one which I have supported in the past when I thought we had the dollars to pay for this and when I thought it was a lot cheaper than it is now. The savings we would have by getting out of this at this point is over 5 years.

Next is the space station funding program. I suggest that we cut that by 15 percent. I happen to represent part of the State of Florida, a district in Florida, and this is an important question for jobs in Florida and the economy of the space coast area. I am well aware of that. But I think it is important to be consistent. The criteria has to be the national good, not specific jobs programs for regional areas. I think it would be unfair and unreasonable to propose cuts in other regions and localities without including those in my own backyard.

So we have tried not to be parochial in the inclusion of the 50 projects on our list at all. While I believe very strongly that the space station is something that will provide us good rewards and is probably important in terms of the national security, much more than any of the projects I have mentioned so far, the projected cost of this space station has gone from \$10 billion to \$40 billion, and we are not sure exactly how much it is really going to cost, and we are not exactly sure what we are going to get out of it. We point out there are other countries involved, and maybe there are better ways to go about a space station, this type of research, better ways to get private enterprise involved, better justification by dealing with perhaps the Russians, who have done some extraordinary things with space stations already.

I think there needs to be reexamination of this project. But initially from our estimate on it, we have taken from the pages of the Congressional Budget Office, the Heritage Foundation, the Citizens Against Government Waste, we are talking about a significant savings of a billion and a half or so over 5 years with a 15-percent cut.

Getting to a new area, eliminating the below cost timber sales from the national forests. This is one project I

have never particularly understood at all. Government is not great as a businessman, we all know that. Yet Government here is in the business of managing our timber sales from 119 national forests.

We find that in seven of the nine national forest system regions, annual cash receipts from Federal timber sales consistently failed to cover the Forest Service's annual cash expenditures. Critics charge these sales contribute to the national deficit, delete timber resources, destroy roadless forests valued, of course, by recreational visitors and others, and interferes with the private timber markets.

Those are a lot of different complaints from a lot of different sources. For almost a quarter billion savings in 5 years, it appears that this is an area whose time has come to be chopped out.

We have talked about agriculture a lot in the list, primarily because things have changed in the way we go about producing our agriculture in this country. It is time for some of the programs that were started many years ago, in many instances, programs of support and helping build our foreign muscle in this country, which we did brilliantly, as everyone knows. We are now a wonderful producer, in fact, feeding in many instances from our surplus, the world's starving, and can continue to do a better job at that.

We are nevertheless paying a very high price to do this through what I call outmoded programs. In some of these instances the purpose of the program appears to be what we would like to sell our crop for, rather than what we are actually going to be able to sell it for in the marketplace. That difference is made up by the Federal Government in a subsidy. It is a little hard to justify that subsidy these days when we are producing so much just for the agricultural sector.

If we did that for everybody who manufactures something or produces something in this country, Government would be in the business of producing everybody's business who is not getting what they thought they should get at the marketplace. I suspect that would be full chaos.

I would suggest that some of the subsidization programs that we have got going now are beginning to border on chaos. That is why we call for a lower target price by 3 percent annually in this area, and we adjust in over 5 years \$11.2 billion of savings doing that.

I think there are perhaps other philosophical advantages. Collectively subsidization encourages excess surplus, erodes America's agricultural competitiveness, impedes access to foreign markets, and, of course, costs consumers taxpayers dollars in the amount of billions every year. I suspect this is an area also that if you put out the whole story to the taxpayers in this country

and said "Are you willing to sacrifice more of your hard earned dollars, are you willing to ask your family to give up something, your kids to give up something, yourself to give up something, and contribute a little more to the Federal Government so they can use the money for this purpose." I suspect the answer would be a ringing "no" when you look at how that money is finally used.

Eliminating the price support for wool and mohair. This is one of many types of projects. I picked this one. I could have picked many other specifics.

The Federal Government actually spends millions of dollars each year to encourage domestic wool production. It is not a bad idea, I suppose. But actually the project was started back in 1954 because wool was considered an essential and strategic commodity at that time for U.S. commercial and military items. Since that time, however, I think all of us know that synthetic fibers and imported wool have reduced our domestic dependency question, so some of the original justification has disappeared.

The Grace Commission noted each additional pound, whose market value is about 88 cents, costs the Government between \$2.63 and \$6.01. That means that we are subsidizing something that has a market value of 88 cents to everybody in the world, and we are jacking the price up to somewhere between \$2.63 and \$6.01 for the wool producers so they can get what they want.

This program was recommended for elimination by the GAO in 1990. The 5-year savings would be \$760 million.

Another one of these types of programs, which sometimes is referred to with a bit of a smile because it, in Washington terms, is not as much money as some of the other programs, and it sort of tickles people's imagination, but in fact the honey program is a rather interesting program. The honey price support program is \$100 million per year gift to the Nation's 2,000—2,000—commercial beekeepers. In other words, there are 2,000 people out there commercially in the beekeeping business who are getting better than 100 million dollars' worth a year of tax dollars.

According to the Cato Institute, the \$100 million received by honey producers in 1988 was almost equal to the market value of all U.S. honey production. This program has disrupted market prices to such an extent that producers often find it more profitable to sell directly to the Government than to the market, and consumers find it cheaper to purchase foreign than domestic honey.

So something has gone wrong when we have done that. The question has to be asked why are we taking such good care of the honey program. Why are we taking such good care of the commer-

cial beekeepers? What is the advantage and what is the justification for putting hard earned tax dollars into that?

The savings are relatively small, \$60 million over 5 years. But I suggest \$60 million is a number that commands attention in any American family that is being asked to sacrifice.

I would also suggest that probably everybody who has looked at this program has said it is time that it were terminated.

There are so many other areas that we could go through. I want to hit one here, the market promotion program. This is an area where you scratch your head and say how in the world did we get into this?

This was actually authorized in 1992 to assist U.S. agricultural exporters when they were facing unfair trading practices abroad. Some of that still goes on.

Payments are made to assist U.S. agribusiness—this is agribusiness, big business—in advertising and market building abroad.

That is good for America. We want American products overseas. The practice of subsidizing brand name advertising overseas has been very controversial as large corporations such as McDonald's is getting money from us to advertise overseas.

Is that the way our tax dollars should be spent right now? Does this benefit American taxpayers, or is the benefit going back to the McDonald Corp.

This is the type of question that I do not think was asked at the time that this program was started. I think that the intent was good, that let us get American products overseas and do everything we can to launch them.

□ 1250

But let us ask the question, is this proper? In today's area of concern about our deficit, a time of sacrifice for American taxpayers, are we really in the business of supporting commercial advertising for American enterprises that are making money overseas?

I think that the answer is "No." That is private enterprise's business. We need to find ways to assist them to do that, and I suggest those ways lie more in the area of regulatory reform than they do in the area of handing out dollar bills for them to pay advertising costs overseas. The savings are considerable, \$900 million over 5 years.

I have only done about 10 of these programs. There are so many more that we could talk about and go through: repealing the Davis-Bacon Act. That is a subject that comes up every so often. That is obviously a politically difficult question for the minority because they have never been able to convince the majority of the savings that are there, as well as the fair play that is there in treating projects the same and the cost of projects and trying to provide savings for the American taxpayer.

I do not know whether there will be the stimulation to move on Davis-Bacon this year or not, but I think it is one that certainly should be looked at.

The question of the current law eliminating the statute of limitations on collecting defaulted student loans. I know that this is very topical. We want education to work well. We want the citizens of our country to be educated so that they can contribute and look out not only for their welfare by being educated and productive but also contribute to the prosperity of the Nation as a whole. When we as taxpayers help pay for their education, is there any reason at the time that they have achieved prosperity in their own lives that they not repay loans? Twenty-nine percent of those who graduated from college in 1989 are in default of their Government-guaranteed loans, adding to the enormous burdens that we have already placed on the taxpayers.

In 1992, the Government will pay \$3.5 billion just for the defaulted loans and almost \$3 billion in interest subsidies. I suspect that most Americans would agree that if you have benefited from this program and you have the wherewithal to begin to start to pay it back, you should do so, and that effort should be made.

Our conclusion, coming from OMB, is that there is a 5-year savings of a quarter of a billion, \$266 million about, that could be collected and should be collected without causing undue hardship.

We have also included in a list a non-specified statement about terminating most of the Federal commissions. There are so many Federal commissions out there, I do not honestly know exactly what they all do in every case. And I do not know how much benefit or value there is to all of them. I suspect most Members of Congress do not know either. The American Battle Monuments Commission, the Commission for the Preservation of American Heritage Abroad, the Christopher Columbus Quincentenary, the Jubilee, Commission, that was this past year, the Delaware River Basin Commission, the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission. I think that we know we are in times of scarce Federal resources. I do not think that we ought to be perpetuating nonessential Federal commissions.

I am not saying there are not some out there that are justifiable. I am saying that if we look at the whole list, we are going to find a great many that have become little more than sinecures and need to be terminated. We estimate that the 5-year savings could get as high as \$1.167 billion if the job were done properly. That is a significant amount of money.

We have talked a lot about energy conservation measures. It turns out the Federal Government is a high consumer, in fact, the Nation's largest

consumer of energy. We are also the Nation's largest waster of energy.

We spent, I understand, in 1989, \$8.67 billion to heat, cool, and light Federal buildings and to power the cars and planes that we operate. By contract, our conservation efforts in that year were a mere 1.9 percent of our energy expenditure. That does not measure up well to private enterprise or to individuals in this country and their residences, and there are many things we can do that are relatively simple that we ought to do that will yield big savings over the next 5 years.

In fact, the Citizens Against Government Waste, the National Taxpayers Union suggest that if we did that job right and followed the provisions that were in H.R. 2452 fully, we would save almost \$2 billion over the next 5 years. Again, worth undertaking.

In another area, that we have had a lot of question on, and I think I will wind it up here, Madam Speaker, is something that a lot of people do not understand. And I did not understand it very well until I looked into it.

The gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY] has introduced a bill, H.R. 1080. It gets down to this question of illegal aliens who are in our workplace and are working at jobs, possibly displacing others, but more important, adding to a cost because of the system's delivery, the social system's delivery that is working to their benefit now. And as we know, there are many areas in our country where we have some who are going without. They are not getting the necessary help from the Government they need. American citizens who are in want. We know about shelter. We know about starvation. We know about lack of jobs. We know about all of these problems and programs. And we debate here. We read about it in the paper, see it on TV, yet we find that some of the resources we are providing are being consumed by illegal aliens because there is a large system in this country going on of taking care of illegal aliens by providing them fake documents from basically what I will call street-corner printing houses. And they use these documents, and they get into our welfare and unemployment programs, and they become part of the system.

Of course, once you are in the system, you do not get out of the system. And so they become in the system and it becomes a self-sustaining activity. And they are getting benefits that we do not know about, we cannot really document, because we do not know how many there are because these are illegal aliens. And others are going without. So we get 2 for 1 if we correct this program.

We save an estimated \$27 billion, according to the National Taxpayers Union, over 5 years, if we stop this illegal practice. And not only that, we provide some of those savings to Americans who are in need.

I think that is a good double hit for that program and certainly justifies its being on the list.

There are so many other areas to go through on this list. The one or two final points of sample-type things that we have put on our list, we have called for closing 20 of the underutilized black lung offices, for instance.

Now, I am very compassionate and sympathetic about the industry, the coal industry and the mining industry and the problems that they have had with black lung, the many victims that exist and the need to provide adequate care. What I am talking about here is the way we are doing it now has become inefficient. It needs to be streamlined. It is so costly, and it probably means that some of the people who need the services, in fact, are not getting the services they need because of the inefficiency of the system.

Frankly, it has become a jobs program. I understand that the decreased workload in treating the black lung program has made obsolete at least 209 field stations. During the 2 or 3 years the Labor Department has considered reducing the number of such stations, but even before the Department of Labor has been able to get those proposals to Congress, the individual legislators in the affected areas have basically succeeded in heading off any closing of these offices.

My assumption is that it is because they are related to jobs and benefits in those legislators areas, and I can understand them wanting to take the best possible care of their districts and the people they represent and serve. I suspect that now even the Department of Labor as well as the Grace Commission have gotten to the point where we agree on obsolescence in a number of these issues, that calling for the closing of 20 of these offices is not very dramatic when we are told that at least 209 of them are probably obsolete.

□ 1300

The savings are significant. We can save \$300 million over 5 years, according to the Citizens Against Government Waste, if we could have a good close look at that program; probably more, in fact.

There are other areas where the Government is doing things that it probably would better leave to private enterprise, as I think everybody knows, and I have said before. We do not do a great job of being business people in Government. One from the Grace Commission's report comes to mind. It is the fact that Government spends over \$1 billion a year in printing. One of the reasons we went into the printing business, and we do have a monopoly of our printing businesses, was to save money, but it turns out that after we look at this for a little bit, there are many who believe that private enterprise can do as good a job at one-third

the cost. When we take a look at matching some of the salaries, it becomes sort of curious how things got to be the way they are.

For example, GPO wages, the Government Printing Office's wages, average 42 percent above the pay scales for similar Federal jobs. A journeyman GPO proofreader earned \$30,000, while their counterparts in the executive branch earned \$12,000, according to the Grace Commission. That is government to government, but that means something is wrong somewhere.

The Citizens Against Government Waste have estimated a 5-year savings at \$63 million. My feeling is if we get into that a little further they are going to find there are, indeed, more savings than that, because printing is sort of an area that in some people's minds has been regarded as superinefficient because of the patronage practices of the past, which we hope are rapidly being erased, but which we need to be assured in fact has been erased.

Madam Speaker, I am going to stop at this point because I have consumed enough of this time, I think, to make it clear the kind of thinking and the kind of projects that we have gone after. As I said, there is no particular wisdom that makes these 50 projects on this gentleman's list the right 50 projects. The purpose of this is to urge other Members to submit their views on where we can cut costs, where we can erase waste, where we can chop out unnecessary expenditures, and where we can focus the mechanisms of this institution on cutting spending.

It is not as if this is a new idea. It is not as if this is a foreign idea. This is an idea that is abroad in our country, and it is an idea that the people that we serve have asked us to pursue. So I stand here in pursuit of that objective, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

**SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED**

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mr. GOSS, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. BOEHNER, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mrs. MEEK, for 60 minutes, on March 10.

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

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

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

- Mr. GALLEGLY.
- Mr. BEREUTER in two instances.
- Mrs. ROUKEMA.
- (The following Members (at the request of Ms. LAMBERT) and include extraneous matter:)
- Mr. TRAFICANT in two instances.
- Mrs. LLOYD in five instances.
- Mr. HAMILTON in 10 instances.
- Mr. DE LA GARZA in 10 instances.
- Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.
- Mr. BROWN of California in 10 instances.

**ADJOURNMENT**

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 2, 1993, at 12 noon.

**EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.**

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

802. A letter from the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting a report of the Corporation's activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

803. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting Final Regulations—Regional Resource and Federal Centers, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

804. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the annual report on railroad financial assistance for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to Public Law 96-448, section 409; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

805. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

806. A letter from the Chairman, Armed Forces Retirement Home Board, transmitting an annual report on activities pursuant to the Inspector General Act, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

807. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(e); to the Committee on Government Operations.

808. A letter from the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

809. A letter from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting a report of the Corporation's activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(b); to the Committee on Government Operations.

810. A letter from the National Labor Relations Board, transmitting a copy of the an-

nual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

811. A letter from the Cost Accounting Standards Board, Office of Federal Procurement Policy, transmitting the third annual report of the Cost Accounting Standards Board, pursuant to Public Law 100-679, section 5(a) (102 Stat. 4062); to the Committee on Government Operations.

812. A letter from the Secretary, Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting a report of the Corporation's activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552; to the Committee on Government Operations.

813. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(e); to the Committee on Government Operations.

814. A letter from the President, Thrift Depositor Protection Oversight Board, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(e); to the Committee on Government Operations.

815. A letter from the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the 18th Annual Report of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, which includes the Corporation's financial statements as of September 30, 1992, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. 1308; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Education and Labor.

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS**

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MINETA: Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 904. A bill to amend the Airport and Airway Safety, Capacity, Noise Improvement, and Intermodal Transportation Act of 1992 with respect to the establishment of the National Commission to Ensure a Strong Competitive Airline Industry (Rept. 103-22). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

**PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS**

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. LAROCOCO, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. FROST, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. APPELEGATE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. DIXON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. RUSH, Mr. STARK, Mr. KLEIN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. WYNN, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 1152. A bill to direct the United States Sentencing Commission to make sentencing

guidelines for Federal criminal cases that provide sentencing enhancements for hate crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 1153. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for expanded preinspection at foreign airports, to provide for a permanent visa waiver program, and to expedite airport immigration processing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDEN:

H.R. 1154. A bill to permit States to establish programs using unemployment funds to assist unemployed individuals in becoming self-employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1155. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to restore the 3-year basis recovery rule with respect to annuities under chapters 83 and 84 of such title for Federal income tax purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mr. SOLOMON):

H.R. 1156. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code with respect to the interest of the debtor as a tenant under the rental of residential real property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVY:

H.R. 1157. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the adjusted gross income of an individual shall be adjusted to reflect the value of such income relative to the cost-of-living in the area in which such individual resides; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHTLEY (for himself and Mr. MURTHA):

H.R. 1158. A bill to provide for the affordability of prescription drug prices by reducing certain nonresearch related tax credits to pharmaceutical manufacturers and to generate previously uncollected tax revenues for the Federal Government; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TAUZIN (for himself, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, and Mr. COBLE):

H.R. 1159. A bill to revise, clarify, and improve certain marine safety laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TAUZIN:

H.R. 1160. A bill to make permanent the temporary exemption from duty of the cost of certain foreign repairs made to U.S. vessels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. HAYES, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. COBLE, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. PETE GEREN, Mr. GING-

RICH, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KING, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LEVY, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mrs. MEEK, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. WELDON, and Mr. WISE):

H.R. 1161. A bill to establish research, development, and dissemination programs to assist in collaborative efforts to prevent crime against senior citizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSS:

H. Res. 105. Resolution instructing the Committee on the Budget to make the precise spending cuts set forth in this resolution to save \$190 billion over the next 5 fiscal years unless the committee determines that any such cuts would be unjustified; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

47. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Medicare coverage for dental care; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. ABERCROMBIE introduced a bill (H.R. 1162) for the relief of the Persis Corp.; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 28: Mr. CRAMER.  
 H.R. 55: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. PORTER, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Miss COLLINS of Michigan.  
 H.R. 159: Mr. KNOLLENBERG.  
 H.R. 170: Mr. EMERSON and Ms. DANNER.  
 H.R. 229: Mr. HASTINGS.  
 H.R. 236: Mr. MILLER of California.  
 H.R. 301: Mr. GREENWOOD.  
 H.R. 306: Mr. HANCOCK.  
 H.R. 349: Mr. SUNDRQUIST.  
 H.R. 359: Mr. RICHARDSON, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. MILLER of California, and Ms. MCKINNEY.  
 H.R. 388: Ms. MOLINARI and Mr. LEHMAN.  
 H.R. 396: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. EWING, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 419: Mrs. MEEK.

H.R. 495: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 496: Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 522: Mr. FROST, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. WASHINGTON, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. LLOYD, Ms. MOLINARI, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. MCHALE.

H.R. 561: Mr. CRAPO, Mr. PENNY, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. STUMP, Mr. CAMP, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. EWING, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. HYDE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 583: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 584: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 739: Mr. KASICH, Mr. GALLO, Mr. LIVINGSTON, and Mr. INHOFE.

H.R. 749: Mr. HANSEN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. FROST, Mr. CAMP, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. KYL.

H.R. 769: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. GENE GREEN, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. KOPETSKI, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BLACKWELL, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 790: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. KLUG, and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H.R. 852: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. MCCANDLESS, and Mr. APPLIGATE.

H.R. 882: Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 1000: Mr. MILLER of California and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1001: Mr. STARK, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1007: Ms. BYRNE.

H.R. 1106: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1138: Mr. PENNY.

H.J. Res. 22: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FISH, and Mr. BUNNING.

H.J. Res. 84: Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. STOKES, Mr. PAXON, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BREWSTER, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. ORTON, Mr. EWING, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KASICH, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. REGULA, Mr. LEACH, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. DANNER, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. ROTH, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. LAFALCE, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. FROST, and Mr. TOWNS.

H. Con. Res. 20: Ms. BYRNE, Mr. GILCREST, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mrs. LLOYD, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. MALONEY, and Ms. ESHOO.

H. Res. 40: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. VENTO.