

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, June 23, 1993

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 23, 1993.

I hereby designate the Honorable G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

We remember in our prayer, gracious God, all those who seek in their lives the healing of body or soul, those who desire the recovery of the gifts that give fullness to their days. We pray, O God, that You would restore and give strength to those who are weak, who are weighed down by the cares of the world, who suffer from lack of support from family or community. As we recognize that You have created us as one people, with responsibilities to each other, may we live our lives in ways that give meaning to the unity that we share. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Utah [Ms. SHEPHERD] will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. SHEPHERD 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.

CONSERVATION AND A HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT MUST BE NATIONAL PRIORITIES

(Ms. SHEPHERD asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SHEPHERD. Mr. Speaker, today our scientists at the National Institute of Environmental Health Service can tell us how environmental toxins dramatically damage human genes. In fact, scientific breakthroughs have shown how air pollutants transform healthy genes into mutated, cancer-causing genes which are passed down from generation to generation.

Too many people are exposed to this risk. Americans are living too close to incinerators and landfills. A recent study shows that more than half of the total U.S. population, from Salt Lake City to New York City, lives in communities with old, uncontrolled hazardous waste sites located dangerously close to homes and schools. Many of these people also lack access to health care. For them, the danger of exposure almost doubles.

Life in these communities does not have to be a prisoner's dilemma. We have choices. We can make conservation a national priority and give business incentives to help. Last year, a Utah company successfully cleaned up 4,700 tons of petroleum waste in Summit County, UT, and expanded Utah's local job base. We can transform local disasters into healthy environmental and business opportunities that will end dangerous practices that lead to sickness and result in waste. We can, Mr. Speaker, and we must.

AMERICANS DO NOT BUY THE PRESIDENT'S TAX INCREASES

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

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton claims that under his tax-and-spend plan, every \$10 in deficit reduction includes \$5 in spending cuts for every \$5 in tax increases. Well, let us take a closer look at that with this chart.

As the chart shows, out of that \$5 in spending cuts 80 cents comes from cuts that were already promised in the 1990 budget deal. If he is going to take credit for these cuts, he should also take credit for the \$160 billion in new taxes the 1990 budget deal contained. You cannot have it both ways; \$1.35 are unspecified cuts promised in the out-years, but I have never met a taxpayer who lived in an out-year; 30 cents comes from user fees. Now, the Republican alternative contained user fees, but we

called them user fees, not spending cuts; and \$1 comes from interest savings on the debt, which is not a spending cut at all.

The President uses blue smoke and mirrors to make the largest tax increase in history seem a little easier to swallow, but thousands of Americans turned out for our town meetings on Saturday, and they are not buying it.

PREVENT THE CLOSURE OF UCLA'S GRADUATE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH

(Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, on June 3 Chancellor Young of the University of California at Los Angeles shocked the public health community by announcing a proposal to eliminate the UCLA Graduate School of Public Health, the fourth largest in the country. We cannot afford to lose one of the world's premier institutions for the education and training of public health professionals.

If the proposed closure occurs, California and our Nation will suffer the diffusing of a major synergistic resource for the refined development of health professionals and policies at the very time our Nation's health issues require an expanded rather than a contracted role for the discerning expertise crafted and honed within UCLA's School of Public Health.

The education and training of public health professionals is vital to the promotion of public health in this Nation and to the success of our national health care program. We must not allow this closure to occur.

REVISIONIST HISTORIAN

(Ms. PRYCE of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the President's ability to revise history would make those old Soviet bureaucrats jealous.

He says that Republicans do not have a budget plan. He says that Republicans are simply obstructionist. And he says that his package contains an equal proportion of spending cuts to tax increases.

This sounds great on TV, but it is simply not true.

Republicans do have a plan that will cut almost \$500 billion without raising taxes. It is called the Kasich budget.

□ 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.

Republicans have offered credible alternatives on several other legislative issues as well. But the Rules Committee, the black hole of good ideas, has refused to allow debate on most of them.

The President's package is 72 percent tax increases, and only 24 percent spending cuts. Worse, the taxes come now, while the cuts come later. Not quite the 1-to-1 ratio we were promised.

President Clinton can try to revise history all he wants. But he cannot escape the facts.

JAPANESE CONDOMS SING THE BLUES

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, Uncle Sam has Buy American laws, but in Michigan Buy American means buy Japanese. That is right, Michigan bought 1½ million blue-colored condoms from Japan. A Michigan spokesman said these blue-colored condoms, even though they were more expensive, best met the tough standards of the State of Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, since when did Michigan become experts on condoms? In fact, I have heard of the rally cry of the University of Michigan, "Go, Blue," but I think this is stretching it too far, folks.

If you ask me, when the State of Michigan starts passing out Japanese condoms that are blue, in the State of Michigan, the American worker is in deep trouble.

□ 1010

INCREDIBLE SHRINKING SPENDING CUTS

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, most of us have heard of the movie "The Incredible Shrinking Hulk." And here in the last 5 months we are working over the process of the incredible shrinking spending cuts.

During the campaign we know the President promised \$3 in cuts for every dollar in new taxes. During the Inaugural it was \$2 in cuts for every dollar in taxes. The budget speech said we will hope to get 1 to 1, and the budget proposal came to the House at 25 cents in cuts for every dollar in new taxes. The way the House passed the bill was 16 cents in cuts for every dollar in taxes.

Mr. Speaker, this may perhaps not be "Honey, I Shrunk the Kids," but it is "Honey, I shrunk my principles."

IT'S NONE OF YOUR BUSINESS

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I read in the newspapers that the Pentagon is edging toward a "don't ask, don't tell" policy on gays in the military. Most Americans always thought that was the military's policy about everything. We can't ask them anything, and they won't tell us anything.

A case in point. The Pentagon commissioned a \$1 million Rand Corp. study on gays in the military. The report is finished and recommends a complete lifting of the ban. What did the Pentagon do? It suppressed the report. Don't ask, don't tell.

"Don't ask, don't tell" is bad policy: First, it continues to sanction a gay individual's discharge for status rather than misconduct. Second, it leaves the question of investigations to the discretion of commanders, which is no different from current policy and will lead to widely varying practices throughout the military. Third, investigations will supposedly no longer be initiated without "credible information." What constitutes credible information? Attendance at a meeting of the largest gay organization in America, the Metropolitan Community Church? So military personnel will no longer be able to attend church? What about men who cross-dress when their ship crosses the equator, a common male Navy ritual?

Worst of all, the proposed policy will promote snitching among military personnel, an already uncommon and invidious practice. In retaliation for the spurning, they are reported as lesbians, which often triggers a harrowing investigation into their private life. In fact, women are three times more likely than men to be investigated and discharged for homosexuality. That is why Navy reservist Zoe Dunning is challenging this irrational policy in court as a form of sex discrimination against all women.

I urge the Pentagon to consider another approach, as time-honored as it is all-American: It's none of your business.

LET'S CALL A TAX A TAX

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, over the past 6 months, working Americans have grown accustomed to a lot of doublespeak coming from the White House. While candidate Clinton promised a middle-class tax cut, President Clinton proposed the largest tax increase in U.S. history. While candidate Clinton promised to cut Government spending, President Clinton has called for the largest spending increases in

U.S. history. While candidate Clinton supported a line-item veto, President Clinton has backtracked.

Last week, the Senate Finance Committee inserted a massive increase in the gas tax into President Clinton's budget proposal. Despite his solemn promises during the Presidential campaign to lower the tax burden placed on working Americans, President Clinton now appears ready to support such a measure.

Mr. Speaker, if President Clinton truly believes that Americans will stand for his doublespeak on taxes, maybe he did inhale after all.

THE FATAL SHOOTING OF ARCHIE ELLIOTT III

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, today I am asking Attorney General Reno to open an investigation into the fatal shooting of Archie Elliott III.

Archie Elliott, the son of Archie Elliott, Jr., of Portsmouth, Virginia, was slain by police officers in District Heights, MD, last Friday, June 18, 1993, under very suspicious circumstances.

According to news reports, the officers claim that Mr. Elliott was shot repeatedly after he aimed an unloaded pistol at the officers. The reports also stated that at the time of the shooting, Mr. Elliott's hands were handcuffed behind his back and he was restrained by a seatbelt in the police car.

Because of the unusual nature of this incident, I am calling for an immediate investigation by the Attorney General.

The Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice has made clear that they vigorously pursue allegations of civil rights violations. I believe that this case surely merits the Department's speedy intervention.

THE DEMOCRATS' STRANGE TAX AFFLICTION

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the President has a strange tax affliction. Not once, but twice, House Republicans have offered alternative budget bills with well over \$400 billion in spending cuts in each. However, the White House claims they haven't seen either one. The New York Times saw them; the Washington Post saw them; Ross Perot saw them; but somehow the White House missed them both.

The only explanation as to how the White House could miss two plans with \$400 billion in spending cuts was that the plans didn't have what they were looking for: taxes. Evidently, the administration has a blind spot for spend-

ing cuts, they can't see anything but taxes. To them no taxes mean no plan.

The administration's tax affliction is stranger still. While they can't see anything but taxes, they call them anything but taxes. They call them "patriotism," "responsibility," "contribution," and now "plan." So the next time you hear President Clinton claim the Democrats have a "plan" and the Republicans don't, remember what they can't say and can't see. When the President says "plan," he means taxes, and he couldn't see the Republican budget because they weren't there.

INTRODUCTION OF THURGOOD MARSHALL COMMEMORATIVE STAMP RESOLUTION

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

Mr. BLACKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution to honor a great American, Justice Thurgood Marshall.

House Joint Resolution 215 provides that a commemorative stamp be created in Justice Marshall's image, from a rendering offered by one of my constituents, Mr. Steven Johnson.

Mr. Johnson, a paraplegic, reflects what Justice Marshall stood and fought for, an America for all the people. He has done an excellent job of capturing the essence of this great jurist.

Justice Marshall beamed in our cramped and constricted community, a community in which the law at one time ordained segregation in the court room and exclusion of African-Americans from the jury box.

As a result of his career as a lawyer and as a Justice, Thurgood Marshall left an indelible mark, not just upon the law, but upon this country as well.

He finished first in his class at Howard Law School. He founded the NAACP Legal Defense Fund. He served as this Nation's first African-American Solicitor General. And he won the landmark case of Brown versus Board of Education.

Of the 32 cases he argued as a lawyer before the Supreme Court, he won 29 of them. Perhaps his name foretold his future. It was derived, and appropriately so, from his grandfather's name, "Thorough Good."

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that we honor this great grandson of a slave, brought from the Congo region of Africa. Born in Baltimore, the son of a school teacher and yacht-club steward, his roots in America run deep.

This Nation is indebted to Thurgood Marshall's accomplishments. We, who have been nourished by the sunlight of his deeds, owe a special debt of gratitude.

I urge my colleagues to join me in sponsoring the Thurgood Marshall commemorative stamp resolution.

SUPER COSTS OF SUPER COLLIDER

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, in this week's U.S. News & World Report, some of the super costs of the supercollider were outlined.

The supercollider's primary civil construction contractor has billed the Department of Energy for some very interesting—and expensive—items.

A small sample of the 1990 and 1991 expense reimbursements for this contractor are \$18,403 for coffee; \$21,369 for office plants and their upkeep; \$1,626,605 for relocation costs over 15 months, or \$10,844 for each relocated person, and over a quarter of a million dollars for auto leasing and rental.

Until this kind of contract is prohibited by Congress, these types of expenses will continue to plague what might otherwise be a worthy project. Unfortunately, somebody has to foot the bill. That somebody is the U.S. taxpayer.

BREAKING THE GRIDLOCK

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

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, the gridlock griots continue to weave tales of deceit and doom about the President's economic plan.

These crafty raconteurs would prefer to bankrupt the middle class, allow the rich to get richer, and the jobless to remain hopeless.

President Clinton's vision for this country is about balanced economic growth, tax fairness, and real deficit reduction.

Already we are seeing rises in hourly earnings and consumer confidence, and falls in mortgage rates and unemployment benefits.

Yet those gridlock griots would have us believe the sky is falling.

They continue to cry wolf when it is they who are attempting to disrupt the root of economic stability.

Those grim fairy tales doled out by these pious pipers of perfidy must be silenced.

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton's economic plan provides sound solutions that will eventually lead to a happier future for everyone.

□ 1020

BIG GOVERNMENT'S SHRINKING HARVEST

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

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, while President Clinton fights for more taxes, more spending, and bigger government, we should learn what happens when governments do just that.

Across the Atlantic, one finds the kind of big government Bill Clinton likes. Europe has big social welfare programs, plus big unemployment, big deficits, and economic decline. Noting Europe's 11 percent unemployment, Robert Samuelson writes in today's Washington Post:

To many, Europe's welfare states represent a model worth emulating. Please, look again. The combination of rigid wages and generous welfare benefits hampers economic growth, which raises welfare spending—which hampers growth.

He continues:

We should take heed. We ought to be wary of proposals that raise companies' labor costs, from higher minimum wages to more mandated benefits.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is why Americans are wary of the Clinton tax-and-spend plan. They plead to us to cut spending first.

ROEMER-ZIMMER AMENDMENT WOULD ELIMINATE SPACE STATION PROGRAM

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

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Speaker, as we debate the space station program today, you will hear proponents say that eliminating the space station will not assure that any more money will go to space science programs. They will also say that the space station is needed to ensure the very survival of the space program.

In fact, the opposite has proved to be true.

Dozens of important, successful space programs have had their funding cut or eliminated because of the space station's escalating costs.

Among those are:

The Earth Observing System—plans for environmental satellites being designed to gather data about global climate change were delayed for lack of funds.

The Magellan—a mapping satellite surveying Venus was turned off while in perfect working order due to lack of funds.

The Space Exploration Initiative—our only long-range plan for human space exploration, was eliminated from the budget.

As recently as yesterday, the VA, HUD Appropriations Subcommittee cut a variety of space programs—including \$165 million from the space shuttle—in order to bring funding for the space station up to the President's new request. Chairman STOKES predicted that more NASA programs will have to be eliminated in order to make room for the space station.

Instead of ensuring the survival of our space program, the space station is sucking the lifeblood out of the rest of the space program.

Support the Roemer-Zimmer amendment to H.R. 2200, the NASA authorization bill, and eliminate the space station program now.

GAYS AND LESBIANS IN THE MILITARY

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

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, today while the United States is debating the role of gays and lesbians in our military, there is another country in the world which just yesterday made a change in their policy, and that is the State of Israel.

The State of Israel lifted any restrictions in any security classification of gays and lesbians to work in any security classification in the Israeli military. The Israeli Defense Force has never asked recruits if they were gay, has never kicked out any soldier whose homosexuality has been known.

Israel's existence, as our existence, is directly tied to its military capability. Israel has fought six wars in the last 40 years.

A country that lives and survives on its military capability has come to a conclusion which I believe this country should be sharing in our decisionmaking process. There is no question that gays have ably served this country as well as served every army in the history of the world.

I urge the President to look and focus on the leadership that other countries in the world have shared and have done including the State of Israel in their recent decision.

SHOOTING THE HORSE

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

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, the latest version of the tax plan increases the capital gains tax by 10 percent.

Instead of taking steps to lower the cost of capital or to make our private sector more competitive, the Democrats will increase the effective tax rate on small business by 30 percent.

The President has consistently stated he supports small business, but his actions speak louder than his words. And those actions are saying: Forget small business.

But Mr. Speaker, like a horse pulling a carriage, small business pulls our economy.

Putting more taxes on small business in the name of economic growth is like shooting the horse to get the carriage moving faster.

Such logic flies in the face of reason.

Mr. Speaker, the President should not shoot the horse. He should not abandon our private sector. That is no way to get our economy going.

PROPER MENTAL HEALTH CARE A MUST

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

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday we had a very sad occasion. It was a tragic day not only for the District of Columbia but for America and Americans all over this country.

Six schoolchildren were injured in the District of Columbia as they were trying to partake in the summertime activities of swimming at a local pool, Mr. Speaker, just another one in the long litany of heinous crimes that we see from week to week now with gunmen, snipers, whether they be in the post office or whether they be in this situation.

Mr. Speaker, people are looking to this body, to this House to do something about it, to put the brakes on all of these senseless, endless, countless violent attacks. Children, seniors, it does not matter who it is.

It is time that this body gets off the dime and passes the Brady bill, and then, Mr. Speaker, if we can get ourselves off of this focus on cutting, cutting, cutting so much, it is time that we cut back and get to the business of providing some health care for the people in this country.

When we provide mental health care, maybe we will not have so many crazies, whether they be in Waco, Wacko, or the District of Columbia shooting our young kids.

STOP THE TAXING AND CUT THE SPENDING

(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, the American taxpayers are speaking but President Clinton and his fellow Democrats just are not listening.

The American people want spending cuts first. Not tax increases.

The Clinton Btu tax, adopted by House Democrats was roundly rejected by the taxpayers. So, Democrats in the other body regrouped and came up with—guess what—a gasoline tax.

There seems to be a communications problem here. The people keep saying cut spending first. The Democrats keep hearing raise taxes.

What the Democrats in the other body have concocted is a \$265 billion tax increase package which contains a mere \$83 billion in spending cuts. And only \$30 billion of those cuts occur before 1996.

Listen up, my Democrat friends. You do not have to read lips. Just open your ears. The taxpayers want spending cuts now. Not promises of spending cuts a few years from now.

Mr. Speaker, stop the taxing. Cut the spending.

JOE LOUIS, A REAL AMERICAN HERO

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

Mr. APPELGATE. Mr. Speaker, as a young boy many, many years ago, I sat in front of our upright Philco radio listening to the Joe Louis-Max Schmeling fight when Joe Louis cold-cocked him in about 2½ minutes, erasing what Hitler was talking about as the superior race.

The U.S. Postal Department yesterday issued a stamp for the Brown Bomber, as he was affectionately known. Joe was a real American hero. He was quiet, he had fists of steel, he had a 6-inch punch which would put you out in no time where you'd see the stars, and he defended against all comers. In fact, there were so many of them they used to call it the "Bum of the Month Club." He took all comers on.

He was a role model and an inspiration to all of us young kids who used to listen to that radio and watch Joe Louis fight. He served his country when his country asked him to serve.

Joe Louis was a real American hero.

WHERE IS THE SPACE STATION MONEY GOING?

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have been prepared for a couple of days to vote against the space station. Frankly, I find it hard to justify with our huge budget deficit, and I think many of my colleagues feel the same way.

But just yesterday, a question popped into my mind. If it does not pass, where will the money really go?

I had always assumed it would go to deficit reduction. Well, guess what? Not necessarily.

By merely eliminating the space station's budget authority, we do not prevent the money from being spent elsewhere, say for instance in public housing programs or community development block grants.

Indeed, rather than taking it away entirely, the amendment puts its trust in Congress not to spend the money, a situation I personally do not find very comforting.

Make no mistake. I am going to cast my vote against the space station. But I want my vote to be for deficit reduc-

tion, not for taking money away from science only to further pad wasteful spending programs.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say to the sponsors and supporters of the amendment. If it passes, we must follow this money like hawks through the appropriations process, through the conference committee, all the way to the President's desk. If we really want this to go to deficit reduction, this is merely our first battle.

□ 1030

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S BROKEN CAMPAIGN PROMISES

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

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, if President Clinton were Pinnocchio, his nose would be longer than his list of broken campaign promises. The President insists upon telling the American people that his tax plan is half spending cuts and half tax increases. Well, you can call a duck a cow all you want, but at the end of the day it still has feathers and it still quacks.

The White House is lying to the American people. He is utterly undeterred by the facts. His budget being debated today in the Senate, includes \$3.18 in tax hikes for every dollar in spending cuts. And take a look at the spending cuts President Clinton is taking credit for:

Forty-four billion dollars in cuts already written into law by the 1990 budget agreement. Bill Clinton had nothing to do with those cuts.

Fifty-five billion dollars in savings on interest on the national debt. Now there is a tough choice from the White House.

One billion dollars by shifting the reimbursement dates for American hospitals from a fiscal to a calendar year basis.

Seventy billion dollars in future spending cuts during 1997 and 1998, almost \$200 billion in sham spending cuts. The only cuts are in defense, and they will cost us up to 2.8 million jobs.

Mr. Speaker, in the Land of Oz that is Bill Clinton's White House, this qualifies as bold leadership.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The Chair would warn the gentleman that he should not make certain references to the President of the United States.

DEFENSE FOR DEFENSE BILL

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

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to defend our country's defense budget. The fall of communism has allowed us to enter into a new era where a leaner defense budget is possible. However, leaner does not mean nonexistent.

Funds are being transferred out of the defense budget for nondefense purposes. The defense budget has become a pot of gold for Members of Congress who can't get their programs funded in other budgets. In fact, over the past 5 years over \$5 billion has been transferred out of the Pentagon in this manner.

My bill is not a new idea—it simply strengthens and codifies a 1989 provision in law by reaffirming the statutory prohibition on the transfer of DOD funds to any other agency or Department of Government, unless the Secretary of Defense submits a certification to the Congress that such a transfer would be in the national security interest.

My bill will stop the dollar drain from the Pentagon, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

THE TAX GRABBERS ARE BACK

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, the tax grabbers are back again. And they are coming for your pocketbooks.

Only last month, this House passed a bill which included the largest tax increase in American history. Now, the other body is preparing to consider its own package.

The latest version of the tax and spend budget, passed last week by the Senate Finance Committee, calls for \$3.18 in new taxes for every \$1 in spending cuts.

No, this version of the tax grab does not include the job-killing Btu tax favored by President Clinton and House Democrats. It contains instead a job-killing gasoline tax, which particularly hits hard at rural areas like those I represent in northern California.

Mr. Speaker, like the House-passed energy tax, it will pick the pocket of every American from the gas pump to the grocery store. Like the House-passed tax, it will kill hundreds of thousands of American jobs.

Mr. Speaker, higher taxes do not create jobs. Higher taxes do not stimulate economic growth. Higher taxes do not reduce the deficit.

The President and his Democrat allies in the Congress should forget about all their new tax proposals and cut spending first.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced

that the Senate had passed with amendments a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2118. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 2118), an act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD, Mr. INOUE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SASSER, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. REID, Mr. KERREY, Mr. KOHL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. BOND, Mr. GORTON, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MACK, and Mr. BURNS, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST H.R. 2446, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 204 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 204

Resolved, That during consideration of the bill (H.R. 2446) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, all points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. The amendments en bloc specified in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution to be offered by Representative Fawell of Illinois or a designee may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment, shall be considered as read when offered, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLLEN] for the purposes of debate only, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 204 is the rule waiving points of order against provisions of the bill, H.R. 2446, the Military Construction Appropriations for fiscal year 1994. Since general appropriations bills are privileged under the Rules of the House, the rule does not provide for any special guidelines for the consideration of the bill. Provisions related to time for general debate

are not included in the rule. Customarily, Mr. Speaker, general debate time is limited by a unanimous-consent request by the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee prior to the consideration of the bill.

The rule waives clause 2 of rule XXI against all provisions of H.R. 2446. Clause 2 of rule XXI prohibits unauthorized appropriations and legislative provisions in general appropriations bills. The waiver is necessary because the authorizing legislation for this bill is not in place. In addition, the rule makes in order an en bloc amendment which is printed in the report accompanying the rule if offered by Representative FAWELL or his designee. The amendment en bloc is not divisible.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2446 appropriates approximately \$10.3 billion for fiscal year 1994 military construction, family housing and base closure costs for the various branches of the Department of Defense. It is consistent with the budget resolution and under the administration's request. My colleagues on both sides of the aisle have worked diligently under difficult budgetary constraints to produce an excellent piece of legislation.

The bill appropriates approximately \$27.6 million in funding for several projects at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, which is partially located in my congressional district. I am pleased that the committee approved the necessary projects which were requested by the Department of Defense. Included in the bill are funds for the next phase of an acquisition management complex for the Aerospace Systems Center and the second phase of an avionics research laboratory which was authorized in 1992. In addition, the committee provided assistance to renovate electrical substations, replace underground fuel storage tanks, and improve above-ground tanks. These projects replace old facilities and tanks which pose an unacceptable risk to people who work on the base and live near it. Finally, I appreciate the funds provided to install gas-fired boilers at the Defense Electronics Supply Center [DESC].

Mr. Speaker, these projects are important to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, and to the community of Dayton, OH which has been a world leader in aviation since the days of the Wright brothers. I commend my colleagues for including them in H.R. 2446.

Mr. Speaker, under the normal rules of the House, any amendment which does not violate any House rules could be offered to H.R. 2446. The rule received unanimous support in the House Rules Committee, and I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] for yielding. The gentleman

has ably explained the provisions of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, the rule does not restrict the normal amending process, and I support it.

This bill is \$521 million below the President's request, and I commend the members of the Appropriations Committee for putting together a bipartisan, fiscally responsible measure while still meeting the construction needs of our military.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also addresses the important issue of base realignment and closure by setting aside 30 percent of the total funding into three separate accounts for this purpose.

H.R. 2446 contains some legislative provisions, including the requirement that the Department of Defense inform the Congress 30 days in advance of any proposed military exercise that involves U.S. personnel with an anticipated cost in excess of \$100,000. The measure also requires the Defense Department to report to Congress on specific actions it is taking to encourage NATO allies and Japan and Korea to assume a greater share of the common defense burden. Given our Nation's current economic situation, we have to make some tough choices, and it is imperative that other nations contribute a fair share toward global responsibilities.

I know some Members have concerns over specific spending items in this bill, and this rule will allow Members to offer amendments to reduce or eliminate certain expenditures if they so desire. The rule also allows the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] to offer an en bloc amendment to strike 143 unauthorized projects from the bill.

□ 1040

Mr. Speaker, I want the Members to take special notice of this amendment. Projects are being cut in practically every State of this Nation.

I do not support the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL], but I do not object to his offering it on the floor of the House.

I would hope the Members would find out the specific projects in their districts being eliminated by this en bloc amendment and take notice on the floor of the House when the amendment is presented.

Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the rule.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. 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 resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on the bill, H.R. 2446, which will be presently considered.

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

There was no objection.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2446) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair designates the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN] as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole and requests the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1044

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2446, with Mr. HALL of Ohio, Chairman pro tempore, in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. By unanimous consent, the bill was considered as having been read the first time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

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

Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to present to the House, H.R. 2446, the fiscal year 1994 military construction appropriations bill.

BILL TOTAL

The bill we are recommending totals \$10.3 billion which is below the subcommittee 602(b) allocation for both budget authority and outlays. The bill is under the President's request by \$521 million. This bill is over the 1993 appropriated level, but one should review that with caution and qualification. The reason I say that is because, last year, we were forced under a veto threat to reduce military construction by over 40 percent with the understanding that, in 1994, we would return to a more appropriate level. The comparative numbers are all laid out on page 2 of the report which shows that when you separate out base closure funding, and go back to the 1992 level, the military construction and family housing portion of the bill is under the 1992 level by \$848 million. Again, this bill is under the President's request by \$521 million and under the 1992 level by \$848 million.

BASE CLOSURE

With regard to base closure the bill provides funding to implement three separate rounds of base realignment and closure, the total of which has tripled since 1992 to a point that represents 30 percent of the entire bill. We have included \$1.2 billion to facilitate the next round of base closure recommendations that are currently pending before the Base Closure Commission. However, such funds are available, only to the extent, that a formal budget request is transmitted. The committee took this action to avoid the need for supplemental appropriations at a later date.

ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

Within the base closure funding, the committee recommends \$582 million for environmental cleanup which is so essential to expediting orderly cleanup of closed bases.

QUALITY OF LIFE

The bill before you is a bill that provides for quality of life of our military. Our service men and women need to have better living and working conditions. For example, we still have troops living in antiquated World War II barracks. For that reason, we are supporting a department initiative to upgrade and replace antiquated barracks. This bill also includes funds to repair and replace housing that is substandard and dangerous to the health of families because of the presence of asbestos and lead based paint.

INVESTMENT PROGRAM

Members should realize that the military construction bill is an investment bill that has significant payback in economic terms and provides for offsets in other parts of the Defense budget.

BILL FEATURES

Let me just go over some of the special features of the bill. The bill provides about \$500 million for new bar-

racks and modernization of existing barracks.

It provides about \$300 million for environmental compliance type projects.

It provides about \$100 million for child development centers.

It provides about \$200 million for overseas priority projects, one-third of which is for construction in Guam as a result of the Philippine relocation.

It reduces the President's request for NATO funding by \$100 million.

For the Reserve Components, it provides for an increase of about \$200 million over the President's request but is under the 1993 level.

It continues the longstanding policy of phase funding of large hospital complexes based on executable rates.

It provides \$50 million as an ongoing effort to reduce energy costs.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Mr. Chairman, before I conclude my remarks, I want to express my appreciation to all the members of the subcommittee, and especially our ranking minority member, the gentlelady from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH]. It is a pleasure to work with the gentlelady from Nevada. This is why we are presenting, to you, a bipartisan bill and a good bill given the budget constraints that we have to work with.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my remarks and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1050

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

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted today to bring to the floor, along with my chairman and friend, Mr. HEFNER, the bill making appropriations for military construction for fiscal year 1994.

I would like to thank the subcommittee chairman, Mr. HEFNER has been patient and informative as he has guided me through my first year as ranking member.

I would also like to thank the members of the subcommittee for their hard work and input during our hearing process. The staff work has been exemplary and I want to commend them for their hours of toil and trouble.

I support this bill. It is a truly bipartisan bill and a very balanced and fair bill.

Although the measure is not all things to all Members, I believe we treated everyone fairly.

Mr. HEFNER has outlined the highlights of the bill so I will not be repetitive. I would simply point out again that the bill totals \$10.3 billion for fiscal year 1994, is under the President's request by \$521 million, and is below the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation.

While the bill shows a significant increase over fiscal year 1993 funding—due to base closure expenses and making up for a DOT-initiated construction pause—when combined with the de-

fense appropriations bill, overall defense numbers will be \$17.3 billion below fiscal year 1993 in outlays.

The military construction bill constitutes about 3 percent of DOD's total budget. The majority of the other 97 percent is provided through the annual defense authorization and appropriations bills. Both these bills have been delayed this year. However, our subcommittee has worked closely with the Armed Services Committee in crafting this bill to allow it to move forward. The appropriations bill language makes all appropriations subject to authorization.

Military construction is an investment program that has significant paybacks in economic terms, in better living and working conditions, and in environmental restoration.

With reduction in forces, it is imperative that we put a priority on providing the best working and living conditions for our service members and their families. The bill contains \$3.6 billion for family housing. An example of these needs exist in my district at Nellis Air Force Base. There are 70 homes for junior enlisted and their families which are falling apart. They are 50 years old and made of cinder block which allows water seepage causing interior wall damage. Some have severe foundation and wall cracks. The roofs are deteriorated and the old cast iron sewer lines under the slabs are in desperate need of repair.

These are the men and women to whom we entrust the care and maintenance of \$40 million airplanes. These are the men and women across the Nation we sent to Desert Storm and Somalia. I believe they deserve a decent roof over their heads, and a home for their families.

This bill helps meet that goal. I hope that my colleagues will support H.R. 2446.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

Mrs. MEEK. Mr. Chairman, I especially want my colleagues in the freshman class to know that this is a most responsible bill, a bill that is already \$521 million below the President's request. As a new member of the Military Construction Subcommittee, I know the extent that we are downsizing military construction. The Congress has concerns about military families, including child care for their children. We have concerns about the inadequate housing that we ask our military personnel to live in. We also have concerns about base closure, including in my own district.

There is nothing in this bill for my own district other than ensuring that the Base Closure and Realignment Commission has adequate funds to begin final base closures and hazardous

cleanup so that our communities can get on with defense conversion.

The Fawell amendment uses the excuse of congressional add-ons. The committee has made some necessary changes in the President's request. It is the prerogative of the Congress, and indeed our duty, to do so. The bill gives the President 95 percent of what he has requested. The Fawell amendment also uses the excuse that projects are not authorized. He is wrong. The military installations in the bill are not projects. Furthermore, there is a provision under every heading in the bill, making the appropriation subject to authorization. Last, the bill drafted under the excellent leadership of Chairman HEFNER is well under the 602(b) allocations, and well under the budget resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my freshmen colleagues to oppose the Fawell amendment and vote for final passage of this bill.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to commend Chairman HEFNER and the ranking Republican, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, for their efforts in crafting a balanced and bipartisan military construction bill. I strongly support their efforts on this necessary legislation.

As my colleagues know, military construction funding is an integral part of our defense planning. The appropriations bill before us today provides a total of \$10.3 billion in fiscal year 1994 for new building construction, revitalization of existing military facilities, and the costs associated with the base closure process. Most importantly, H.R. 2446 allocates \$3.6 billion of the fiscal year 1994 funds for family housing projects. I believe it is extremely important to focus our efforts on family housing projects because this improves the quality of life for our military families. As we continue to downsize our military, it is more necessary than ever to maintain a high quality of life for our families in order to attract the highest quality servicemember.

Finally, I would like to note that a significant portion of military construction money now goes to fund base closures—I believe base funding closure constitutes 30 percent of this appropriations bill. I would like to work with my colleagues to ensure that this funding goes to actually get these bases off the military rolls, and is not spent on hordes of lawyers and endless litigation.

Again, I commend the chairman and Mrs. VUCANOVICH and look forward to working with you both on military construction issues.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill, and I am opposed to the Fawell amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I serve on the House Committee on Armed Services, and am ranking member on the Subcommittee on Military Forces and Personnel, and the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities. We have worked very closely with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] and his committee, and this bill attracts a lot of what the authorization bill does do.

Mr. Chairman, I point out that this is a jobs bill. It will put people back to work. It is military construction, and it spreads defense spending around the country in the United States. It gives jobs to people in small States, building armories and building ranges.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is good legislation, I strongly support it, and I oppose the Fawell amendment.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the military construction appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994. This is the fourth appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994 to come before the House.

I want to commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], chairman of the Military Construction Appropriations Subcommittee, and the gentlelady from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], the ranking minority member on the subcommittee.

This important bill provides support for our active duty forces as well as our National Guard and Reserves. Also, this bill provides funding for base realignment and closure activities. We need to provide for these activities so that the Department of Defense can continue to downsize in an efficient manner.

I want to commend all 11 members of the Subcommittee on Military Construction on a good bill.

The next 2 weeks will be active ones on the floor of the House because of bills reported by the Committee on Appropriations as we continue to move our bills for consideration prior to our Fourth of July work period. I want to thank all Members for their cooperation.

Again, I want to commend subcommittee members for a job well done.

I urge adoption of this bill.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, the military construction appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994 is the 4th of 12 appropriations bills we intend to act on in the next 2 weeks. Under the leadership of Chairman NATCHER our committee is under an ambitious schedule—and one I know we will meet—to bring 12 fiscal year 1994 appropriation bills to the floor before the July 4 recess.

I'd like to take this opportunity to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. HEFNER for his diligence in bringing this bill to the floor. And Mrs. VUCANOVICH, serving in her first year as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, has done a superb job in juggling the difficult task presented her. We also have three other new members on our side, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Mr. HOBSON who have played an instrumental role in crafting this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the military construction appropriations bill funds military construction and

family housing throughout the world. In addition, one-third of the bill accounts for all funds related to domestic base closures. H.R. 2446 totals \$10.3 billion and is \$521 million below the President's budget request. The bill is \$1.89 billion above the fiscal year 1993 level, which is due to the funding of the 1993 base closures to be voted on by the Commission this week and making up for a DOD initiated military construction pause.

This funding increase, I might add, was also intended under the Bush administration.

While military construction shows an increase over last year, because of the priority given to these programs, you have to look at defense in the aggregate—and, the total defense function is coming down. The Clinton request for the defense budget as a whole is \$10.2 billion less in budget authority and \$14.8 billion less in outlays than last year.

Under the 602(b) allocations total Defense comes down even more by some \$10.8 billion less in budget authority and \$17.3 billion less in outlays than fiscal year 1993. And, this bill goes even further by cutting an additional \$63 million in budget authority from the allocation—which for milcon was already cut by nearly half a billion dollars from President Clinton's budget. To put this in perspective, defense is the biggest single budget cutting contribution to deficit reduction for fiscal year 1994—some \$17 billion outlays.

This is proposed at a time when our military commitments appear to be growing, given the military's expanded role in disaster relief, humanitarian assistance, and international peacekeeping and sanctions enforcement. At the same time, there are disturbing signs that a return to the hollow military of the 1970's is imminent. Military recruitment is down, while a greater proportion of those enlisting have failed to complete high school.

The Joint Chiefs have testified to growing morale problems resulting from uncertainty about future defense cuts, a pace of deployments which is increasing as force structure shrinks, and most recently, the administration's proposals to cut military cost-of-living adjustments.

As we try to juggle these problems with limited resources it is imperative now more than ever that we provide the finest working and living conditions to our men and women in uniform.

This bill is a quality-of-life bill for our service members and their families but it is also an investment, produces jobs, and produces savings in other defense accounts. In the wake of Desert Storm and Somalia it is imperative we send a strong signal of support for our service members. When visiting military installations around the world you will see tangible results from this bill—results that make a difference in morale and in turn, improve the quality of our Armed Forces.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this bill and urge my colleagues to oppose any amendments to it which further decreases our defense resources.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Mr. HEFNER, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and the military construction staff.

I ask the Members to support the bill.

Member's quote unquote projects are being given a bad name. There is no question that,

in the past, there have been abuses, but I remind you, that under the Constitution, it is the duty of the Congress to decide what is to be funded.

If we are to act merely as a rubberstamp for the administration's proposals, all of us might as well go home.

And if we go home, the executive could save \$2 billion for the operation of the legislative branch—but then the Constitution would not be served because there would be no representation of the people.

I have a Member's initiative in this bill—it is a day care center for the children of the troops serving at Edgewood arsenal.

The Army slated this project to be completed with minor construction funds. However, there is a limit of \$1.5 million for those items. The day care center's projected cost is \$1.45 million. If the bids come in for over \$1.5 million—minor construction funds could not be used.

As a result, the day care center could not be built—and one is needed.

Currently, the child care center is housed in a World War II era stable. I would like to quote DOD's own description:

Buildings "consist of three separate World War II wood buildings contaminated with friable asbestos and lead paint. The buildings have structural problems. . . . Facilities are presently required to use bottled water for drinking due to the condition of the pipes. The present capacity of 125 does not meet the current need of 363 children."

This need has existed for years; and the Army did not budget for an adequate child care center.

The executive branch cannot know the needs in every congressional district. That is why we are here.

We are not rubberstamps. That is why my constituents have sent me here. It is my duty to raise this and other issues that affect my district.

I urge support of the bill.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the military construction appropriations bill and in support of funding included for construction at the Ohio Air National Guard's 179th Medical Squadron's installation in Mansfield, OH.

The Guard has a dire need for facilities adequate to train personnel. The unit's current medical training and dining facilities offer only half the space needed. They are housed in poorly configured structures in the unit's overcrowded operational training area, which cannot be expanded. The current facilities present health risks, inefficient training routines, and increased operation and maintenance costs that degrade the mission readiness of the unit.

The \$2.9 million included in the bill to construct a 19,000 square foot facility is a reasonable appropriation to improve the readiness of the Ohio National Guard. I commend the committee for its foresight, and I urge support for the bill.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2446, the fiscal year 1994 military construction appropriation bill. This is an important bill because it is an investment in the protection of our peace and freedom. Even in these days of downsizing the military, what we ultimately spend on our armed forces guar-

antees that we can live in peace and freedom. American men and women are encouraged to serve in the military when we provide efficient, quality workplaces and modern housing facilities. This is something we must do to continue having an all volunteer force.

The \$10.3 billion bill is roughly divided into thirds: First, \$3.5 billion for military construction, second, \$3.6 billion for family housing, and third, \$3 billion for base closure. While the bill is over fiscal year 1993 levels, this is due to base closure expenses and making up for a Department of Defense-initiated construction pause. H.R. 2446 is \$63 million under the military construction 602(b) allocation in budget authority. It is at the 602(b) allocation in outlays.

On a parochial bases, let me note about \$28 million in construction projects at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base which is partially in my district. All of these projects were requested by the administration.

Finally, I want to say what a great privilege it is to serve on the military construction subcommittee. Of the choices I looked at when I came to the Appropriations Committee this year, Milcon was my first choice. My thanks and compliments to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], the distinguished ranking minority member, the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], and all the subcommittee members for their hard work. H.R. 2446 is an excellent bill and I highly recommend it to you.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2446. In an era of increasingly limited resources, this Member recognizes the enormous difficulties that our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee must face. They are forced to make difficult choices among many worthy programs, knowing full well that there are not sufficient funds to support even a fraction of the competing initiatives. This is particularly true for the military construction subcommittee, which must simultaneously deal with issues such as the base closings, the NATO infrastructure account, consolidation of numerous assets for active duty forces, and the continued modernization of National Guard and Reserve facilities.

It is with that in mind that this Member expresses his sincere gratitude to the Chairman of the military construction subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], and the distinguished ranking member, the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], for supporting important and much needed modernizations for the Nebraska Air National Guard with the recommended \$7.3 million for hanger construction and renovation plus \$1,850,000 for a necessary fire station construction project. As the subcommittee recognizes, the Nebraska Air Guard is in the midst of a transition from RF-4C reconnaissance aircraft to KC-135R tankers. The Nebraska Air Guard has enthusiastically embraced this new mission, and the conversion is well underway. However, a number of infrastructure alterations are necessary to support the conversion.

Of particular concern is the old maintenance hanger and repair facility. The hanger in question is almost 40 years old and is showing its age. Moreover, it is filled with old asbestos insulation, which carries with it obvious health

risks. While it may have been adequate to maintain small fighter-type aircraft such as the RF-4C, it is completely unsuitable for the much larger KC-135R tankers. Construction of the new maintenance hanger is absolutely essential if the Air Guard is to support its new mission.

Mr. Chairman, this Member is particularly appreciative of the fact that the military construction subcommittee was able to find the funds required to support the hanger renovation. In doing so, they have made an important, positive contribution to the readiness of our Air National Guard.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, as we consider the military construction appropriations bill today, I have several observations.

I would like to thank Chairman HEFNER and ranking member Mrs. VUCANOVICH for their help and consideration in addressing the genuine needs of the Marine Corps base, Camp Pendleton, in this bill.

H.R. 2446 contains funds to repair extensive flood damage at Camp Pendleton, which is in my district.

I visited Camp Pendleton earlier this year to see flood damage at the base. We saw helicopters buried in mud up the cockpit. A portion of the airstrip was washed away and tons of mud accumulated on the airfield.

Bridges and major portions of roadways literally disappeared. Wells were washed away and a sewage treatment plant was severely damaged. Funding in this bill will cover a small portion of flood repairs that need to be made to the base.

We have an obligation to provide funding to repair damage at the base. When cities and counties in southern California needed help from flooding this year, they were able to turn to FEMA for help. Obviously, the marines can't do that.

We cannot ask the Marine Corps to absorb these costly repairs from a budget that is already stretched to its limits. The defense budget is being hit from all sides. The armed services are being asked to downsize at an historic rate. Military personnel, are being asked to accept a pay freeze, weapons programs are being canceled or drastically scaled back. In short, the defense budget is being cut too deep, too fast. It simply is not fair to turn around and ask them to absorb the costs from this flood damage and any other emergencies that, by definition, come along unexpectedly.

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the distinguished chairman of the Military Construction Subcommittee, Mr. HEFNER, and the able ranking member, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, for the hard work they have done in bringing to the floor a military construction appropriations bill that is both responsive to the demands of budget constraints and to the changing demands on our defense infrastructure.

I particularly appreciate their favorable consideration of my request for two important military construction projects at the U.S. Army Armament Research, Development and Engineering Center [ARDEC] at Picatinny Arsenal, NJ. They are:

The construction of an advanced warhead development facility. This facility would enhance ARDEC's ability to meet its Army mission for the development of armament sys-

tems, including antiarmor warheads. It would provide a safe, secure, cost-effective, environmentally acceptable facility for conducting tests for terminal ballistics evaluation of explosive warheads for large caliber munitions. This facility will permit testing in any weather and will also comply with environmental mandates for reducing noise and eliminating radioactive and toxic waste. Construction of this facility will result in an annual cost savings of \$1.3 million, with a payback in less than 4 years, and;

The construction of an explosive development facility. This facility would enhance ARDEC's ability to meet its missions to formulate, characterize, and determine the sensitivities of new explosives and propellants, as well as its Army mission for interim qualification of new and improved energetic materials employed in munitions systems—mines, artillery, et cetera. It will consolidate preparation and small scale testing for the research and development of new explosive formulations and will be used to develop new Army insensitive energetic materials to be used in future insensitive munitions [IM] as mandated by the tri-service insensitive munitions policy. Construction of this facility will result in an annual cost savings of \$1.8 million, with a payback of less than 4 years.

I believe both of these projects, which have Army support, represent important and wise investments in the Army of the future. By providing ARDEC—an Army center of excellence 3 years running—with these up-to-date facilities, we can enhance their ability to meet their mission while investing in infrastructure improvements of the arsenal that will pay for themselves in less than 4 years.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer an amendment to H.R. 2446, the Military Construction Appropriation Act, with Congressman PENNY, ZIMMER, and THURMAN. Unfortunately, due to the fact that general debate was cut far short of what was anticipated, and the vote on final passage occurred unusually fast, I lost my opportunity to offer an amendment on behalf of the porkbusters coalition to cut 143 unauthorized, unrequested projects totaling over \$520 million.

The following is the statement I had prepared on our amendment:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN HARRIS W. FAWELL ON THE FAWELL-PENNY-ZIMMER-THURMAN AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2446, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment, with Congressmen PENNY, ZIMMER, and THURMAN, on behalf of the porkbusters coalition to eliminate earmarked funding for 143 projects totaling over \$520 million. All of these projects were specifically earmarked by the Appropriations Committee—in other words, the committee directs tax dollars to be spent in a specific location for a specific project. The earmarks were not requested by the Defense Department. They have not been authorized.

This amendment is straightforward. It asks that Congress abide by the rules it sets for spending tax dollars. And these rules are straightforward: First get it authorized, then appropriate the money. The Appropriations Committee is asking us to do it the other way around.

If the Appropriations Committee is going to earmark specific projects, then they

should be specifically earmarked for funding first by the authorizing committee, Armed Services. These rules assure that projects will be carefully considered by Congress and taxpayers' funds will not be wasted.

It appears that none of these 143 projects has had a specific authorization in previous years, and could not have been authorized this year because the Defense Authorization bill has not yet been reported out of committee. Further raising our suspicions about the projects, all are earmarked in the committee report for specific locations—all domestic locations, of course—and none were requested by the administration.

Mr. Chairman, the porkbusters coalition is a bipartisan group of 72 Members of Congress and 11 taxpayer organizations. I cannot stress the following point enough: Porkbusters is not questioning the merits of these projects; we are questioning the way in which they are being funded in violation of established procedures.

Opponents of the amendment will argue that H.R. 2446 requires that projects be authorized before they can be funded. From my reading of this bill, that is not the case. The bill does not require that the earmarks be specifically authorized. Moreover, projects are supposed to be authorized prior to receiving funding.

Opponents of the amendment will also argue that we need not cut \$520 million from the bill because the military construction appropriation bill is already under the President's request. Total requested spending under the President's budget is irrelevant. What is relevant is that this bill appropriates \$1.9 billion more than was appropriated last year in a time of expanding national debt. Therefore, if we adopt our amendment, we will only cut the increase over last year by one-quarter. If the Federal Government were operating under zero-based budgeting where you begin with what you got last year, the burden would be on the proponents of this bill to justify a 20-percent increase in spending in a single year.

Opponents will argue that the bill comes in under the budget allocation, the 602(b) allocation. This half billion dollars in earmarks will have to be borrowed from our grandchildren. These earmarks are equivalent to a one-half cent per gallon gasoline tax—think of it, we could knock off that much from the proposed new gas tax just by cutting these earmarks.

One-half billion dollars will not burn a hole in our pockets if it is not spent. Even if all of the President's budget plans are implemented—all of the tax increases and spending cuts take place—we will still add \$1.8 trillion to the national debt over the next 5 years. If we can find a half billion dollars that isn't absolutely essential to spend, then we'd darn well better use it to reduce the accumulated debt.

If we cannot cut spending, such as this \$520 million, that has never gone through the authorization process, then what can we cut? If we cannot cut spending that was not even requested by the military for the military, then what can we cut? If we cannot make this first toddling step, how can we ever be trusted to take more taxes from the American people? How can we be trusted to move toward balancing the budget?

I would especially like to appeal to the 110 new Members of this body who came to Washington to change business as usual when it comes to spending taxpayers' money. If you campaigned on cutting waste in government, on eliminating unnecessary defense spending, or if you pledged to support the

line-item veto, this amendment goes to the heart of why you ran for Congress.

This is a bipartisan amendment that also has the support of the National Taxpayers Union, Citizens Against Government Waste, Citizens for a Sound Economy, U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

I urge a "yes" vote on the Fawell-Penny-Zimmer-Thurman amendment.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my appreciation to today's bill managers for their efforts on behalf of Luke Air Force Base, AZ, so that flood control improvements may go forward. Chairman BILL HEFNER and ranking minority member BARBARA VUCANOVICH, of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction, recognized the urgency of this matter, and the opportunity to involve local government in cost sharing.

Last September, Luke AFB was flooded by storms representing a 100-year activity within the watershed that drains toward the base. Flood depths on Luke AFB ranged from 0.5 to 4 feet. Twenty-two fighter aircraft sustained brake and wheel bearing damage. In addition, 78 houses were damaged and 63 families were evacuated. Damage sustained on Luke AFB was \$3.2 million. In January 1993, another storm caused \$310,000 of damage when the Dysart drain on the north side of the base again breached its banks.

This flood channel was built in the 1950's. Luke AFB owns the channel and its related right of way. Ground water subsidence caused by many years of agricultural ground water pumping caused the channel to settle nearly 17 feet in some places. This subsidence has lowered the channel near Luke, with the presence of a salt dome creating a channel high point between Luke and the channel discharge point. This high point has negated the channel's effectiveness.

The estimated cost of a long-term fix to this problem is \$12 million. Local county and municipal officials surrounding Luke AFB are aware of this situation and have repeatedly expressed a strong commitment to participate with the base on this project. On March 3, 1993, the board of directors of the flood control district of Maricopa County approved project resolution FCD 92-10 authorizing negotiation of an intergovernmental agreement with Luke, including cost sharing. They have already undertaken approximately \$200,000 in technical study-design cost.

I strongly commend the actions of local officials in support of Luke AFB, and believe Congress should recognize their commitment to the base by moving forward with funding for this project as soon as possible. H.R. 2446 provides funding for this effort, and I again want to express my appreciation to the subcommittee leadership and staff for their assistance.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HALL of Ohio). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendments en bloc printed in House Report 103-148 to be offered by the gentleman

from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] or his designee, may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment, shall be considered as read, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2446

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, for military construction functions administered by the Department of Defense, and for other purposes, namely:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Army as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Army Corps of Engineers and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, and for construction and operation of facilities in support of the functions of the Commander in Chief, \$837,644,000, to remain available until September 30, 1998: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$109,441,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, facilities, and real property for the Navy as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Naval Facilities Engineering Command and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, \$575,971,000, to remain available until September 30, 1998: *Provided*, that of this amount, not to exceed \$64,373,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Air Force as currently authorized by law, \$913,297,000, to remain available until September 30, 1998: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$63,882,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, installations, facilities, and real property for activities and agencies of

the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as currently authorized by law, \$618,770,000, to remain available until September 30, 1998: *Provided*, That such amounts of this appropriation as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to such appropriations of the Department of Defense available for military construction as he may designate, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$42,405,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, \$203,980,000, to remain available until September 30, 1998.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, \$161,761,000 to remain available until September 30, 1998.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army Reserve as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, \$87,825,000, to remain available until September 30, 1998.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVAL RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the reserve components of the Navy and Marine Corps as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, \$28,647,000, to remain available until September 30, 1998.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air Force Reserve as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, \$66,136,000, to remain available until September 30, 1998.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE

For the United States share of the cost of North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure programs for the acquisition and construction of military facilities and installations (including international military headquarters) and for related expenses for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area as authorized in military construction Acts and section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, \$140,000,000, to remain available until expended.

FAMILY HOUSING, ARMY

For expenses of family housing for the Army for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration and for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, \$218,785,000 to remain available until September 30, 1998; for operation and maintenance, and for debt payment, \$1,067,922,000; in all \$1,286,707,000.

FAMILY HOUSING, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For expenses of family housing for the Navy and Marine Corps for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration and for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, \$367,769,000, to remain available until September 30, 1998; for operation and maintenance, and for debt payment, \$781,952,000; in all \$1,149,721,000.

FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE

For expenses of family housing for the Air Force for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration and for operation and maintenance including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, \$192,197,000, to remain available until September 30, 1998; for operation and maintenance, and for debt payment, \$805,847,000; in all \$998,044,000.

FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of family housing for the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration, and for operation and maintenance, leasing, and minor construction, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, \$159,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1998; for Operation and maintenance, \$25,711,000; in all \$25,870,000.

HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE FUND, DEFENSE

For use in the Homeowners Assistance Fund established pursuant to section 1013(d) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, as amended (42 U.S.C. 3374), \$151,400,000.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART I

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account established by section 207(a)(1) of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100-526), \$27,870,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1995: *Provided*, that none of these funds may be obligated for base realignment and closure activities under Public Law 100-526 which would cause the Department's \$1,800,000,000 cost estimate for military construction and family housing related to the Base Realignment and Closure Program to be exceeded: *Provided further*, That not less than \$19,800,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be available solely for environmental restoration.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART II

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 established

by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991 (Public Law 101-510), \$1,800,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such funds are available solely for the approved 1991 base realignments and closures: *Provided further*, That not less than \$262,300,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be available solely for environmental restoration.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT,
PART III

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991 (Public Law 101-510), \$1,200,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such funds will be available only to the extent an official budget request is transmitted to the Congress: *Provided further*, That such funds are available solely for the approved 1993 base realignments and closures: *Provided further*, That not less than \$300,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be available solely for environmental restoration.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for work, where cost estimates exceed \$25,000, to be performed within the United States, except Alaska, without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense setting forth the reasons therefor.

SEC. 102. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles.

SEC. 103. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction may be used for advances to the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, for the construction of access roads as authorized by section 210 of title 23, United States Code, when projects authorized therein are certified as important to the national defense by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 104. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to begin construction of new bases inside the continental United States for which specific appropriations have not been made.

SEC. 105. No part of the funds provided in Military Construction Appropriations Acts shall be used for purchase of land or land easements in excess of 100 per centum of the value as determined by the Army Corps of Engineers or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, except (a) where there is a determination of value by a Federal court, or (b) purchases negotiated by the Attorney General or his designee, or (c) where the estimated value is less than \$25,000, or (d) as otherwise determined by the Secretary of Defense to be in the public interest.

SEC. 106. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts shall be used to (1) acquire land, (2) provide for site preparation, or (3) install utilities for any family housing, except housing for which funds have been made available in annual Military Construction Appropriations Acts.

SEC. 107. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts for minor construction may be used to transfer or relocate any activity from one base or installation to another, without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 108. No part of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts may be used for the procurement of

steel for any construction project or activity for which American steel producers, fabricators, and manufacturers have been denied the opportunity to compete for such steel procurement.

SEC. 109. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for military construction or family housing during the current fiscal year may be used to pay real property taxes in any foreign nation.

SEC. 110. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts may be used to initiate a new installation overseas without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 111. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts may be obligated for architect and engineer contracts estimated by the Government to exceed \$500,000 for projects to be accomplished in Japan or in any NATO member country, unless such contracts are awarded to United States firms or United States firms in joint venture with host nation firms.

SEC. 112. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts for military construction in the United States territories and possessions in the Pacific and on Kwajalein Atoll may be used to award any contract estimated by the Government to exceed \$1,000,000 to a foreign contractor: *Provided*, That this section shall not be applicable to contract awards for which the lowest responsive and responsible bid of a United States contractor exceeds the lowest responsive and responsible bid of a foreign contractor by greater than 20 per centum.

SEC. 113. The Secretary of Defense is to inform the Committees on Appropriations and the Committees on Armed Services of the plans and scope of any proposed military exercise involving United States personnel thirty days prior to its occurring, if amounts expended for construction, either temporary or permanent, are anticipated to exceed \$100,000.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 114. Unexpended balances in the Military Family Housing Management Account established pursuant to section 2831 of title 10, United States Code, as well as any additional amounts which would otherwise be transferred to the Military Family Housing Management Account, shall be transferred to the appropriations for Family Housing, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, based on the sources from which the funds are derived, and shall be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which they have been transferred.

SEC. 115. Not more than 20 per centum of the appropriations in Military Construction Appropriations Acts which are limited for obligation during the current fiscal year shall be obligated during the last two months of the fiscal year.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 116. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction in prior years shall be available for construction authorized for each such military department by the authorizations enacted into law during the current session of Congress.

SEC. 117. For military construction or family housing projects that are being completed with funds otherwise expired or lapsed for obligation, expired or lapsed funds may be used to pay the cost of associated supervision, inspection, overhead, engineering and design on those projects and on subsequent claims, if any.

SEC. 118. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds appropriated to a military department or defense agency for the construction of military projects may be obligated for a military construction project or contract, or for any portion of such a project or contract, at any time before the end of the fourth fiscal year after the fiscal year for which funds for such project were appropriated if the funds obligated for such project (1) are obligated from funds available for military construction projects, and (2) do not exceed the amount appropriated for such project, plus any amount by which the cost of such project is increased pursuant to law.

SEC. 119. Of the funds appropriated in this Act for Operation and maintenance of Family Housing, no more than \$13,000,000 may be obligated for contract cleaning of family housing units.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 120. During the five-year period after appropriations available to the Department of Defense for military construction and family housing operation and maintenance and construction have expired for obligation, upon a determination that such appropriations will not be necessary for the liquidation of obligations or for making authorized adjustments to such appropriations for obligations incurred during the period of availability of such appropriations, unobligated balances of such appropriations may be transferred into the appropriation "Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Construction, Defense" to be merged with and to be available for the same time period and for the same purposes as the appropriations to which transferred.

SEC. 121. The Secretary of Defense is to provide the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives with an annual report by February 15, containing details of the specific actions proposed to be taken by the Department of Defense during the current fiscal year to encourage other member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and Japan and Korea to assume a greater share of the common defense burden of such nations and the United States.

SEC. 122. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Army shall transfer, no later than September 30, 1994, without reimbursement or transfer of funds, to the Architect of the Capitol, a portion of the real property, including improvements thereon, known as the Army Research Laboratory, Woodbridge Research Facility, located in Prince William County, Virginia, consisting of approximately 100 acres, more or less, as determined under subsection (c).

(b) The Architect of the Capitol shall, upon completion of the survey performed pursuant to subsection (c) and the transfer effected pursuant to subsection (a), utilize the property to be transferred to provide facilities to accommodate the varied long term storage and service needs of the Library of Congress and Legislative Branch.

(c) The exact acreage, legal description and apportionment as to the portions of the property to be transferred under this section shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Architect of the Capitol and the Secretary of the Army.

SEC. 123. Proceeds received by the Secretary of the Navy pursuant to section 2840 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (Public Law 102-190) are appropriated and shall be available for the purposes authorized in that section.

SEC. 124. Defense access roads from Camp Dodge, Iowa, (86th Street Improvements)

shall be considered as fully meeting the certification requirements specified in section 210 of title 23 of the United States Code.

□ 1100

Mr. HEFNER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, through page 17, line 9, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against those portions of the bill?

The Chair hears none.

Are there any amendments?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY Mr. TRAFICANT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT: At the end of the bill, add the following new sections:

SEC. . COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT.

No funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a-10c, popularly known as the "Buy American Act").

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.

(a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Secretary of Treasury shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

SEC. . PROHIBITION OF CONTRACTS.

If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a fraudulent label bearing a "Made in America" inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that was not made in the United States, such person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds provided pursuant to this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in section 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

Mr. TRAFICANT (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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member for bringing us a fine bill.

This language is the "Buy American" provision and has been placed on many of the appropriation bills. The amendment has been in essence cleared with Chairman CONYERS, and it does speak to those provisions of the bill that make it stronger. I appreciate the fact that it has been accepted.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, we have reviewed the amendment, and it has been cleared through Chairman CONYERS. We have no objection to the amendment.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, with that, I would like to commend the committee for this legislation. I also want to commend them for what they are doing with base closings, as well as congratulate them for the fine effort they have made in building our infrastructure, which was so successful in Desert Shield and Desert Storm.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

If not, the Clerk will read the last two lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1994".

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY) having assumed the chair, Mr. CARDIN, 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. 2446) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 347, nays 67, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 261]

YEAS—347

Abercrombie	Costello	Hefley
Ackerman	Coyne	Hefner
Andrews (ME)	Cramer	Hoagland
Andrews (NJ)	Cunningham	Hobson
Andrews (TX)	Danner	Hochbrueckner
Applegate	Darden	Holden
Archer	de la Garza	Horn
Army	DeLauro	Houghton
Bacchus (FL)	DeLay	Hoyer
Bacchus (AL)	Dellums	Huffington
Baessler	Deutsch	Hughes
Baker (CA)	Diaz-Balart	Hunter
Barca	Dicks	Hutchinson
Barcia	Dingell	Hutto
Barlow	Dixon	Hyde
Barrett (NE)	Dooley	Inglis
Barrett (WI)	Durbin	Inhofe
Bartlett	Edwards (CA)	Inslee
Barton	Edwards (TX)	Jefferson
Bateman	Emerson	Johnson (CT)
Becerra	Engel	Johnson (GA)
Bellenson	English (OK)	Johnson (SD)
Bentley	Evans	Johnson, E.B.
Bereuter	Everett	Johnston
Berman	Ewing	Kanjorski
Bevill	Farr	Kaptur
Bilbray	Fazio	Kasich
Billrakis	Fields (LA)	Kennedy
Bishop	Fields (TX)	Kennelly
Blackwell	Flitner	Kildee
Bliley	Fish	Kim
Blute	Flake	King
Boehlert	Foglietta	Kingston
Bonilla	Ford (MI)	Klecak
Borski	Ford (TN)	Klink
Boucher	Fowler	Kolbe
Brewster	Franks (CT)	Kopetski
Brooks	Frost	Kreidler
Browder	Furse	Kyl
Brown (CA)	Galleghy	LaFalce
Brown (FL)	Gallo	Lambert
Brown (OH)	Gejdenson	Lancaster
Bryant	Gekas	Lantos
Buyer	Gephardt	LaRocco
Byrne	Geren	Laughlin
Callahan	Gibbons	Leach
Calvert	Gilchrest	Lehman
Camp	Gillmor	Levin
Canady	Gilman	Levy
Cantwell	Gingrich	Lewis (CA)
Cardin	Glickman	Lewis (FL)
Carr	Gonzalez	Lewis (GA)
Castle	Goodlatte	Lightfoot
Chapman	Goodling	Lipinski
Clay	Gordon	Livingston
Clayton	Grandy	Lloyd
Clement	Green	Long
Clinger	Gunderson	Lowe
Clyburn	Gutierrez	Machtley
Coleman	Hall (OH)	Maloney
Collins (GA)	Hall (TX)	Mann
Collins (IL)	Hamburg	Manton
Collins (MI)	Hamilton	Markey
Combest	Hansen	Martinez
Conyers	Harman	Matsui
Cooper	Hastert	Mazzoli
Coppersmith	Hastings	McCandless

McCloskey	Pickett	Smith (TX)
McCollum	Pickle	Snowe
McCrery	Pombo	Spence
McCurdy	Porter	Spratt
McDade	Poshard	Stearns
McHale	Price (NC)	Stenholm
McHugh	Pryce (OH)	Stokes
McInnis	Quillen	Strickland
McKinney	Ramstad	Studds
McMillan	Rangel	Stump
McNulty	Ravenel	Stupak
Meehan	Reed	Sundquist
Meek	Regula	Swett
Menendez	Reynolds	Swift
Meyers	Richardson	Tanner
Mfume	Ridge	Taylor (MS)
Mica	Roberts	Tejeda
Michel	Roemer	Thomas (CA)
Miller (CA)	Rogers	Thomas (WY)
Mineta	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson
Mink	Rose	Thornton
Moakley	Rostenkowski	Torres
Mollinari	Roth	Torricelli
Mollohan	Rowland	Trafficant
Montgomery	Roybal-Allard	Tucker
Moran	Sabo	Unsoeld
Morella	Sanders	Valentine
Murphy	Sangmeister	Velazquez
Murtha	Santorum	Visclosky
Myers	Sarpallus	Volkmer
Nadler	Sawyer	Vucanovich
Natcher	Saxton	Walsh
Neal (MA)	Schenk	Waters
Neal (NC)	Schiff	Watt
Oberstar	Schroeder	Waxman
Obey	Scott	Weldon
Oliver	Serrano	Wheat
Ortiz	Shaw	Whitten
Owens	Shays	Williams
Oxley	Shuster	Wilson
Packard	Sisisky	Wise
Parker	Skaggs	Wolf
Pastor	Skelton	Woolsey
Payne (NJ)	Slattery	Wynn
Payne (VA)	Slaughter	Yates
Pelosi	Smith (IA)	Young (AK)
Peterson (FL)	Smith (MI)	Young (FL)
Peterson (MN)	Smith (NJ)	Zimmer
Petri	Smith (OR)	

NAYS—67

Allard	Greenwood	Portman
Baker (LA)	Hancock	Quinn
Ballenger	Heger	Rahall
Boehner	Hoekstra	Rohrabacher
Bunning	Hoke	Roukema
Burton	Istook	Royce
Coble	Jacobs	Schaefer
Condit	Johnson, Sam	Sensenbrenner
Cox	Klein	Shepherd
Crane	Klug	Solomon
Crapo	Knollenberg	Stark
Deal	Lazio	Talent
DeFazio	Linder	Taylor (NC)
Doolittle	Manzullo	Thurman
Dorman	Miller (FL)	Torkildsen
Dreier	Minge	Upton
Duncan	Moorhead	Vento
Dunn	Nussle	Walker
Fawell	Orton	Washington
Fingerhut	Pallone	Wyden
Franks (NJ)	Paxon	Zeliff
Goss	Penny	
Grams	Pomeroy	

NOT VOTING—20

Bonior	Henry	Rush
Derrick	Hilliard	Schumer
Dickey	Hinchey	Sharp
English (AZ)	Margolies	Skeen
Eshoo	Mezvinsky	Synar
Frank (MA)	McDermott	Tauzin
Hayes	McKeon	Towns

□ 1127

Messrs. STARK, GREENWOOD, MOORHEAD, and CRAPO changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. MURPHY, KLINK, and WAXMAN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, due to events beyond my control, I missed House rollcall vote No. 261. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1994 AND 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 193 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2200.

□ 1130

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2200) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, space flight, control, and data communications, construction of facilities, research and program management, and inspector general, and for other purposes, with Mrs. UNSOELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Monday, June 14, 1993, all time for general debate had expired.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, at the request of the Democratic leadership, I move that the Committee do now rise briefly for some incidental business.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY) having assumed the chair, Mrs. UNSOELD, 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. 2200) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, space flight, control, and data communications, construction of facilities, research and program management, and inspector general, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, at the direction of the Democratic caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 205) designating membership on certain standing committees of the House, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 205

Resolved, That the following named Members, be, and they are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives.

Committee on Agriculture: SAM FARR, California.

Committee on Natural Resources: SAM FARR, California.

Committee on Public Works and Transportation: PETER W. BARCA, Wisconsin.

Committee on Science, Space and Technology: PETER W. BARCA, Wisconsin.

Committee on Small Business: BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1994 AND 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Pursuant to House Resolution 193, and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2200.

□ 1134

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2200) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, space flight, control, and data communications, construction of facilities, research and program management, and inspector general, and for the other purposes, with Mrs. UNSOELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and each title is considered as having been read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

H.R. 2200

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995".

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Madam Chairman, there is an amendment to section 1, to the findings section that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] wishes to offer at some point. Given the constraint of time that we have been put under for this bill, we are being told that we are to offer two amendments today, and we

just want to make certain that the time is reserved for the gentleman from Wisconsin to be able to come back and bring up his amendment at a later date, and he does not lose his opportunity as a result of us moving past that.

I think that the chairman of the committee, Mr. BROWN, has agreed to that procedure, that we would ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to come back at the appropriate time.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin has spoken to me about his amendment. I am perfectly agreeable to protecting his right to offer that amendment at the appropriate time, and if necessary, we can come back to that amendment.

Mr. KLUG. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KLUG. Madam Chairman, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for yielding.

So even though today we are going to deal with two amendments, and essentially we are bypassing the section that would include the findings, which is where my amendment is, it is the intention of the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] that later on that section will remain open, subject to the amendment.

Mr. BROWN of California. If the gentleman will yield, that is correct.

Mr. KLUG. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WALKER. In that regard, Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that at the appropriate time in the future the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] be able to offer his amendment to section 2 when we return to the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate section 2.

The text of section 2 is as follows:

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) the civil space program has the potential to contribute to the advancement of technologies critical to the competitiveness and productivity of United States industry;

(2) the core mission of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is, and depends upon, the extension of human presence beyond Planet Earth, specifically by the construction and operation of the International Space Station Freedom in the near term, and by the acquisition and development of knowledge necessary for expanding human presence beyond low Earth orbit to other celestial bodies over the middle and long term;

(3) the reduction in international tensions and the end of the Cold War provide an opportunity for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to achieve a closer co-

ordination with defense-related agencies and, consistent with the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, to reduce overlap and duplication among Federal space programs and to take greater advantage of other Federal space capabilities;

(4) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should play an active role in preserving a robust space industrial base and should seek to strengthen incentives for industry to conduct research and development for both Federal mission needs and the diversification of space-related applications;

(5) in the conduct of its space activities, the United States should employ the existing space assets and capabilities of the former Soviet Union on a selective basis when unique programmatic benefits are offered, and should encourage a collaboration between United States industry and the privatizing space organizations of the former Soviet Union in developing future space capabilities;

(6) in the conduct of space missions, the United States should give preference to integrating the broad range of "off-the-shelf" existing space assets and capabilities available from commercial sources; and

(7) the cancellation of the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor program should result in a reduction of the funding requirements for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration equal to 50 percent of the project cost of such program over the 5-year period following the date of enactment of this Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 2?

The Clerk will designate title I.

The text of title I is as follows:

TITLE I—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Subtitle A—Authorizations

SEC. 101. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) SPACE STATION FREEDOM.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for "Research and Development" for the Space Station Freedom, \$1,900,000,000 for fiscal year 1994, \$1,900,000,000 for fiscal year 1995, \$1,900,000,000 for fiscal year 1996, \$1,900,000,000 for fiscal year 1997, \$1,900,000,000 for fiscal year 1998, \$1,900,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, and \$1,300,000,000 for fiscal year 2000.

(2) SCOPE OF PROGRAM.—The Space Station Freedom shall be designed to provide the capability for productive scientific and engineering research in low Earth orbit, shall be capable of incorporating advanced technologies over the operational life of the Space Station for the purposes of increasing the productivity of research and reducing the costs of operation, shall include a habitation module as part of its permanently manned configuration, and shall be developed in accordance with the international agreements in place as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) ADDITIONAL FOREIGN PARTICIPATION.—The Space Station Freedom program shall, where feasible, employ the existing space assets and capabilities of the former Soviet Union on a selective basis when such use will reduce the cost of developing and operating the Space Station Freedom to the United States and its international partners. Any proposed use of such assets and capabilities shall be in accordance with the international agreements in place as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(4) PROGRAM MANAGEMENT OFFICE.—The National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall maintain a strong, independent

Space Station Program Management Office with financial control of the program budget at least through the date of the First Element Launch, unless the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (in this Act referred to as the "Administrator") certifies to the Congress that an alternative management approach will save money and will not result in increased annual funding requirements or schedule delays.

(b) OTHER RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for "Research and Development" for—

(1) Technology Investment Program, established under title II of this Act, \$22,000,000 for fiscal year 1994, and \$40,000,000 for fiscal year 1995, none of which shall be available for administrative expenses of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, except that no funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be obligated for the establishment of any Technology Research institutes unless otherwise specifically provided for by law;

(2) Space Transportation Capability Development, \$751,600,000 for fiscal year 1994, and \$819,300,000 for fiscal year 1995, of which \$21,000,000 for fiscal year 1994 and \$40,000,000 for fiscal year 1995 are authorized to develop improvements in existing expendable launch vehicles (including the development of a single-engine version of the Centaur upper stage rocket), and of which \$21,400,000 for fiscal year 1994 and \$46,000,000 for fiscal year 1995 are authorized to support the development of advanced launch technologies, including single-stage-to-orbit technologies, and components;

(3) Physics and Astronomy, \$1,094,700,000 for fiscal year 1994, and \$1,162,300,000 for fiscal year 1995, of which \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 1994 and \$15,000,000 for fiscal year 1995 are for augmenting the funding for Mission Operations and Data Analysis activities by that amount;

(4) Planetary Exploration, \$622,200,000 for fiscal year 1994, and \$646,800,000 for fiscal year 1995, of which \$65,000,000 for fiscal year 1994 and \$85,000,000 for fiscal year 1995 are for augmenting funding for Mission Operations and Data Analysis activities and to initiate development of a Mars Environmental Survey mission;

(5) Life and Microgravity Sciences and Applications, \$426,000,000 for fiscal year 1994, and \$485,700,000 for fiscal year 1995, of which at least \$2,000,000 for each such fiscal year is reserved for research on the causes of breast and ovarian cancers and other women's health issues;

(6) Mission to Planet Earth—

(A) \$1,109,900,000 for fiscal year 1994, of which \$5,000,000 are authorized for the development of instrumentation for and flight of remotely piloted aircraft, \$25,000,000 are authorized for the High Resolution Multispectral Stereo Imager for Landsat 7, if the Administrator determines and reports to Congress in writing that equivalent data will not be made available by private remote-sensing space systems at the time Landsat 7 will be launched, or for the purchase of equivalent data to be provided in the future by private remote-sensing space systems, and of which \$18,000,000 may be provided for the Consortium for International Earth Science Information Network, except that no funds may be obligated for the Consortium for International Earth Science Information Network in excess of \$18,000,000 in fiscal year 1994 unless an equal amount of matching funding is provided from non-Federal sources; and

(B) \$1,448,100,000 for fiscal year 1995;
(7) Space Research and Technology, \$298,200,000 for fiscal year 1994, and \$333,100,000 for fiscal year 1995;

(8) Commercial Programs, \$172,000,000 for fiscal year 1994, and \$141,400,000 for fiscal year 1995;

(9) Aeronautics Research and Technology Programs—

(A) for Research Operations Support, \$143,500,000 for fiscal year 1994, and \$148,300,000 for fiscal year 1995;

(B) for Research and Technology Base activities, \$448,300,000 for fiscal year 1994, and \$433,900,000 for fiscal year 1995;

(C) for High-Speed Research, \$187,200,000 for fiscal year 1994, and \$236,300,000 for fiscal year 1995;

(D) for Advanced Subsonic Technology, \$101,300,000 for fiscal year 1994, and \$128,500,000 for fiscal year 1995, of which \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 1994 and \$13,000,000 for fiscal year 1995 shall be for Short-Haul Aircraft, \$30,200,000 for fiscal year 1994 and \$30,500,000 for fiscal year 1995 shall be for Noise Reduction, and \$11,500,000 for fiscal year 1994 and \$12,000,000 for fiscal year 1995 shall be for Technology Integration for Reducing Environmental Pollution;

(E) for Other Systems Technology Programs, \$140,400,000 for fiscal year 1994, and \$168,000,000 for fiscal year 1995; and

(F) for the National Aero-Space Plane Program, \$80,000,000 for fiscal year 1994, and \$80,000,000 for fiscal year 1995;

(10) Safety, Reliability, and Quality Assurance, \$35,300,000 for fiscal year 1994, and \$38,500,000 for fiscal year 1995;

(11) Academic Programs, \$74,500,000 for fiscal year 1994, and \$81,500,000 for fiscal year 1995; and

(12) Tracking and Data Advanced Systems, \$24,600,000 for fiscal year 1994, and \$25,100,000 for fiscal year 1995.

The Administrator shall make available for the National Aero-Space Plane the full amounts authorized under paragraph (9)(F) from the amounts made available pursuant to paragraph (9) for each fiscal year.

SEC. 102. SPACE FLIGHT, CONTROL, AND DATA COMMUNICATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for "Space Flight, Control, and Data Communications" for—

(1) Space Shuttle Production and Operational Capability, \$1,069,200,000 for fiscal year 1994 and \$978,500,000 for fiscal year 1995, of which no funds are authorized for the continuation of the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor program, and of which \$150,000,000 for fiscal year 1994 and \$35,000,000 for fiscal year 1995 are authorized to cover the cost of terminating the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor program and transferring the production of Space Shuttle and other solid rocket motor nozzles and the refurbishment of Redesigned Solid Rocket Motor cases to the new production site located near Yellow Creek, Mississippi;

(2) Space Shuttle Operations, \$3,006,500,000 for fiscal year 1994, and \$2,810,400,000 for fiscal year 1995;

(3) Space and Ground Networks, Communications, and Data Systems, \$795,500,000 for fiscal year 1994, and \$964,600,000 for fiscal year 1995, including procurement of Tracking and Data Relay Satellites on a fixed-price basis using functional performance specifications, and, to the extent practicable, seeking to incorporate potential improvements to such Satellites that result in cost savings or a greater probability of returning data; and

(4) Launch Services, \$300,300,000 for fiscal year 1994, and \$313,700,000 for fiscal year 1995.

None of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be used to launch the Advanced X-ray Astrophysics Facility on the Space Shuttle. By fiscal year 2003, the combined annual cost for the production and operation of the Space Shuttle program and the Space Station Freedom program shall not exceed, after adjustments for inflation, \$4,325,000,000 in fiscal year 1992 dollars.

SEC. 103. CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 1994.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1994 for "Construction of Facilities", including land acquisition, for—

(1) Construction of Space Station Freedom Facilities, \$25,000,000;

(2) Replacement of Mission Control Center Air Handlers, Johnson Space Center, \$8,000,000;

(3) Replacement of Thermal Vacuum Helium Refrigeration System, Johnson Space Center, \$7,400,000;

(4) Rehabilitation of Electrical Distribution System, Project Management Building, Johnson Space Center, \$2,200,000;

(5) Modification of Launch Complex 39 Exterior Utility Piping, Kennedy Space Center, \$1,200,000;

(6) Refurbishment of Launch Complex 39 Cooling System, Kennedy Space Center, \$4,000,000;

(7) Refurbishment of Launch Complex 39 Secondary Circuit Breakers, Kennedy Space Center, \$3,300,000;

(8) Refurbishment of Vehicle Assembly Building/Pad Water Storage Tanks, Kennedy Space Center, \$3,000,000;

(9) Rehabilitation of Industrial Area Fire Alarm Reporting System, Kennedy Space Center, \$4,900,000;

(10) Restoration of C-5 Substation, Launch Complex 39 Area, Kennedy Space Center, \$5,000,000;

(11) Restoration Class III Landfill, Kennedy Space Center, \$1,900,000;

(12) Restoration of High Pressure Air Compressor System, Marshall Space Flight Center, \$8,500,000;

(13) Restoration of Electrical Power System, Marshall Space Flight Center, \$2,600,000;

(14) Repair of Decking and Roof, X-Ray and Staging Facility, Michoud Assembly Facility, \$1,500,000;

(15) Replacement of Cooling Tower and Boiler, Michoud Assembly Facility, \$4,000,000;

(16) Restoration of Space Shuttle Main Engine Text Complex High Pressure Industrial Water System, Stennis Space Center, \$2,300,000;

(17) Restoration of High Pressure Gas Storage Capacity, Stennis Space Center, \$2,300,000;

(18) Restoration of Underground Communication Distribution System, Stennis Space Center, \$3,800,000;

(19) Construction of Earth Systems Science Building, Goddard Space Flight Center, \$12,000,000;

(20) Replacement of Central Plant Steam and Electrical Generation Equipment, Goddard Space Flight Center, \$8,600,000;

(21) Restoration and Modernization of Chilled Water System, Goddard Space Flight Center, \$5,000,000;

(22) Restoration of Airfield, Wallops Flight Facility, \$5,200,000;

(23) Replacement of Chillers and Modification of Related Systems, Various Buildings, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, \$2,900,000;

(24) Construction of Advanced Solid Rocket Motor Facilities, Various Locations, \$32,600,000;

(25) Phase I Facility Studies, Requirements Definition, Design, and Modification and Construction of National Aeronautics Facilities, Various Locations, \$74,000,000;

(26) Modifications for Composite Technology Center, Lewis Research Center, \$27,000,000;

(27) National Transonic Facility Productivity Enhancement, Langley Research Center, \$60,000,000;

(28) Performance Improvements in 11-Foot Wind Tunnel, Ames Research Center, \$20,000,000;

(29) Rehabilitation of Control Systems, National Full-Scale Aerodynamics Complex, Ames Research Center, \$2,100,000;

(30) Upgrade of Outdoor Aerodynamic Research Facility, Ames Research Center, \$3,900,000;

(31) Modernization of the Unitary Plan Wind Tunnel Complex, Ames Research Center, \$25,000,000;

(32) Construction of EOSDIS Distributed Active Archive Center, Langley Research Center, \$8,000,000;

(33) Rehabilitation of Rocket Engine Test Facility, Lewis Research Center, \$12,500,000;

(34) Construction of 34-Meter Multifrequency Antenna, Goldstone Facility, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, \$17,600,000;

(35) Repair of facilities at various locations, not in excess of \$1,000,000 per project, \$36,000,000;

(36) Rehabilitation and modification of facilities at various locations, not in excess of \$1,000,000 per project, \$36,000,000;

(37) Minor construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities at various locations, not in excess of \$750,000 per project, \$14,000,000;

(38) Facility Planning and Design, \$27,000,000; and

(39) Environmental Compliance and Restoration, \$50,000,000.

Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) through (39), the total amount authorized to be appropriated under this subsection shall not exceed \$570,300,000.

(b) FISCAL YEAR 1995.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1995 for "Construction of Facilities", including land acquisition, \$422,200,000.

SEC. 104. RESEARCH AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for "Research and Program Management", \$1,650,000,000 for fiscal year 1994, and \$1,675,000,000 for fiscal year 1995.

SEC. 105. INSPECTOR GENERAL.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for "Inspector General", \$15,500,000 for fiscal year 1994, and \$16,000,000 for fiscal year 1995.

Subtitle B—Limitations and Special Authority

SEC. 111. USE OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN ITEMS AND GRANTS.

(a) AUTHORIZED USES.—Appropriations authorized under sections 101 and 102 may be used for—

(1) any items of a capital nature (other than acquisition of land) which may be required at locations other than installations of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the performance of research and development contracts; and

(2) grants to institutions of higher education, or to nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research, for purchase or construction of additional research facilities.

(b) **VESTING OF TITLE; GRANT CONDITIONS.**—Title to facilities described in subsection (a)(2) shall be vested in the United States unless the Administrator determines that the national program of aeronautical and space activities will best be served by vesting title in the grantee institution or organization or the Federal contribution to such purchase or construction is not substantial enough to warrant vesting title in the United States. Each grant under subsection (a)(2) shall be made under such conditions as the Administrator shall determine to be required to ensure that the United States will receive therefrom benefits adequate to justify the making of that grant.

(c) **LIMITATION.**—None of the funds appropriated under sections 101 and 102 may be used in accordance with this section for the construction of any facility, the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds \$750,000, unless 30 days have passed after the Administrator has notified the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives of the nature, location, and estimated cost of such facility.

SEC. 112. AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATED AMOUNTS.

Appropriations authorized under sections 101, 102, and 103 may remain available until expended. Contracts may be entered into with funds appropriated under section 104 or 105 for training, investigations, and costs associated with personnel relocation and for other services provided during the fiscal year following the fiscal year for which funds are appropriated.

SEC. 113. LIMITED USE OF FUNDS.

(a) **USE FOR SCIENTIFIC CONSULTATIONS OR EXTRAORDINARY EXPENSES.**—Appropriations authorized under section 101 may be used, but not to exceed \$35,000 per fiscal year, for scientific consultations or extraordinary expenses upon the authority of the Administrator, and the Administrator's determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

(b) **USE FOR FACILITIES.**—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (3), appropriations authorized under sections 101 and 102 may be used for the construction of new facilities and additions to, repair of, rehabilitation of, or modification of existing facilities, except that the cost of each such project, including collateral equipment, shall not exceed \$200,000 per fiscal year.

(2) Appropriations authorized under sections 101 and 102 may be used for unforeseen programmatic facility project needs, other than those described in paragraph (1), except that the cost of each such project, including collateral equipment, shall not exceed \$750,000 per fiscal year.

(3) Appropriations authorized under section 101 may be used for repair, rehabilitation, or modification of facilities controlled by the General Services Administration, except that the cost of each such project, including collateral equipment, shall not exceed \$500,000 per fiscal year.

SEC. 114. REPROGRAMMING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES.

Appropriations authorized under any paragraph of section 103—

(1) in the discretion of the Administrator may be varied upward by 10 percent; or

(2) after the expiration of 30 days following a report by the Administrator to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives on the circumstances of

such action, may be varied upward by 25 percent, to meet unusual cost variations.

The total amount authorized to be appropriated under section 103 shall not be increased as a result of actions authorized under paragraphs (1) and (2) of this section.

SEC. 115. SPECIAL REPROGRAMMING AUTHORITY FOR CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES.

Where the Administrator determines that new developments or scientific or engineering changes in the national program of aeronautical and space activities have occurred; and that such changes require the use of additional funds for the purposes of construction, expansion, or modification of facilities at any location; and that deferral of such action until the enactment of the next National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities; the Administrator may transfer not to exceed one-half of one percent of the funds appropriated pursuant to sections 101 and 102 to the appropriation under section 103 for such purposes. The Administrator may also use up to \$10,000,000 of the amounts authorized under section 103 for such purposes. The funds so made available pursuant to this section may be expended to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment. No such funds may be obligated until a period of 30 days has passed after the Administrator has transmitted to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a written report describing the nature of the construction, its costs, and the reasons therefor.

SEC. 116. CONSIDERATION BY COMMITTEES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(1) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program deleted by the Congress from requests as originally made by the President for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to either the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate or the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives;

(2) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program in excess of the amount actually authorized for the particular program by section 101, 102, or 104; and

(3) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program which has not been presented to either such committee,

unless a period of 30 days has passed after the receipt, by each such committee, of notice given by the Administrator containing a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of such proposed action. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall keep the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives fully and currently informed with respect to all activities and responsibilities within the jurisdiction of those committees. Any Federal department, agency, or independent establishment shall furnish any information requested by either committee relating to any such activity or responsibility.

SEC. 117. LIMITATION ON OBLIGATION OF UNAUTHORIZED APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 30 days after the later of the date of enactment of an Act making appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1994 or 1995 and the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit a report to Congress and to the Comptroller General which specifies—

(1) the portion of such appropriations which are for programs, projects, or activities not specifically authorized under subtitle A of this title, or which are in excess of amounts authorized for the relevant program, project, or activity under this Act; and

(2) the portion of such appropriations which are specifically authorized under this Act.

(b) **FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICE.**—The Administrator shall, coincident with the submission of the report required by subsection (a), publish in the Federal Register a notice of all programs, projects, or activities not specifically authorized under Act, and solicit public comment thereon regarding the impact of any such obligations on the conduct and effectiveness of the national aeronautics and space program.

(c) **LIMITATION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no funds may be obligated for any programs, projects, or activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal years 1994 and 1995 not specifically authorized under this Act until 30 days have passed after the close of the public comment period contained in the notice required in subsection (b).

SEC. 118. LIMITATION ON APPROPRIATIONS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no funds are authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the programs for which funds are authorized by this Act for any fiscal year other than as provided by this Act.

SEC. 119. ADDITIONAL LIMITATION.

No funds authorized under this Act may be obligated or expended to transfer the management of the External Tank Program from the Marshall Space Flight Center unless 30 days have passed after the Administrator has made a report of the technical justification for such a move to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and such Committees have raised no objection.

SEC. 120. PRIORITY EXPENDITURE.

Of the amounts authorized under—

(1) section 102(1), only \$258,200,000 for fiscal year 1994 and only \$252,200,000 for fiscal year 1995;

(2) section 103(a)(24), no funds for fiscal year 1994 and no funds for fiscal year 1995;

(3) section 102(2), only \$1,887,800,000 for fiscal year 1994 and only \$1,870,000,000 for fiscal year 1995; and

(4) section 104, only \$1,400,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1994 and 1995 to effect the closure of at least one National Aeronautics and Space Administration Center and the corresponding reduction in full-time equivalent employees,

may be expended unless \$1,900,000,000 are made available for such fiscal year for the Space Station Freedom.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALL OF TEXAS
Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALL of Texas: Page 4, after line 9, insert the following new section:

SEC. 100. TOTAL AUTHORIZATION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle, the total amount authorized to be appropriated under sections 101(b), 102, 103, 104, and 105 for fiscal year 1994 shall not exceed \$12,889,000,000. Each amount stated in such sections shall be reduced proportionately as necessary to meet the requirement of this section.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chairman, this amendment is a bipartisan amendment which was originally conceived by the gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT]. I will shortly defer to him to further explain this amendment, but I want to make one central point.

I think we all want to achieve deficit reduction, both Democrat and Republican alike, and indeed, this is perhaps our highest priority this Congress.

The tough question, of course, is how to do this and keep essential programs like the space station on track. This amendment achieves deficit reduction without further cutting the space station, and I would point out that we cut space station in committee \$226 million. The President cut \$18 million off the total program in the outyears. This cuts about \$250 million. This amendment achieves deficit reduction, I say, without touching space station.

It also will allow NASA to perform all of the essential things that it needs to do, including continuing the space station, and to do so without adversely affecting veterans, housing, and other high-priority programs.

I want to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT] for his work on this amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, before I begin, I would like to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL] for his support of this amendment.

I would also like to thank Chairman BROWN of California for once again providing for an open rule which gives all Members the opportunity to participate in the legislative process.

And, I would like to thank Mr. WALKER, our ranking member for his leadership on this issue.

And finally, I would like to thank Mr. SENSENBRENNER, the ranking member of the Space Subcommittee, for his help with this amendment.

Madam Chairman, this is a very simple bipartisan amendment.

What it does is freeze the appropriations for NASA in fiscal year 1994 at the fiscal year 1993 level plus 3.2 percent to compensate for inflation.

This means that the increase of 4.9 percent that NASA has requested will be reduced by 1.7 percent.

Let me make it very clear that I am one of NASA's strongest supporters. I believe the work they are doing is of vital importance to all Americans—and to future generations.

And, let me emphasize that this amendment will do nothing to prevent NASA from continuing its important work.

All we are asking NASA to do with this amendment, is to bite the bullet of fiscal responsibility just as we have asked the American people to do.

In fact, we are not even asking that much.

Just a little over 2 weeks ago, this body passed a bill which would impose billions of dollars of new taxes on the American people.

While our constituents are being asked to live on less, is it too much to ask that Government agencies operate at the same level of funding as last year?

I do not think so.

Madam Chairman, as I said before, this is a simple amendment.

Members who believe we need to get Government spending under control so that their constituents will not be asked for even more taxes, should vote "yes" on the Calvert amendment.

□ 1140

Ms. DUNN. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to cut a quarter of a billion dollars out of next fiscal year's authorization for NASA.

All of us probably agree that the deficit is the No. 1 issue for our Nation and that Congress must do more to address it. There is disagreement only over whether and how much we can rely upon tax increases to reduce the deficit.

However, we all agree that further spending reductions are necessary, reductions beyond what Congress has done in the past, reductions, where possible, beyond what President Clinton has called for.

Madam Chairman, this amendment, and this bill, give us the opportunity to do just that.

Already, the NASA authorization brought forth by Chairman BROWN is well below what the White House requested, some \$226 million less than the President asked for. This amendment will cut another \$250 million, right away, in the first year.

Why must we cut even further? Because even if the President's program is enacted in total, and even if the tax increases do not depress the economy, even if everything turns out exactly as the President predicts, even if all that happens, the President's plan still would add another \$1 trillion to the national debt over the next 4 years.

That is why we must, we must, cut more deeply where possible. We must cut as deeply as we can without cut-

ting so severely that we kill the economy and our collective future.

The Calvert-Hall amendment does that. It takes us another big step forward, another step in the right direction, another step toward reduced spending without sacrificing national priorities.

And this cut can be achieved. I believe that any good manager can always find ways to trim his or her budget. This amendment will tell NASA managers to get their budgetary scissors out and start cutting.

At the same time, this amendment does not require us to abandon the vital role we enjoy as the world's leader in space exploration and research. Our Nation, alone among all the nations on the Earth, is capable of continuing a space program.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Madam Chairman, I wish to reiterate what the distinguished chairman of the Space Subcommittee has already said, that the amendment being offered by him, and the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT], is a bipartisan amendment which has my approval. It is a version of an amendment offered in committee by the gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT], which at the time we thought was a little bit too strong, but we have worked with the gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT] to put it in the shape that it is now.

We thoroughly agree with it and support it and ask all the Members to support it.

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

Madam Chairman, I first want to thank the gentleman from Texas for offering this amendment. I do think it improves the bill. I think it is something that many Members of the House will want to do as part of our deficit-reduction efforts in the House. This does, I think, bring us closer to where we need to be in terms of the spending that this House can justify.

I also want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT] for his perseverance and fortitude in pursuing this. This is something he offered at the committee, ran into somewhat of a buzz saw in the committee in terms of getting it passed, but I think has been very persuasive since, and as a result, we do have a bipartisan effort out here.

I want to thank the chairman of the full committee also for being on board on the amendment.

This is a good vote. It is a vote to cut back on NASA while at the same time assuring that we have sufficient money to do that which is important to the future of manned space, and that is build the space station.

So I rise in favor of this amendment and urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Madam Chairman, I also would like to thank the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], in the way he has handled this whole issue. He has allowed us to speak and had an open rule allowed for amendments, and he has handled himself in a very dignified manner. I appreciate it very much.

This amendment merely states that we are going to ask NASA to live within their budget, to grow only as much as the cost of living.

If we could do that to all government, we would not have the tremendous deficit that we have. There is only one thing more important than continuing our exploration in space, continuing to be a high-technology country, and that is to put our fiscal house in order.

Bankrupt nations do not feed poorer nations. Bankrupt nations do not explore space, if you will notice the former Soviet Union and their space program as it continues, but at a lesser level. No, our fiscal good health is what is important, and this amendment merely says, "NASA, we are going to hold you to cost-of-living increases. Make do with your budget," and they are going to do it. They are a good operation. They are becoming more efficient.

I want to commend again our chairman for allowing this debate.

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

Madam Chairman, this amendment makes sense only if we also eliminate the insatiable budget demands imposed on the space program by the space station.

The problem that we have had with NASA is that many excellent, cost-effective programs have been delayed or scaled back or terminated because of the ongoing cost of the space station.

This amendment, which will modestly reduce the authorization, for a single year, will not solve the problem that we have been confronting year after year of multibillion-dollar appropriations for the space station.

Already we have seen dozens, Madam Chairman, of important and successful space programs have their funding cut or eliminated because of the escalating costs of the space station. The Earth Observing System has been delayed. The Magellan Venus probe was turned off when it was in perfectly good operating order because they ran out of money. The Space Exploration Initiative, which is our only long-range human exploration program that NASA has conducted, has been terminated, and as recently as yesterday the VA-HUD Appropriations Subcommittee cut a variety of space programs including \$164 million from the space

shuttle in order to bring funding for the space station up to the President's request.

The chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], predicted that more NASA programs will have to be eliminated in order to make room for the space station.

So the only way we are going to deal with the problems that we have had in the NASA budget is to eliminate this black hole, this fiscal black hole, which has been absorbing the money we ought to be spending on worthwhile programs, manned and unmanned, in space.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 411, noes 11, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 262]

AYES—411

Ackerman	Chapman	Filner	Houghton	Mfume	Saxton
Allard	Clayton	Fingerhut	Hoyer	Mica	Schaefer
Andrews (ME)	Clement	Fish	Huffington	Michel	Schenck
Andrews (NJ)	Clinger	Flake	Hughes	Miller (CA)	Schiff
Andrews (TX)	Clyburn	Foglietta	Hunter	Miller (FL)	Schroeder
Applegate	Coble	Ford (MI)	Hutchinson	Mineta	Scott
Archer	Coleman	Ford (TN)	Hutto	Minge	Sensenbrenner
Army	Collins (GA)	Fowler	Hyde	Mink	Serrano
Baesler	Collins (MI)	Frank (MA)	Inglis	Moakley	Shaw
Baker (CA)	Combest	Franks (CT)	Inhofe	Molinar	Shays
Baker (LA)	Condit	Franks (NJ)	Inslee	Molohan	Shepherd
Ballenger	Conyers	Frost	Istook	Montgomery	Shuster
Barca	Cooper	Furse	Jacobs	Moorhead	Sisisky
Barclay	Coppersmith	Gallegly	Jefferson	Moran	Skaggs
Barlow	Costello	Gallo	Johnson (CT)	Morella	Skelton
Barrett (NE)	Cox	Gedensson	Johnson (GA)	Murphy	Slatery
Barrett (WI)	Crane	Gekas	Johnson (SD)	Murtha	Slaughter
Bartlett	Crapo	Gephardt	Johnson, E. B.	Myers	Smith (IA)
Barton	Cunningham	Geren	Johnson, Sam	Nadler	Smith (MI)
Bateman	Danner	Gibbons	Johnston	Natcher	Smith (NJ)
Bellenson	Darden	Gilchrest	Kanjorski	Neal (MA)	Smith (OR)
Bentley	de la Garza	Gillmor	Kaptur	Neal (NC)	Smith (TX)
Bereuter	de Lugo (VI)	Gilman	Kasich	Norton (DC)	Snowe
Berman	Deal	Gingrich	Kennedy	Nussle	Solomon
Bevill	DeFazio	Glickman	Kennelly	Oberstar	Spence
Bilbray	DeLauro	Gonzalez	Kildee	Obey	Spratt
Bilirakis	DeLay	Goodlatte	Kim	Oliver	Stark
Bishop	Dellums	Goodling	King	Ortiz	Stearns
Blackwell	Deutsch	Gordon	Kingston	Orton	Stenholm
Bliley	Diaz-Balart	Goss	Kleczka	Owens	Stokes
Blute	Dickey	Grams	Klein	Oxley	Strickland
Boehlert	Dicks	Grandy	Klink	Packard	Studds
Boehner	Dingell	Green	Klug	Pallone	Stump
Bonilla	Dixon	Greenwood	Knollenberg	Parker	Stupak
Bonior	Dooley	Gunderson	Kolbe	Pastor	Sundquist
Borski	Doolittle	Gutierrez	Kopetski	Paxon	Swett
Boucher	Dornan	Hall (OH)	Kreidler	Payne (NJ)	Swift
Brewster	Dreier	Hall (TX)	Kyl	Payne (VA)	Talent
Brooks	Duncan	Hamburg	LaFalce	Pelosi	Tanner
Brown (CA)	Dunn	Hamilton	Lambert	Penny	Tauzin
Brown (FL)	Durbin	Hancock	Lancaster	Peterson (FL)	Taylor (MS)
Brown (OH)	Edwards (CA)	Hansen	Lantos	Peterson (MN)	Taylor (NC)
Bryant	Edwards (TX)	Harman	LaRocco	Petri	Tejeda
Bunning	Emerson	Hastert	Laughlin	Pickett	Thomas (CA)
Burton	Engel	Hastings	Lazio	Pickle	Thomas (WY)
Buyer	English (OK)	Hefley	Leach	Pombo	Thompson
Byrne	Eshoo	Hefner	Lehman	Pomeroy	Thornton
Callahan	Evans	Henger	Levin	Porter	Thurman
Calvert	Everett	Hoagland	Levy	Portman	Torkildsen
Camp	Ewing	Hobson	Lewis (CA)	Poshard	Torres
Canady	Farr	Hochbrueckner	Lewis (FL)	Price (NC)	Torricelli
Cantwell	Fawell	Hoekstra	Lewis (GA)	Pryce (OH)	Trafiacant
Cardin	Fazio	Hoke	Lightfoot	Quillen	Tucker
Carr	Fields (LA)	Holden	Linder	Quinn	Underwood (GU)
Castle	Fields (TX)	Horn	Lipinski	Rahall	Unsoeld
			Livinston	Ramstad	Upton
			Lloyd	Rangel	Valentine
			Long	Ravenel	Velazquez
			Lowey	Reed	Vento
			Machtle	Regula	Visclosky
			Maloney	Reynolds	Volkmere
			Mann	Richardson	Vucanovich
			Manton	Ridge	Walker
			Manzullo	Roberts	Walsh
			Markey	Rogers	Waters
			Martinez	Rohrabacher	Waxman
			Matsul	Romero-Barcelo	Weldon
			Mazzoli	(PR)	Wheat
			McCandless	Ros-Lehtinen	Whitten
			McCloskey	Rose	Williams
			McCollum	Rostenkowski	Wilson
			McCrery	Roth	Wise
			McCurdy	Roukema	Wolf
			McDade	Rowland	Woolsey
			McHale	Roybal-Allard	Wyden
			McHugh	Royce	Wynn
			McInnis	Rush	Yates
			McKinney	Sabo	Young (AK)
			McMillan	Sanders	Young (FL)
			McNulty	Sangmeister	Zeliff
			Meehan	Santorum	Zimmer
			Menendez	Sarpallus	
			Meyers	Sawyer	

NOES—11

Browder	Roemer
Clay	Washington
Cramer	Watt
Hilliard	

NOT VOTING—17

Collins (IL)	Faleomavaega	Hinchey
Coyne	(AS)	Margolies-
Derrick	Hayes	Mezvinsky
English (AZ)	Henry	McDermott

McKeon
Meek
Schumer

Sharp
Skeen
Synar

Towns

□ 1209

Mr. HILLIARD and Mr. BROWDER changed their vote from "aye" to "no." Mr. MILLER of California and Mr. DIXON changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall votes number 261 and 262 on H.R. 2446 and H.R. 2200 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on both.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 262, the vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL] on H.R. 2200, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROEMER: Page 4, line 11, through page 6, line 2, amend subsection (a) to read as follows:

(a) SPACE STATION FREEDOM.—The Administrator shall cancel the Space Station Freedom program. There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the costs of such cancellation for fiscal year 1994, \$825,000,000.

Page 12, lines 10 and 11, strike paragraph (1).

Page 12, line 12, through page 16, line 9, redesignate paragraphs (2) through (39) as paragraphs (1) through (38), respectively.

Page 16, line 11, strike "(39)" and insert in lieu thereof "(38)".

Page 16, line 13, strike "\$570,300,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$545,300,000".

Mr. ROEMER (during the reading). Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.
The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

□ 1210

Mr. ROEMER. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be concluded in 3 hours, the time to be equally divided among myself, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Ms. PELOSI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROEMER. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Madam Chairman, this amendment, simply put, would terminate space station Freedom.

I would like to begin by thanking a number of the cosponsors on this amendment that have worked so hard through the last year, and, in the case of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER], over the last 2 years, to end this space station Freedom program. I would like to thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON], the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOAGLAND], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KLEIN], the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY], the gentlewoman from Missouri [Ms. DANNER], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STRICKLAND], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. INSLEE], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], the 18 cosponsors.

Madam Chairman, as we debate this very, very important amendment, I would like to bring up the name of a President that challenged us to put a person on the Moon in the 1960's, and that was President Kennedy. President Kennedy asked this country to plan wisely and dream big, and we did. We put a man on the Moon by 1969. We saw the success of Apollo XI where we returned \$7 for every \$1 invested from NASA.

Now, while those glory days are gone, they are not over. This amendment hopes to return to the days of Apollo XI, the days when we have successful technology spinoffs and good jobs, the days when we are all proud of NASA and we do not have an average cost overrun of 76 percent on each individual item.

President Kennedy also said, "If not now, when? If not us, who?" It is us, Members of Congress; we are going to have to make some of these tough decisions to restore NASA to the days of credibility and prominence, discovering new frontiers. We are going to have to help NASA in supporting the small science programs like the Earth observing system, the Magellan Program, the Explorer, programs that are returning good data for us but are threatened to be cut off by a bloated space station.

We need to look at the common sense of this amendment, Madam Chairman. We are faced with a \$300 billion budget deficit. We cannot afford to go on spending money in a callous and cavalier manner, such as we have, on this space station where we have experienced a billion dollar cost overrun just this year.

Finally we will hear arguments, Madam Chairman, about the need to participate because it is important for our international partners, whereby our international partners, such as the Japanese, are not helping us out on the superconducting super collider. They are not helping us out with our trade negotiations in the world. They are not helping us out in a number of important science projects. We should not feel compelled to spend \$100 billion on a space station because the Japanese want us to take the lead so they can spend a couple billion dollars.

We will also hear panacea arguments, that this is a panacea for every disease imaginable. We have to be realistic, Madam Chairman. We fund one out of every four approved grants in the NIH budget. We are not adequately dealing with our budget at NIH, only funding one out of every four approved grants for diseases, for heart disease, breast cancer, prostate cancer. We have AIDS problems in this country, lots of problems here on Earth that we are not dealing adequately with with our already limited NIH budget.

So, I say to my colleagues, "When you hear these arguments, I hope that we apply some pragmatism, some reality and some common sense to these arguments, given the problems that NASA faces, given the problems of a huge budget deficit and given the tough choices that we have to deal with here in the U.S. Congress with an escalating budget deficit."

I would urge particularly the freshmen to vote with this Roemer-Zimmer amendment.

Madam Chairman, the Roemer-Zimmer amendment is supported by: the National Taxpayers Union, Citizens Against Government Waste, Citizens for a Sound Economy, Businesses for Social Responsibility, the American Physical Society, the Planetary Society—Carl Sagan—and other civic, social, and environmental groups.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] and I urge all of my colleagues to vote against it.

Over the past 5 years, the House has voted on five separate occasions to continue the space station program. There have been many arguments made in favor of and against the space station since the beginning of this program. One central issue which all agree on, however, is that the space station is at the heart of the manned space program. Without the space station, our Nation's long commitment to the manned exploration of space will be at an end.

We will have walked away from the legacy of the Mercury, the Gemini, the

Apollo, and the Skylab programs. What will we have gained by this decision? Will we have balanced the budget? Will some other field of science experience a windfall? I am certain that no one 10 years from now will have the slightest idea of what we gained this day—but they will certainly know what we lost. We will have lost the opportunity to establish man's permanent presence in space and accomplish the dream that President Kennedy inspired us with 30 years ago.

Ever since the first American flew into space, our space program has been a steady progression of technology and human will all directed towards one goal—to achieve the capability to do things in space. Not just go there and return, but to live and work there on a permanent basis, to produce things, and achieve scientific results rather than merely survive.

Today, as we debate this issue, the space shuttle *Endeavor* is flying overhead, its crew struggling to scratch the surface of what might be possible. We have flown 56 such shuttle missions and we are still learning. All of the shuttle missions flown to date barely amount to a year's worth of work in orbit.

Opponents of the space station are fond of counting what they refer to as missions of the space station and explaining how these have gone away with each space station redesign. The truth of the matter is that there is only one mission for the space station and it hasn't changed. Its mission is to establish an outpost in space in which we can work year round. This is and always will be the next logical step in our manned space program. Once this initial step is taken, all those other things will follow.

What practical benefits will there be from such a facility? It is, of course, impossible to predict the future. Based on the work we have done on the shuttle, we know that there is a vast potential to use what space offers best and what we will never really achieve on Earth—a zero gravity environment.

In the zero gravity environment, we can study and conquer metallurgical problems and begin to understand, and perhaps even manufacture, valuable new alloys in space. In the zero gravity environment, we can grow more perfect crystals of critical proteins and understand their structures and how to alter them to perform better. We can understand, not only the effects of gravity on our biological functions, but how these systems fundamentally work.

Madam Chairman, I also want to point out that we are not alone in this commitment. The space station is also the centerpiece of the national space programs of Canada, Japan, and 10 European nations. They perceive the same logical progression in space and the same potential benefits that can be realized. We have signed intergovern-

mental agreements that require cost sharing of the type that I hope will be the hallmark for all of our future endeavors in science.

We are also discussing with the Russians the prospects for broadening this international cooperation. Certainly, the end of the cold war should drive a dramatic realignment in the competition in space which has characterized the past 30 years. This is a difficult process and it is vital that we demonstrate our own ability to follow through on such undertakings as the space station.

Finally, I want to ensure that all my colleagues clearly understand the progress that has been made in the station program thus far and the work that remains to be done. We have now spent over \$8 billion on the space station and our partners have spent over \$3 billion. We and our partners have developed a design we know will work and will serve the needs of the user community. There are tens of thousands of detailed engineering drawings and many subsystems that we will use have already been built.

The President's call for a redesign early this year was, to be sure, a difficult challenge for all involved in the space station program. The President envisioned a major cost reduction and commissioned a review of alternative designs to accomplish this goal. What emerged was in some ways remarkable but in some ways not surprising at all.

First of all, there are no better designs. The station has gone through countless such reviews over the past 6 years and certain fundamental features of the station have been validated time and again. What the President and the blue ribbon panel he commissioned to review the station concluded was that we should continue the space station *Freedom* Program and take advantage of the work that has been done thus far.

What was accomplished however is nevertheless a major cost reduction. By streamlining the management, and cutting back on some of the hardware features, the President has been able to cut the costs by over \$4 billion over the next 5 years and \$18 billion over the life of the program.

In order to accomplish these goals, there will need to be a major reduction in management overhead and a dramatic increase in Government efficiency. I believe these things can be done and they will have consequences far beyond the space station. This new way of doing business will become the standard for all major Government development programs in the future, both civil and military. This may be the only way we can accomplish what needs to be done in the austere budgetary environment we envision in the future.

Madam Chairman, I want to conclude by calling the attention of my col-

leagues to the letter that was received by the Speaker from the President on H.R. 2200. This signifies that, for the first time ever, that there is a broad consensus on the need for and approach to the space station that is shared by the authorizing committee, the Appropriations Committee and by the President.

Now is the time to reaffirm our commitment to the Space Station program.

□ 1220

Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against the Roemer amendment.

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

Madam Chairman, shortly after he took office, President Clinton concluded that space station *Freedom* was going to cost more than we could afford, so he directed NASA to prepare three options for building a space station that would require the Nation to spend between \$5 and \$9 billion over the next 5 years.

After 3 months of frantic work by NASA engineers and managers, three space station designs were submitted to the President for his review. But each design cost far more than the President's targets. Each design also delayed or eliminated significant capabilities of the current program.

Last week, the President endorsed NASA's option A, but said he would enhance it with elements of the more capable option B. Well, according to NASA and the President's own blue ribbon review panel, option A costs \$12.8 billion and option B costs even more. But by using political math, Clinton announced that the 5-year cost of this space station program would be only \$10.5 billion.

The promise of a capable, inexpensive space station has been made before. When it was first proposed in 1984, the space station was to be a space-based workshop, a laboratory, an observatory, a transportation hub, a repair shop, and a warehouse. Taxpayers and the Congress were told it would cost only \$8 billion to build this beauty.

But, the experts, including then-NASA Administrator James Beggs, knew it would cost more. Rather than reflecting actual cost estimates, the \$8 billion figure was chosen because it seemed politically viable. But that decision undermined the program's credibility and doomed it to an endless series of political battles. As costs went up, capabilities diminished and the rest of our space program was cannibalized.

By ignoring the sober assessments of his own blue ribbon panel, President Clinton has again consigned the space station program to the political thick-et. Congress is again debating the future of an imaginary space station program, one that was created out of

whole cloth inside the White House, one that does not bear any resemblance to any of the options created by NASA engineers and reviewed by the President's experts. It is a space station program based on politics rather than science.

In a White House briefing about the new space station plan last week, senior administration officials admitted to the press that they could not provide details about what the new space station would look like, who would build it, what it would do, the extent of participation by Russia and other foreign nations, or its planned orbit. We were told that these essential facts would be revealed only after 90 more days, that is, only after Congress has agreed to pay for whatever it is we are building. But somehow these administration officials knew that whatever it is we are building would cost exactly \$10.5 billion.

In short, the administration is asking taxpayers to buy a pig in a poke. The administration cannot explain how a 5-year, \$12.8 billion space station program will have its capabilities expanded, yet cost only \$10.5 billion.

Let us look for a moment at that magic \$10.5 billion figure. If the space station program should survive, we will hear a great deal in the future about how the \$10.5 billion number was never intended to represent the entire cost of the program and how we need to spend a lot more on it. With all of the numbers flying around in this debate, it is easy to get confused.

Proponents of the program will keep repeating the number \$10.5 billion while doing little to explain what it includes. It does not include the money already spent, roughly \$9 billion. Because the space station will not be fully operational within the 5-year budget period, it does not include the money needed to complete construction, at least \$3.7 billion, and probably a lot more due to a stretched out construction schedule which NASA has admitted could delay completion for 2 years. The \$10.5 billion number does not include the extra billions needed to add upgrades from option B. It does not include the full cost of payloads. And it does not include the money needed to use the space station once it is built, at least \$1.4 billion annually. NASA itself has estimated that the full cost of option A without upgrades is \$47 billion. But without supporting details, there is no way to know for sure how much whatever it is we are buying today is going to cost. One way to put the new costs in perspective is to listen to space station advocates who are boasting that the latest redesign will save taxpayers \$8 billion. Just remember, that is the total amount we originally planned to spend. Let us not let ourselves be deluded again by low-ball budget estimates. It is time to stop the hemorrhaging. It is time to cut our

losses. It is time to terminate the space station program.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and in strong support of the space station.

It is no secret that opponents of the station have employed the old strategy of divide and conquer.

They attempt to prove that a station is not the best method of conducting certain individual missions. In doing so, however, they show exactly why it is needed.

They say it is not the most efficient method of conducting scientific research or of conducting medical research or that it may not be the best way of preparing for future endeavors or to inspire children to become young scientists. Each isolated argument just might be true.

But, by using this argument, they beg the next question:

Is it the best method of pursuing all of these goals? The answer is yes.

For just over one one-thousandths of our budget we can continue to conduct space research which will have applications none of us can yet imagine.

After all, could any of us have imagined just a few years ago that our space program would lead to advances in areas such as wastewater treatment, liquid crystals, materials, batteries, engines, and microbiology.

I dare say no.

If the same shortsighted attitude were applied just a few decades ago, we might likely be without such taken-for-granted items like antilock brake systems for cars, magnetic resonance imagers, and artificial knees and hips.

With regard to budget considerations, few in this Chamber can match my voting record on budget matters. I strongly believe we must balance our budget like any family in America and my voting record shows that belief.

However, when an American family runs into tough times, they do not take funds from their children's education, they cut out unnecessary spending.

Cutting the station would be tantamount to taking money from a child's education fund to continue to eat dinner out every night.

Finally, the opponents of the station want to have it both ways. They claim they are not against a space program. They tell you they believe the station is crowding out other NASA programs.

This implies their savings would go to other NASA programs. In the next breath they claim to be doing this to cut the deficit, citing unrealistic numbers. My friends, it cannot be both.

Madam Chairman, we all know the case for the space station in terms of economic benefits and the advance-

ment of science but there is one more very important reason and that is I still believe, as do the majority of the American people, that it is America's destiny to explore space. Not for the cold war reasoning of proving we are the greatest Nation on Earth, but because we are the greatest Nation on Earth.

We became great by dreaming and pursuing that dream. As soon as we lose the ability to dream and reach for the stars we cease to be great.

Madam Chairman, let us keep the dream alive. Support the space station. All mankind will continue to reap the magnitude of benefits from this program.

□ 1230

Mr. ROEMER. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Chairman, I congratulate the offerers of the amendment, and hope it is adopted.

Madam Chairman, this space station is not a bad thing. It is a very good thing. It is marginally better with people on it. But we do not have the luxury in this House of killing only bad things if we want to cut the deficit. We have incurred a deficit, by and large, by doing a number of good things, things people wanted, and not paying for them. The question is not whether in the abstract there is any value to a manned space station or not, but how it stacks up in terms of priorities.

It is true the space station has been evolving because of the need to control the cost. But the rationale has also been evolving. We used to hear about the importance of America being No. 1. We used to hear about the psychological and geopolitical and world political aspects of this.

That is no longer the case. I recommend Members go back to the prior debate, if they have nothing else to do, and look at the arguments. They were that America must be No. 1, that we were challenged to do this by the Soviet Union. One whole strong rationale for the manned space station, the international competitive aspect, has completely collapsed.

Nobody argues that if you said to any objective panel of scientists, "Here is this amount of money; what would you spend it on to get scientific benefit?" that they would say adding men to the space station would be the way to do it. That does not mean that there is no benefit. There is some benefit from it. But there is far less than from a number of other things.

In particular we talk about deficit reduction. We are underfunding Pell grants. You talk about taking money from children's education? We are doing that in this budget. We are underfunding Pell grants, we are underfunding Head Start, we are underfunding basic services.

We are talking in the budget being considered about the unmentionable, cutting Medicare. How can you justify the tens of billions of dollars for putting men on the space station in that context?

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Space.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chairman, I, of course, rise in active opposition to the amendment from the gentlemen to kill the space station. I think it would be a terrible mistake for this Congress to vote to terminate the space station.

I am as strong a supporter, Madam Chairman, of fiscal responsibility. As the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEWIS] has stated, there are many of us here who are not strangers to fiscal responsibility in this House. In H.R. 2200 we have cut the space station by \$4 billion over the next 5 years. The House has just adopted an across-the-board cut to the NASA budget that cuts an additional \$250 million.

We have shown that we can cut back. But I think we also must show that we are not going to cut out and lose the dream that many youngsters, many schoolchildren have, many old people who are wasting away in cancer wards with no hopes for the future. The space station, to these people, to these youngsters, and to the elderly, means hope. And that is what the space station is to us. Can you really put a price on hope?

I disagree with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] when he says this country does not want to be number one anymore. I disagree with anyone when they say we should not be geopolitically strong and have a leadership position in the eyes of the world.

I certainly want to also appeal to the new Members of this organization, the 110 freshmen, who will really be the beneficiaries of the gifts of discovery that we might find, that might be spawned through the space station.

This Congress in 1971, Madam Chairman, created and passed the National Cancer Institute. And the breakthroughs since that time, the MRI, the CT-scan, the many other findings along the way, discoveries that have come on the heels of research, have benefited millions and millions of people, and this Congress, in its wisdom, has supported that institute. It has grown by leaps and bounds and the discoveries and breakthroughs and the alleviation of pain and suffering has followed.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] made a series of arguments opposing the space station. Upon close examination, let us look and see whether or not they really and truly hold up.

The reality is that the space station in H.R. 2200 was introduced by the gen-

tleman from California [Mr. BROWN] and others of us, before the President decided on A, B, or C option; then the decision made by the thinking Members of this Congress was that we should support that that the President sends over here. If it is a space station, we are going to give him the support. We endorse the President's cuts in costs in the space station. He cut those by over \$4 billion over the next 5 years. We cut in committee \$226 million. The President cut in the outyears \$18 billion.

These are cuts. This is real money. Just 20 minutes ago this Congress cut \$250 million out. So no one can take the position that we have not addressed this and not made the cuts.

Moreover, the total cost for the development and 10 years of operation of the space station will be about \$47 billion, not \$120 billion that they have been asserting. In addition, that \$47 billion includes \$11 billion that we have already spent. Of course, that should be taken into calculation. But that is not to be added to & held out as expenditures that we may have in the future.

As recently as yesterday the Subcommittee on Space, which I chair, received testimony from a group of nine very renowned doctors and medical researchers, including, Madam Chairman, the world famous Dr. Michael DeBakey, who told us how important the space shuttle is now to medical research and drug research that these scientists are conducting, and how much more important the space station will be to the research they hope to be able to do in the future.

Dr. DeBakey made calls on Members here, a man who came to Washington, who gave his time, gave his week to support the space station, a man who people cross oceans to get 30 minutes with, came to this body and gave up his time and his information.

These scientists explained that the microgravity environment that is provided on the space station is allowing them to do very important research on life-threatening diseases like cancer and AIDS, and it cannot be duplicated on Earth.

They also told us the Shuttle is allowing them to conduct experiments on revolutionary new drugs that cannot be done on Earth because of the presence of gravity. These scientists went on to explain that the space station will be even more important to their future research and experimentation efforts than the Space Shuttle is to their current endeavors. This is, of course, because of the extended volume of research, the duration of research, and more advanced research tools and equipment that can be accommodated on board the space station.

□ 1240

I believe that history has shown again and again that when a new line

of research, scientific research, is pursued or, when a revolutionary new scientific research tool becomes available, the results and the benefits that eventually flow to society are immense. Sometimes it takes even decades for these benefits to fully mature and become widely recognized, but history has shown that these benefits always come.

History can also reveal that there is no return when there is no meaningful research.

Madam Chairman, I certainly recommend and point out many additional investments that are important to us, none more important than that of the youth.

Imaginations of the current generations of children in this country have been captivated by many movies, "Star Trek" and other movies, but this is just science fiction. The space station, on the other hand, is something real that they can feel, that they can see. It is something tangible that our children can dream about and then aim their educations and their careers toward.

I appeal to my colleagues to help keep these dreams alive.

In addition to the dreams for our children, I think we also have to be conscientious about the promises that we make to other nations. The gentleman from California, Chairman BROWN, has very well covered that. Accordingly, Madam Chairman, for these reasons and many more, I think it is very important—yes, I think it is imperative—that this Congress defeat any and all amendments to terminate the space station. I just do not think the American people would tolerate it.

I think if we want to have cards, letters, telegrams, and people in person converging on this city, converging on our districts, then kill something that is as meaningful to them as the space station.

Mr. ROEMER. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Madam Chairman, first of all, I would like to salute the distinguished chairman for the open rule that he has brought to the floor but also the openness that he has had in the committee to debate both sides of this issue.

Second, I would just like to say that I voted against the across-the-board cut that opened debate on this bill because I think that NASA needs good money for research. I am not against NASA. I am not against good programs that are working and across-the-board cuts. I think we should hone in and target in on those programs that are not.

And third, on the distinguished Dr. DeBakey's testimony, oral testimony yesterday, he never mentioned the space station in his oral testimony. He said we do need to invest in good research in NASA but never said, in his

oral testimony, that space station was part of that.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I think the gentleman is right 99 percent of the time. I just disagree with him on this amendment.

Mr. ZIMMER. Madam Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Chairman, I want to first thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] for the excellent job they have done in presenting a very real and helpful case for our decision on whether to fund the new space station. I do not know which version of the space station we're debating, but I know there have been many.

All of us here want to do the right thing. But in the process of determining the right thing, I think of these things: I think of my daughter, who is 13 years old, who has seen in her lifetime the national debt go up fivefold, from over \$800 billion to over \$4,000 billion.

I think of my daughter, who sees us here debating whether we should spend \$47 billion but knows that the deficit this year alone is nearly \$400 billion.

I do not know who is mostly to blame for our deficits. Is it Congress or the White House? Is it the White House that never has submitted a balanced budget in at least 17 years? Or is it the Congress, who never gives back the President a balanced budget? Or is it the Presidents who have never vetoed these unbalanced budgets? I do not know who is mostly to blame. Maybe we all have a role to play. In fact, I do not think, I know we do.

I believe that in this Chamber there are more than 50 percent who would vote for a balanced budget amendment. They would vote for a balanced budget amendment, and I will, too. But to vote for a balanced budget amendment means that we then have to balance the budget. It means we have to cut out programs that we may think are wasteful and fraudulent or programs that we like, which we just cannot fund.

I put the space station in that category. I do not think we can arrive at coming close to a balance budget, even with all the new taxes some may contemplate, without making cuts in programs we like.

The net national debt without Presidential action, without the President's plan, will go up a trillion and a half dollars, the net. With Presidential action, it will still go up a trillion dollars. That is the net, because we subtract out Social Security. If we do not subtract out Social Security, the national debt will go up, in 5 years, \$2.1 trillion.

With the President's program to cut spending and raise taxes, primarily

raise taxes, as I view it, the gross debt will still go up \$1.7 trillion. So on top of the \$4 trillion we are going to see \$1.7 trillion. That is what is in my mind as I debate this bill.

Tom Toles, a cartoonist, had a cartoon in the Buffalo News. He is syndicated, and it may be in other areas. He captures this debate for me.

In the beginning of his cartoon he has a question box and he asks, "So is there any good news coming out of Washington about plans to cut the deficit?" And then, we see an Uncle Sam, a very small Uncle Sam with a hatchet. And we see a pretty large space porky, "The missionless \$30 billion, manned space station."

Well, he really was off \$17 billion. So I guess we should change the cartoon to say \$47 billion. This is the space porky. This is what I think I am debating today.

You see a little Uncle Sam with a hatchet trying to cut spending. I do not know how we get to a balanced budget amendment unless we eliminate some programs. And this is a program that we need to eliminate. Thank you.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER].

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment this afternoon and in strong support of space station *Freedom*. I rise as the most fiscally responsible Member of the House of Representatives, according to the National Taxpayers Union last year. And I also rise as a Representative of a State that does not do much NASA business. So there is no porkbarrel spending for NASA in the State of Wisconsin.

I am taking the position that I am today because this is a note on whether or not to continue a manned space program that has put America on the cutting edge of technology since its inception in 1957. All one needs to do is look at the spinoffs from NASA activities and how they have improved our lives and even extended those lives.

Without the manned space program, we would not have had a revolution in telecommunications, which has made long distance telephone calls dirt cheap. We would not have had the development of medications that have eased pain and extended the life expectancy of people in this country and around the world. We would not have seen new materials developed, whether it be Velcro or materials that could be used for artificial hips and joints. And we would not have been able to see things that have made our lives easier, such as sunglasses that many people now use that can more effectively diffuse the rays of radiation from the Sun.

The space station holds the potential of keeping America on the cutting edge of technology. If we back away from this program, now, the technology,

which America has developed, will be developed by those who do go into space, the Russians, the Europeans, and the Japanese, who will be there regardless of what this Congress decides today.

I do not want to see that happen. As was mentioned earlier, there was a hearing at the Subcommittee on Space yesterday with an all-star panel of witnesses, lead by Dr. Michael DeBakey. Just in the area of medical research alone, there was evidence placed on the table at that hearing to show that we need microgravity research in order to develop a permanent heart ventricle valve, in order to understand better the human body's immunology, which is the key to curing cancer and AIDS. All kinds of other things will flow from the permanent microgravity research, which can be done on space station *Freedom*.

During the last Presidential campaign we heard an awful lot about thinking about tomorrow. This is a vote, Madam Chairman, that will show who is thinking about tomorrow and who is not.

□ 1250

Vote "no" on the Roemer-Zimmer amendment, to keep America on the cutting edge of technological research. Vote "no" on the Roemer-Zimmer amendment, to keep our technology being what makes American business best, and reduces our balance of payments deficit as far as possible.

Vote "no" keep America No. 1 in space, so the rest of the world can follow our lead, rather than the United States of America following somebody else's lead.

Mr. ROEMER. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY], a freshman Member who has been very helpful on this matter.

Mr. ZIMMER. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes, as well, to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Chairman, today Congress has an opportunity to make serious budget cuts.

The Roemer-Zimmer amendment would save the American taxpayer over \$2 billion in the next year alone and as much as \$12 billion over the next 5 years.

We cannot afford to build the biggest pork barrel ever shot into space.

We have tough, serious choices to make.

Our compact with the American people requires Congress to make significant spending cuts in return for increased taxes.

But before we increase taxes on Social Security recipients or cut Medicare, we must eliminate these big-tick-

et scientific boondoggles that return very little on their massive investment.

When Congress first approved the space station, it was estimated that the program would cost \$8 billion to complete.

Today, even with the scaled-down design, NASA estimates completion of the project will cost over \$27 billion, while the General Accounting Office estimates are much higher than that. This does not include the nearly \$60 billion it will cost to operate the station after 1999, bringing the total estimated cost to over \$80 billion.

Extensive national projects may add to our prestige and may even serve science. However, none should take precedence over human needs. Many supporters of the space station hail the microgravity research as a key element of this program. Yet, in March 1991, Dr. Allan Bromley, President Bush's top science aide, wrote a lengthy summary of the space station's merits for then-Vice President Quayle.

Dr. Bromley wrote, and I quote:

Neither the commercial processes nor the scientific merit of the microgravity experiments come close to justifying the cost and effort required to build, deploy, and operate the station.

In fact, for many scientists, this program can be summarized in three simple words: "Waste in space."

So, we are going to spend \$80 billion to build a Red Roof Inn in outer space for four astronauts, when we will spend only a fraction of that amount to house thousands of homeless families here on Earth.

Let me repeat that: billions for housing in space, and only millions for affordable housing in the Nation.

Some might argue that the space station is an important jobs program. The truth is that every job the space station will create costs \$100,000.

This doesn't even begin to address the high technology jobs that are lost because NASA cancels, postpones, or squeezes out other worthy scientific projects.

We must be able to cut programs like the space station that the Nation does not need and can no longer afford. Continued funding for these projects will help ensure that we continue to drown in debt.

Madam Chairman, let us concentrate on the real priorities of this country—putting people, not pork, first.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the amendment.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN], chairman of the Subcommittee on Program and Budget Authorization of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Madam Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] is one of the most effective Mem-

bers here. He almost had me convinced. In fact, he makes a lot of good arguments, but I have to tell the Members, this is one of those issues that I slept over this weekend and decided to use my best instincts, rather than looking at the politics or the jobs issue.

Basically, I came down to the fact that the space station has had a lot of serious trouble in terms of development. NASA has done, at times, a miserable job of managing. But the fact is that America is the leader of the post-World War II world. We are the leader in technology and productivity and manufacturing and in jobs, and yes, in clout as well. That allows us to influence human rights and democracy and market reforms everywhere in the world, and we are being directly and effectively challenged by Japan, by Europe, by Russia, and a whole new group of competitors who are actively engaged in an effort to push us out of our leadership role wherever it exists: in space, in manufacturing, in technology.

While this program has not been perfect and the redesign has at times been a bit sloppy, to kill it now is to accept the fact that we are relegating our position to a secondary status in the area of space exploration, to accept the fact that other countries will take the lead in the future.

How will we feel when Japan and Europe and Russia are the only ones doing this and not us? How will our children feel when this happens? I think it is a pretty sad state of affairs when America so withers and so internalizes that we have lost the role of ourselves as being a great leader.

It is a jobs issue. It is not just jobs to create the station, but it is a whole lot of spinoff jobs. Let me tell the Members this, defense spending is coming down radically. If we look at America's industrial base right now, much of it is defense-related. Much of it is. Much of the spinoff is defense-related. Our new airplanes are defense-related. Our new automobiles, technology, composites. All that was largely done as part of the defense budget.

The space program is really one of the few things we have left going to keep that technological base, in light of that defense spending coming down. Let me finally mention the issue of budget. It is an important issue. I would point out that the real culprit in our budget problem is not the space station, it is entitlement programs. In 1965, we spent \$33 billion on all entitlement programs, from pensions to health care. That was 5 percent of our GNP.

This year we are spending \$770 billion on entitlement programs. That is 25 times they have grown in the last 30 years or so, or about 12.5 times.

I am just saying, in perspective, that the real culprit in deficits is not the space station, while we need to look at

waste in this area as well. I hope my colleagues will not reject it for that reason.

Mr. ZIMMER. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the bipartisan Roemer-Zimmer amendment to cut funds for the space station. I would agree with some that this project would be nice to have, but we simply cannot afford it, not with a \$300 billion annual deficit.

The GAO, the General Accounting Office, said recently that this project will cost \$150 billion to build and operate. We cannot afford that, not with the \$300 billion deficit.

Do the Members remember the old Muppet TV show, "Pigs in Space"? Maybe this space station ought to be the star attraction on a congressional version of a show called, "Pork in Space." Even Elmer Fudd, I think, could have a comeback.

A few weeks ago one of my largest newspapers in southwestern Michigan editorialized this program as "Can the Space Station." That is exactly what this project is, pork in a can. Maybe some would even call it Spam. But whatever we call it, it is a pig in a poke.

Madam Chairman, let us wake up and smell the bacon. It is time to kill this pork project and bring a little fiscal sanity back into our budget recipe.

□ 1300

The time is now for Congress to stand up, make a tough choice and say no to a program that we simply cannot afford. With a \$300 billion deficit, it is time to change business as usual, and I would urge all of my colleagues to vote yes on this wonderful bipartisan amendment to cut spending first.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN].

Ms. DUNN. Madam Chairman, last week I spoke in support of H.R. 2200, the NASA authorization bill. Today, I want again to underscore my support for the space station and for the superb leadership provided by GEORGE BROWN, chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee and ranking member, BOB WALKER.

There are many reasons to support the space station and you will be hearing them today on the floor. But to me, one of the singular reasons for a space station and the continuation of a strong manned space program, is the unique scientific and medical research that can only be done in the microgravity environment of space.

The NASA appropriation provides for ongoing biomedical research programs in the fields of microgravity and life sciences especially in the area of women's health. This research has been both ground-based and on space shuttle missions.

The space station, Madam Chairman, offers a one-of-a-kind environment for this critical health work. While microgravity research is being conducted even now on the shuttle, the long-term research necessary especially for the growth of cancer tissue will be conducted on the space station.

Madam Chairman, projections from the American Cancer Society indicate that 1 in every 3 people alive today will be diagnosed with some form of cancer. That means that about 85 million Americans now living will eventually have cancer. And projections from the American Cancer Society indicate that by age 85 1 in every 9 women will be diagnosed with breast cancer, and 1 of every 65 women will develop ovarian cancer and it is important to note that ovarian cancer survival rates today are no better than they were 30 years ago.

One in nine, Madam Chairman. Look around this Chamber. Those are not very good odds for the 48 women who are now serving in Congress. They are not good odds for our mothers, daughters, friends, and other family members either.

The little research that has been done recently in the life sciences and microgravity fields has been extremely beneficial to women. One of the reasons for this recent focus, is that women now comprise almost 25 percent of our astronauts.

Above all other reasons to support the station and a robust, manned space program is that the research done in space will impact future generations with its continuing benefits. The more research we do, the more new knowledge is derived.

There are many people in my life, both women and men who have been touched by cancer. And many of the treatments they have received have been the results of space research. My two sons, one who has just graduated from college have their full and vigorous lives ahead of them. I would like to think that they and their future wives and daughters will be able to benefit from the decisions we make here today.

Madam Chairman, I am submitting a letter underscoring the importance of NASA's microgravity research on women's health issues.

Madam Chairman, this letter I am including for the RECORD is from the University of South Florida College of Medicine underscoring the importance of NASA's microgravity research and of cancer issues. The text of the letter is as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA,
COLLEGE OF MEDICINE,
Tampa, FL, June 23, 1993.

Congresswoman JENNIFER DUNN,
U.S. House of Representatives, Longworth
House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN DUNN: I am sorry that I missed you yesterday during the Space Subcommittee hearing. I think that the hearing went very well and that the testimonies presented were truly exceptional. I

hope that the vote goes favorably today—it worries me a great deal that so much apprehension about this program still exists for some members.

I have been told of your plans to institute increased funding for research on women's cancer, specifically in the area of biotechnology. This sounds very exciting; although other sources of funding for women's diseases are certainly in place, to my knowledge, there is no other work outside of the studies we have going on with Johnson Space Center which involve the NASA bioreactor culture vessel for evaluating breast and ovarian tumor growth.

If I can help you at any time in the future, please don't hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

JEANNE L. BECKER, PH.D.,
Assistant Professor.

Mr. ROEMER. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] who will speak to some extent about health claims.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam Chairman, with all due respect to the previous speaker, I think those listening to this debate can understand the desperation of the supporters of the space station when they try to convince the American people that putting this station in space is going to find a cure for cancer, or a cure for AIDS. Those arguments have been made on the floor of the House, and I think they betray the problem with this program.

This program has been searching for a mission. If we want to find a cure for cancer or a cure for AIDS, turn to the medical experts in America.

I held a hearing last year and I asked medical research experts if the space station was the place to turn to find medical breakthroughs. They said no. They said Congressmen, stay right here on Earth, because we cannot find enough money in this Federal budget to fund the National Institutes of Health.

This year we will put about \$10 billion into all of the Federal research to find cures for heart disease, cancer, AIDS, Alzheimer's, and still we will only be funding one out of every four approved research grants at NIH. To suggest that we should now turn around and spend \$150 billion on the space station to cure cancer is ludicrous.

If we want to think about tomorrow, as one of my colleagues said in reference to supporting the space station, I would like to join in thinking about tomorrow. The tomorrow I think about is a tomorrow where a child in America finally has a cure for AIDS. The tomorrow I think about is a tomorrow with men and women who find cures for heart disease and cancer by investing here on Earth.

Some people in this world and this Nation need a liftoff and brave astronauts to believe that they are embarking on a great national adventure. I do not need that. I think America can continue to be a leader in medical re-

search. I think we can find cures for diseases. But let us focus on curing the problems right here on Earth.

The President can put a new set of tires and a new paint job on the space station, and it still will not fly. Let us stick with curing those problems right here at home.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume so I may include for the RECORD a statement by another noted physician, Dr. Michael DeBakey, who will address the words of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL E. DEBAKEY, M.D.,
CHANCELLOR AND CHAIRMAN, DEPARTMENT
OF SURGERY, BAYLOR COLLEGE OF MEDICINE

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee: Knowledge, science, and human advancement have always been a reflection of their time. Recorded history began some 5,000 years ago. From those earliest writings we know that humans wondered about their world and sought to learn more about it. The first treatise on surgery was written in Egypt about 2,700 B.C. by Imhotep, the Pharaoh's grand prime minister whose status was so great that after his death he was declared a god.

Surgery in western culture originated with the peoples of Greece and Asia Minor. Hippocrates, known as the father of medicine, was one of the first physicians to view medicine as a systematic science. Medicine and surgery achieved great peaks during the third and fourth centuries B.C., especially in Alexandria. But in the early history of Rome the story was different. Before the Romans conquered the Greeks in 146 B.C., medicine and surgery were considered such lowly pursuits that no Roman citizen would undertake them. Pliny the Elder wrote that because Romans had gotten along without doctors for more than 600 years, they should be able to survive without "the cult of Aesculapius," the Greek-Roman god of medicine, a reference to the medical community.

In the fourth century A.D. the Dark Ages, which lasted nearly an entire millennium, the pursuit of knowledge, new ideas, technology, and science was heresy. Miracles replaced medicine as the form of healing. Civilization regressed to an era of ignorance and fear.

These historical examples underscore the tenuous position science, medicine, and research—the quest for knowledge—sometimes hold in society. In the early Roman days and the later Middle Ages, the decline of medicine and science was due not to ill intentions of societies' leaders, but to other priorities considered at the time as more important: conquest and power for the Romans and faith and religious predominance for citizens of the Middle Ages.

Today, the world and, at its forefront, the United States, are far more enlightened about the critical roles science, research, education, and medicine play in the welfare of our people and of our future.

But today our leaders—you among them—also face the issue of priorities. The Cold War that required much of our attention and resources for half a century is over. Defense as a priority is being replaced by increasingly urgent issues concerning our economic security, social well-being, and future welfare.

I am well aware that with each passing day our country's deficit makes our priorities more difficult to set and our choices harder

to make. My profession of health care has been placed squarely under the microscope of fiscal scrutiny.

But I am here today not only as a physician and surgeon, but as an explorer, a researcher, a participant in today's quest for knowledge. Medicine, after all, is about exploration, the exploration of the human body. I am the explorer of a world composed of microscopic cells and a researcher of systems far more complex than mankind can create. The human body is a world of wonder and discoveries, and we have many, many more discoveries to make in medicine and in surgery.

In times of competing priorities, I hear calls to eliminate what some have called "frivolous big science" programs, such as a space station. Under deficit-imposed pressure, I hear "choices" described that pit possible cutbacks in vitally important programs, such as Medicare and medical assistance to our elderly and disabled against so-called "big science" programs like a space station in a heated either-or financial competition.

Better health care for our citizens is not at odds with a space station. As a physician, teacher, and explorer, I must emphasize that our space program and space station are not frivolous, because they may provide keys to solving some of the most vexing problems that affect our people. Health care is improved not only by such immediate proposals as providing more accessible care to our citizens, but also by promoting the research that will lead to far reaching advances in the field.

For example, you, our leaders, should not see programs such as Medicare and a space station as a choice. Rather, the goal should be to use the unique microgravity laboratory of a space station to research ways to treat or prevent the deteriorating physical conditions that affect the elderly and disabled.

Many health problems that affect the aged—bone density loss, breakdowns in immune response, changes in the cardiovascular system—also affect very young, very healthy astronauts once they are in weightlessness. A space station provides a facility unavailable on Earth to observe these processes and develop countermeasures that could be applicable to the aged and the feeble, as well as astronauts. Such advances could, in turn, potentially lower future health care costs.

More than anything else, I believe a space station will teach us about ourselves, about how humans adapt, live, and work in an entirely new and challenging environment. The space station is not a luxury any more than a medical research center at Baylor College of Medicine is a luxury.

If fiscal priorities do not allow research into the medical mysteries of the human body at the best available research centers, whether they are 200 miles outside of Washington D.C. or 200 miles above the Earth, we are in a worse and likely more prolonged national health care crisis than any of us have imagined.

One way we will ultimately overcome the economic problem associated with medical care is to obtain the knowledge needed to prevent diseases and find new means to treat patients, especially as our population ages. We cannot always predict the outcome of scientific activity, especially efforts as broad and untried as space. One reason some scientists and political leaders question the efficacy of space research is that we have had limited opportunity for multiple experiments and trial runs in space. Significant

return on science research requires an ability to acquire information in both quantity and quality.

Present technology on the Shuttle allows for stays in space of only about two weeks. We do not limit medical researchers to only a few hours in the laboratory and expect cures for cancer. We need much longer missions in space—in months to years—to obtain research results that may lead to the development of new knowledge and breakthroughs.

There are concrete examples of technologies awaiting long-term research in space, and they demonstrate the benefits a space station holds for medicine.

Tissue modeling—producing exact replicas of human tissues—is a relatively new field that promises important insights for cancer research, organ transplant research, and human virus culturing. But on Earth, we have only a two-dimensional understanding of how human cells work and replicate in the body. A tissue modeling device, called a rotating wall vessel, recently developed by NASA at the Johnson Space Center in Houston, imitates certain microgravity properties.

Quite simply, by emulating those microgravity processes, this device has grown the largest three-dimensional cultures of normal and cancerous human tissues ever developed outside the body. This new technology provides an impressive research tool that may greatly advance cancer research and may even allow for the development of transplantable human tissues. Demonstrations on the Space Shuttle have shown great promise for this culture system.

But, quite literally, its full potential won't get off the ground until there is a space station where it can be researched for long periods.

In another area, crystalline structures have important research applications for medicine, pharmacology, and biotechnology. Space-grown crystals are usually large, more developed, and more uniform than those grown on Earth. Earth-bound crystals tend to be distorted by convection and gravity and are therefore poorly suited for study.

The superior space-grown crystals allow for a more complete and exact analysis of their molecular and cellular structures. The analysis then can be used to design and test specific treatments for diseases. Protein crystals for research on the HIV virus, insulin, cancer, rheumatoid arthritis, and emphysema are only a few examples of experiments already flown on the Shuttle. All of them can significantly benefit from long duration access to microgravity on a space station.

Unexpected and unpredictable side benefits for the private sector have stemmed from the technological developments achieved by the U.S. space program since its inception, and many of these involved clinical medicine. Before they were developed, I couldn't have testified to you that if you fund the space program, this will be the result. And I can't tell you now that if you build a space station, you will specifically get this side benefit from some new technology or that side benefit. The only thing I can tell you is what we in medicine have received from space technology thus far. But I don't know how anyone could look at these benefits and imagine similar advances wouldn't occur in turn as a byproduct of a space station.

NASA did not develop these new medical aids, but it did develop and transfer these potential technologies to the private sector. In many cases, NASA researchers actively col-

laborated with scientists in private and public research laboratories to obtain beneficial results.

The space program's requirements for miniaturized and highly reliable instrumentation and sensors were the precursors of cardiac pacemakers. The development of bi-directional telemetry for satellites resulted in programmable pacemakers in which heart rate could be adjusted by the physician as necessary without additional surgery.

The need to monitor astronauts' vital signs while hundreds of thousands of miles away from Earth has led to medical telemetry for monitoring ward patients' vital signs. The same telemetry has permitted paramedics to save countless lives while en route to hospitals. Space telemetry also has spurred the development of "telemedicine" that allows clinical consultation and support in disaster-stricken areas worldwide. "Telemedicine" has opened health care opportunities to remote sites such as Native American reservations. Telemedicine is now being adapted for long-distance medical specialty consultation and for medical education, and the result has the potential to lower health care costs.

Space imaging technology is used for computer-assisted tomography, or CAT scans, positron-emission tomography, or PET scans, and Magnetic Resonance Imaging—technologies that diagnose tissue abnormalities without intrusive measures. Space imagery processing technology is used in the now common treatment known as "balloon angioplasty." This procedure makes use of a tiny balloon on the tip of a catheter that creates internal compression of narrowed heart arteries, opening them to improve circulation of the blood to the heart muscle. Heart attacks may be averted completely by this process.

These are just a few of the thousands of medical applications that have been derived from space technology and now touch lives daily. They were never expected when the space program began, and their original applications were not intended for the purposes that have now saved countless lives.

All of these advances are the serendipitous outcome of scientific and technological research. We investigate to uncover questions we do not yet know how to ask and to discover answers we never expected. These advances are now common, but they still deserve the label of recent. And the unexpected benefits of space exploration continue today. In my work they have been invaluable.

I have devoted my entire professional career to furthering knowledge in cardiovascular medicine and surgery. Before the first human ever flew in space, I was researching the development of a Left Ventricular Assist Device (LVAD) as a life support system for heart failure. This device assists the muscle-damaged heart in pumping blood and provides similar assistance for patients awaiting a heart transplant. The Institute of Medicine estimates that early in the next century, as many as 60,000 patients each year will require the support of an LVAD. If we include circulatory crippled patients, the number increases to 150,000 patients annually. Currently, the only means of circulatory support is through the use of large, complex and expensive pulsatile LVAD's that provide about one year of circulatory support. Such devices cost as much as \$50,000 each and, therefore, are not practical for use on large populations.

I had been working on a non-pulsatile pump that could be compact enough and cost-efficient enough for widespread clinical

use. Unfortunately, currently available heart pumps of this type have a limited life span of just a few days. Another motivation for the development of a simple LVAD system is the scarcity of available donor hearts. In the past, about 2,000 heart transplants were performed annually in the United States. In the future, fewer transplants will likely be performed each year, regardless of the search for donors and an expanded criteria for acceptance. A simple, lower cost, portable heart pump is vital for patients risking heart failure and its complications. If an appropriate system can be developed, transplants will be more successful or not always necessary; the synthesis of anti-rejection drugs can be more effective; and post-transplant complications may be minimized. Early LVAD designs, unfortunately, were experiencing fluid flow problems that damaged blood cells during pumping. I am a surgeon, a researcher, and an explorer, but not an engineer. I needed engineering help with the heart pump, but did not know where to go.

In 1984, a Johnson Space Center engineer named David Saucier was in heart failure. We performed a heart transplant on him. During his convalescence, Saucier and I discussed the similarities between the heart and a spacecraft life support system. Both feature closed-loop systems, pumping fluids at various rates and pressures. Both receive and act upon electric impulses. Both have extensive networks to carry messages and send commands to all parts of the vessel. Saucier returned to work at NASA and put together a four-person team to work with our investigators at the Baylor College of Medicine to develop a prototype unit for an LVAD that eventually would be implanted inside the chest, between the heart and aorta.

Using their knowledge of electronic control systems, computational fluid dynamics, miniaturized spacecraft pump designs, power-efficient small motor designs, computer modeling, and engineering design parameters, the NASA team has helped our Baylor researchers develop an axial flow device. It consists of a spinning impeller, a fixed flow inducer, and a fixed diffuser within a flow tube. The first stage flow inducer for the LVAD was adapted from downsizing a liquid hydrogen inducer used on a Shuttle main engine. The impeller has six blades and is designed to rotate at 10,000 to 12,000 revolutions per minute depending upon the required flow output. The flow tube has an internal diameter of 0.5 inches and a length of 2.25 inches. Rare earth magnets implanted in the impeller blades allow the impeller to act as the rotor of a brushless direct current motor. The motor controller uses a back electromotive force principle for commutation control.

One of the most serious problems with the LVAD design was hemolysis, or trauma to the red blood cells that can occur if conditions are not optimal. Using their state-of-the-art test equipment developed for use in spacecraft design, the NASA team explored sheer force factors acting on the blood as it passes through the tiny impellers and how they correlated to the speed of passage and pressures involved in the process.

The design strengths of the NASA/Baylor LVAD include the small size of the device enabling easy implantation, low power consumption, and absence of blood seals. Thrombus formation, or blood clotting, and blood leakage problems associated with the seals are therefore avoided.

Current pump performance has demonstrated the planned flow rate of 5 liters

per minute against a pump head of 1000 mm-Hg while using 9 watts of power. In vitro hemolysis using cow blood tests has been reduced from a high value of .189 to the current value of .031 grams of liberated hemoglobin per 100 liters of blood pumped. Studies of a prototype unit in calves will continue through this summer. The eventual goal of the project is to perfect the device and to obtain Food and Drug Administration approval for clinical trials.

Why do we need space exploration? You do not have to convince me. More progress was made in the three years I worked with the engineering team at NASA or LVAD than in the previous 35 years of effort on the design and development of this heart pump. I believe we are very close to making a major breakthrough that will revolutionize heart surgery.

Space exploration is human exploration. The knowledge we gain in space is not only from sending people beyond Earth, but also from marshalling the human resources on Earth that make space flight possible. Such people, like David Saucier, come from a variety of science and engineering disciplines and dedicate their lives to the challenge of space and to applying their space expertise for the benefit of those on Earth. Their efforts affect fields far beyond the focus of NASA. They truly are conducting human exploration.

The reason we conduct research is not so much to come up with the right answers as to ask the right questions. The more questions we uncover, the better the research. In the history of science and technology development, the great advances were made by the single person who wondered why and sought to discover how. That is why we go into space. That is why we explore. That is the genius of humanity.

We can be sure of one thing. If we stop researching, searching for answers and asking more questions, we won't expand our store of knowledge, and we will not grow as a civilization. Our priorities may emphasize the bottom line today, but that may not be enough to reach the finishing line as a nation in the future.

Our space program is a symbol to the rest of the world that the United States looks to the future and plans to maintain its leadership role in science, technology, and research. It demonstrates that our leaders have the foresight to look beyond today's challenges and make a commitment to the promise of a better world. The space program, and specifically the space station, is an investment in knowledge that does not exist today and will not exist tomorrow without a commitment now.

We can't predict the outcome of scientific research or the knowledge to be gained. But what we can foresee is that no new knowledge, no new solutions to our concerns will be gained without it.

Thank you.

Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ESHOO], a very valued member of our committee.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to be here today to stand in opposition to the amendment that has been offered.

Just 32 years ago, President Kennedy offered a bold vision for our Nation, and he challenged an agency to come up with a mission that would place a man on the Moon. Americans applauded that, and that young President

and his bold vision produced something for this Nation, and placed us first in space exploration and all that has come from it.

Today, another young President speaks to a vision and a boldness because it takes boldness today to reshape an agency as well as its plan, and that is why I support it.

The benefits are clear, telecommunications, health benefits. This is the basic physiological research project in the Nation. Can we afford to give up an international partnership, the only international partnership that this country has been engaged in other than the allies that we have pulled together in war? That is how critical this is.

What I would like to end my comments with is it is very important for all of us to know the price of everything. But it should not be said that we value nothing. It is our responsibility to place the price tag on things, but also to state the value. This is a reshaped plan in terms of dollars, and it speaks to a vision of that young President of over three decades ago. And I am proud to rise in opposition to the amendment and in support of the space station.

Mr. ZIMMER. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTLEY].

Mr. MACHTLEY. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of the Roemer-Zimmer amendment to terminate the space station program.

Make no mistake about it. I have joined the millions of Americans who for the past 30 years have considered this a noble enterprise to explore outer space. And I have enjoyed the benefits of some of the scientific achievements which have accompanied this exploration.

And while I think that we should continue the scientific exploration of outer space, it must be done within our financial means. We responded to Sputnik by putting a man on the Moon. In 1969, I was an exchange student in Stockholm, Sweden, and I remember in the wee hours of the morning the pride that I felt as Neil Armstrong put his footprint on the Moon as a giant step for mankind.

But today is not 1969. In 1969 we did not have a \$4 trillion debt, we did not have a yearly budget deficit of \$300 billion, and we were not paying more to service our debt than any other segment of our budget outlays.

This is not about dreams for the future. This is about hard financial choices for today so that the future will be economically sound.

Recently a newspaper article indicated that at least 30 percent of the 17,000 people who are working on this project could in fact be released as excess.

In the past I have voted for space station because I felt that some of the limited scientific and medical evidence

could support that. But not today. Not today as we tell the American people that we have a deficit that must come under control. The \$16.5 billion even in this slimmed-down version is too much money for the limited scientific and medical evidence that we may achieve by putting the space station in space.

When I ran for Congress I had a small piglet. I called him Lester Pork, and I thought about Lester as I was thinking about this project. And I was thinking what Lester would say. We called him Les Pork. And I think if Lester were here today he would wink, and he would oink, and he would say this is the stuff that pigs are made of.

With all of our fiscal problems today, we cannot afford this. It has value for some medical and technological achievement. It will not solve our cancer problem. It will not solve the AIDS problem of this Nation.

□ 1310

But it will add to our deficit.

I would urge my colleagues to think of the future when they vote and to support the termination of the space station.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Chairman, I thank my ranking colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, for yielding me this time.

Madam Chairman, I want to express my deep appreciation for the bipartisan effort that has been put forth here today on the part of the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], and my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

One of my earliest memories about our effort in space involves my bathroom early in the morning in California several years ago. I was listening to the television set as I was shaving and getting ready to go to work. At the last moment, walking down the hall, I looked into our family room and saw my youngest boys, twin sons, as they watched our first blastoff sending a man into outer space.

As I listened to their conversation talking about the apogee and the epogee of that flight it struck me that, indeed, they had been inspired to discover the future. Those boys today are college professors looking to a new horizon for America's future in space and, indeed, you and I should recognize that America's history is a reflection of pioneer spirit. Our effort and the vote today for a station program can cause the next generation of young people to aspire to a future that includes manned exploration of space.

Mr. ROEMER. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KLEIN], a valuable member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. KLEIN. Madam Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] for their leadership on the amendment, and I commend as well the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], for his leadership on the committee.

As a member of the Science Committee, I am totally committed to continued American leadership in science. I am also committed to reducing our budget deficit and cutting Government spending. That kind of sound fiscal policy demands that we make hard choices, that we establish our priorities, and eliminate low priority programs. When I weigh the space station against such compelling national needs as health care reform, more police on the streets to fight crime, and more quality affordable housing, the space station falls short on any reasonable priority scale.

And in the area of scientific research, there are far more urgent programs to which we should devote our resources. For example, developing new technologies to create new industries and new jobs; developing environmentally sound and cost effective manufacturing techniques, research in the area of environmental protection, medical research here on Earth and development of a national information infrastructure.

I ask: How can we go home to our constituents and justify spending these huge sums of money on a project when six of its eight scientific missions have been abandoned and when so much of the money has been dissipated in administrative costs? As much as I value most of NASA's work, and support the overall space program, it has become apparent that the space station *Freedom* is a project that is lost in space.

Madam Chairman, I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to exercise sound fiscal judgment and support the Roemer amendment to bring to an end to throwing good money after bad.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD], who chairs the Subcommittee on Energy.

Mrs. LLOYD. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Roemer amendment and in strong support of the space station.

Again this year, we do have a great deal of controversy over this legislation and specifically space station *Freedom*.

However, we must realize the benefits and the possibilities that these projects hold out for every American. Maintaining a strong industrial base that incorporates the most advanced technologies and materials is very vital to our economic stability and our growth.

This space station should be seen as a contributor to our economic future and a giant leap forward in our technological and our scientific capabilities.

Madam Chairman, you know, we are not alone in our endeavor. The international community looks to us as the leader, and should we take the drastic step of cutting off our involvement with the space station, we would jeopardize our standing in the international community.

We know that Japan, that Canada, that the European Community all will have a permanent presence in space.

I would like to comment on the comments by the gentlewoman from Washington. I am one of those nine that did develop cancer, and I am a lucky one because I am a survivor, but I certainly hope that we can look forward at the unique possibilities of a microgravity lab in a space station. I hope that we can have the longer missions to make this possible.

It is so important to establish an outpost in space.

So I would encourage all of my colleagues to support the space station *Freedom* program and the many other worthy projects that are encompassed in this legislative not only for our future but future generations of Americans.

Mr. ZIMMER. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Madam Chairman, the Senate is now talking about a budget proposal that will increase the public debt of this country by \$1 billion a day. That overspending hurts our chances for a good future. Decisions on whether or not to vote for budget cuts, such as the space station, should be predicated on our overall goals to help our economic recovery and stop a decline in the standard of living of Americans. In this regard, space station *Freedom* is indefensible and fiscally unjustified.

The money could more appropriately be spent on encouraging science and research projects to develop new technologies for American companies in order to increase productivity and our competitive position with other countries of the world. Some speakers have suggested we could get a lot of research information from the space station. The fact is, we have already signed away America's exclusive rights to this information to other countries. We have signed intergovernmental agreements that would share research findings with Japan and other countries.

Madam Chairman, if we are going to put billions and billions of dollars into research, then I suggest that it is in America's best interest to fund the kind of research efforts that could be best used by Americans in America, to improve our competitive edge, to improve our economy, and to increase the number of good jobs that are available.

Borrowing money to spend on this project is a luxury that we cannot afford. Each year that we sink more money into this pie in the sky boondoggle makes it that much more difficult to reconsider. Let us put this project on hold while it is still in the planning stages and until this country deals with our most important priorities.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER].

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Madam Chairman, first of all, I would like to salute the leadership of our chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], and the cooperation that we have had between Republicans and Democrats on this vital technological project.

I rise in opposition to the amendment, while at the same time not only saluting the ranking member and my chairman, but also saluting the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER], who provided the leadership in their own way for the things that they believe in about the space station. Their constructive criticism has actually helped improve this program.

Budgets have been cut and costs have been brought under control. The space station now is on track, and its potential is greater now than it was perhaps because of those people who are providing loyal opposition to the project itself. It is actually much greater in its potential than when it was approved by Ronald Reagan back in 1984.

Unlike then, we now have the option of working with our former enemies in space. When Ronald Reagan first approved this station, it was in the height of the cold war. Today we are looking at this station as an example of cooperation for all mankind. Our former enemies can work with us in order to build a celestial beacon of cooperation, of peace, of progress, and, yes, of freedom.

□ 1320

In gravity-free research we can find things that we could not find on Earth. Yes, we have heard about that; medical achievements, scientific investigations and achievements that are impossible on Earth. But that is not the main reason why we are supporting space station *Freedom*. Space station *Freedom* represents humankind's potential; it represents not only scientific and not only medical research, but it symbolizes, as our chairman said, an outpost for mankind, a way station for mankind's future.

I see the space station serving as a way station for Moon colonization and commercial endeavors in space that will enrich our country and all of humankind.

Thus I would ask support of the space station *Freedom* and ask my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. ROEMER. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT], a freshman Member.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Madam Chairman, I love our space program. As a child I watched American astronauts walk in space and land on the Moon. These were incredible moments, accomplishments that stirred patriotic feelings among all of us.

Americans love the space program because we are a nation of dreamers who think that nothing is beyond our grasp, that nothing is too difficult for us to accomplish. Unfortunately, in the case of the space station, our dreams far exceed what our budget can afford.

Just as parents have to tell their children that the family cannot afford that trip to Disney World or that Nintendo game, we as a nation must admit that the money just is not there.

Now is the time to do that with the space station. And it is the time for Members of Congress who claim they want to cut Federal spending to actually do it.

The National Taxpayers Union calls the space station "one of the most technologically indefensible and fiscally unjustifiable Government ventures." If you are for cutting spending, this is where you should start.

This amendment is not a vote against the space program. It is not a vote against space research. The fact of the matter is that the space station funding is crowding out other more important research funding. The space program will flourish without the space station.

It is time to tell the dreamers that we just cannot keep throwing money into the black hole that is the space station. It is wonderful to dream, but we cannot keep paying for our dreams with our children's money. We cannot afford it anymore.

This vote is a vote on our deficit. If you vote for the amendment, you are voting to cut the deficit that our children will be forced to pay by over \$10 billion. Rather than leaving them with a fiscal nightmare, let us do the right thing and approve the amendment.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Madam Chairman, I rise today in full support of H.R. 2200, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act and in strong opposition to the amendment offered by Mr. ROEMER and Mr. ZIMMER to terminate space station *Freedom*. Less than three decades ago Neil Armstrong captured the hearts and imaginations of the young and old around the world as he took those first few steps on the Moon. The words "one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind" still resonate with the sound of American achievement that has never been equaled.

It is now the dawn of a new era where international cooperation in the final frontier will serve all mankind and planet Earth. The development of space station is already pushing the envelope on international cooperation. NASA's flagship program will be an international research laboratory where partnerships with Canada, Japan, and the European Space Agency will bind together a common desire to explore and advance science and technology.

Ladies and gentlemen, what would it have been if about 501 years ago Isabel and Ferdinand had said, "We don't have the money. We can't afford it, Christopher, for you to try to find a new route?" What would this world be today? What are we saying today when we, if we defeat the space station *Freedom*, if we approve the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER]? If you do, you are forever foreclosing manned activity on the Moon, man's habitat on the Moon, man going to Mars. Yes, that is all possible. Without the space station, it will never happen; not going to happen, folks.

What vision have you of our space program? It is a lot different than my vision. My vision of the future in space includes man going to Mars and man living on the Moon, not just here on Earth.

You know, we have the space station already; a lot of people have not recognized it. But you are sitting on it right now. It is Earth.

We have had a lot of frontiers on this Earth, but surely some of you, like I, can look beyond Earth and see new frontiers. This country, this mighty Nation, is still the No. 1 Nation, and to stand in this well and to say that we can no longer afford to have visions, we can no longer as a people afford to look to the future, to dream a little bit, we can no longer afford to do what John F. Kennedy did; we can no longer afford vision nor dreams. We can no longer afford the future. All we have is what we have now as far as space is concerned. The only space station without freedom that you are ever going to have is the one that you have now, and that is Earth.

Mr. ZIMMER. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Madam Chairman, as a strong NASA supporter and a science and space aficionado this Member rises in opposition to funding the space station and in support of the amendment to delete funding for NASA's proposed space station. At a time of huge budget deficits, unmet domestic needs, and more appropriate NASA priorities, construction and operation costs of the space station are projected to reach an incredible and unacceptable \$120 billion. Al-

ready, \$8.5 billion has been poured into this black hole. Yet, the tangible benefits of this project are quite unpredictable, and recent discoveries have revealed countless arguments against, or obstacles to, the project's successful completion and operation of originally described missions. Too many missions were simply dreamed up to justify the space station instead of a legitimate focus first on legitimate missions that are justifiable.

There is, perhaps, no more telling demonstration of the infeasibility and impracticality of the space station program than the desperate attempts of the administration to force *Freedom's* planners to drastically reduce the costs of this enormous science project. Despite having requested alternative designs which would cost \$5, \$7, and \$9 billion over 5 years, the President was forced to choose from three alternatives that all exceeded the \$9 billion design. Now, we have been informed by the President that he has decided to choose a scaled-down version of the space station which will cost less than the space station *Freedom's* planners now estimate. Madam Chairman, given the complete unreliability of former estimates, this Member has no reason to believe that the latest estimate will be any more accurate.

Madam Chairman, we need to face the fact that many of the proposed missions and research applications of *Freedom* have been cut or rejected. At the same time costs have increased dramatically. Nevertheless, supporters of grandiose science projects like the superconducting super collider and the space station criticize opponents for abandoning science. However, in fact, opponents of these grandiose science projects are probably America's science protectors. Instead of focusing attention on just a few hugely expensive projects with little in guaranteed benefits, we prefer to place American science dollars on numerous, innovative projects with higher prospects for far greater returns for the money spent.

Madam Chairman, this Member urges his colleagues to support the Zimmer-Roemer amendment to delete funds for the space station, a glamorous, cost-ineffective project this Nation and American basic and applied science cannot afford and should not undertake. The space station is a well-intended, exciting project that is now clearly a costly boondoggle which is primarily supported for cost-ineffective parochial, geographic, and industrial reasons.

Madam Chairman, the arguments of the proponents in behalf of the space station are well-intended, but I am intellectually offended by the bogus and sometimes far-fetched scientific and medical facts that have been given by various sources to the proponents. We should all be offended by them.

If your constituents had the facts and the results of research we have been

given, they would overwhelmingly say this is the wrong scientific investment for their tax dollars.

Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to load and fire the silver bullet by voting for the Zimmer-Roemer amendment to kill this gluttonous turkey now. It is starving too many truly valuable research and science projects.

□ 1330

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

Mr. HOKE. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to this amendment and in strong support for the space station.

I want to bring just two points to bear on this debate. First of all, I think the Members of this body need to know that a vote for this amendment, that is, a vote to kill the space station is nothing less than a vote to kill manned and womanned exploration of space by the United States of America for the foreseeable future. Let us make no mistake about that.

This is not a vote for a substitute. This is not a vote for some other kind of manned exploration. This will be the end of our manned-womanned exploration of space for decades in the future.

What will happen as a result of that is that we will also abdicate our world leadership with respect to the technologies that drive manned space exploration, with respect to the private sector spinoffs in industry that come from the technology, with respect to the intellectual leadership, the exploratory leadership, and indeed the spiritual leadership that comes from being the premier pioneer of manned and womanned space voyages.

I would like to make another point that I have not heard made this afternoon, and that has to do with the fact that the United States has already entered into express commitments of our word as a nation with the Japanese, the Canadians, and a consortium of European nations with respect to the space station.

As a result of these commitments, those countries have already spent \$3.6 billion and are committed to a total amount of expenditures of over \$8 billion.

And even if we unilaterally shut this program down tomorrow, it is too late for those countries to keep from spending the money that they have already wasted in that event, and that will be required to be shut down.

Madam Chairman, if we in this Congress repudiate America's commitment to our allies around the world, we do two very damaging things. First of all, we cause them to waste extraordinary amounts of money, and second and more disturbing to me is that we have reneged on a solemn commitment. We have broken our word as a nation, and

as the prophet said, "As you sow, so shall you reap."

Mr. ROEMER. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to another distinguished freshman, the gentlewoman from Missouri [Ms. DANNER].

Ms. DANNER. Madam Chairman, Will Rogers, the well-known humorist, once said, "I don't make jokes. I just watch the Government and report the facts. I have never found it necessary to exaggerate."

Or it might even be, as magician David Cooperfield might say, "Slight of hand which you see is not necessarily what you get."

The space station was supposed to have been in operation by 1994, next year. We did not get it.

Now the projection is somewhere in the neighborhood of the year 2,000. It was supposed to have cost \$8 billion. Now we are hearing figures ranging up to \$40, \$50, \$60, and \$70 billion.

Not only would it greatly exceed the projected cost, but it has been redesigned five times in 9 years.

With these redesigns has come a reduction in the scientific goals of the project. We are now at a point where the scientific mission of the space station is questionable.

In these tight budgetary times, times in which there are discussions of cutting such important programs as Medicare and Medicaid, can we justify to the American people a project which has few scientific merits and will, at conservative estimates, cost the American people well over \$40 billion?

I have heard people say we need to cut spending. I believe all Americans feel that we need to cut unnecessary spending.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER], whose district houses the Marshall Space Center.

Mr. CRAMER. Madam Chairman, I thank the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the Space Subcommittee for yielding me this time.

We have hammered out some tough issues through the committee hearings and have held NASA's feet to the fire on both sides of the aisle.

This is NASA's reauthorization bill that forges the space station program, so I rise in strong opposition to the Roemer-Zimmer amendment here.

I have listened to these arguments and I want to make my pitch to the Members of this body, and particularly the new Members.

Did we just wake up today and figure that we have a deficit now, and now we want to take care of this program?

Did we wake up today and decide that the house that has been built and is three-quarters built is a house that we cannot afford and consequently we need to walk away from it?

That is not the way my constituents want to see Government work, and

that is not a part of a process that I want to be a part of, at any rate.

The arguments that are being made today in support of this amendment to kill the space station are just years too late. It is irresponsible for this Government to walk away or for us to leave NASA holding an \$8 billion bag here.

Now, other proponents of this amendment have talked about the spurious arguments that those space station supporters have made about medical issues, and I wish those proponents could have been present this morning at a breakfast that our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ANDREWS] sponsored, where we heard from physicians from Texas who talked about the incredible process that they are involved in, even with other countries, where the Japanese and where the French, using the technology from the aerospace program, using it to make surgery more effective, using it for transplant issues, using it in incredible ways that would allow us to see cures down the line and breakthroughs that benefit people all over this country.

Madam Chairman, this is a people issue. It is too late to walk away from this space station program. It is a responsible thing to do.

Let us quit whining here. Let us look at what we are really doing. Let us not lose this battle to the bigger political issue of the deficit. Let us be responsible and let us support this program.

So I urge my colleagues to vote against the Roemer amendment.

Mr. ZIMMER. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PORTER. Madam Chairman, I support the Romer-Zimmer amendment. I am not an expert, Madam Chairman, in science, but I know what we can afford, and I know that we cannot afford a manned space station. It will have to be deferred until we can put our fiscal house in order.

Earlier the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] said that wonderful technologies were developed through the manned space program, and I am sure that this is true.

He said there would be potentially wonderful technologies developed from the space station, and I am sure this is also true. But he also said that if we did not proceed, Japan, Europe, or Russia, would be there first, and I am sure that this is not true. In fact, it is ludicrous. Each of those economies are in deep trouble, more than our own, and if we shut down, they shut down. If we are going to compete in this way, it will not be a race into space, it will be a race into bankruptcy.

Others in this debate have said that NASA is the choice to find cures for AIDS and cancer.

This administration, in fact, is willing to put money into a manned space

station and the SSC, and yet if you look at their budget carefully, they have suggested to us a 1-percent increase in the National Institutes of Health, the place where we will, in fact, ultimately, find the cures for AIDS and cancer and diabetes.

That is bad prioritizing, Madam Chairman. Science is going to have to contribute through NASA to bring down this deficit.

Let me leave you with one statistic for your scientific consideration. An average young American, like those in the gallery today, going into the work force will have to pay during his or her working lifetime \$200,000 in extra taxes, that is extra before any money is spent by this country on science or defense or transportation or welfare or anything else, \$200,000 each if they are an average American just to pay his or her share of the interest on the debt that we have accumulated to this point, money that they will not have available for the purchase of a home, for the education of their children or to start a business, money that they will have to pay to service that terrible, huge burden of debt.

□ 1340

This, Madam Chairman, is fiscal child abuse. We are abusing the young people of this country, and it has to stop. Science has to make a contribution to doing that. Sure, we want a space station, but it will have to wait. We have higher responsibilities.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Madam Chairman, space station *Freedom* will enable us to safely continue mankind's epic journey into space. It will be an international research laboratory, advancing science and technology, as well as expanding the human presence in space.

Today, we have heard a number of our distinguished colleagues from both sides of the aisle eloquently expounding upon the tangible benefits of space station *Freedom*—benefits and advances to our critical technologies, our global competitiveness, our space exploration, our economic stability, and our international cooperation, among others.

I take the floor now to address another benefit to be derived, which although intangible is, I believe, absolutely no less important—this is the benefit of the space station upon our educational system and its impact upon our Nation's youth.

Education, through exploration and discovery, is the best stimulant for the young mind. In our Nation's scientific classrooms, from our universities to our secondary schools to our elementary schools, space exploration is serving as an educational inspiration.

Space programs have always been an important impetus for the youth of our Nation, linking their imagination and

sense of adventure to the practical study of mathematics and basic sciences.

For example, in 1961, when President Kennedy challenged this country to embark on the Apollo moon program, he inspired thousands of students to pursue studies in science and engineering.

And by 1969, when Apollo 11's lunar lander touched down in the Sea of Tranquility, the number of science and engineering doctorates awarded in the United States had jumped 150 percent.

The Apollo program successfully stimulated our Nation's young people to learn science and engineering. For today's youth, who have no personal knowledge of the Apollo program, space station *Freedom* has become a critical and powerful catalyst for stimulating academic interest and enthusiasm in space and science.

The space station is capturing the imaginations of American students and is helping guide many of them to careers in technically demanding fields, such as math, science, and engineering, which are necessary to maintain a work force capable of competing in the global marketplace. We in Congress have all recognized that there is a dwindling source of graduates in these areas from our Nation's school systems.

Although it is being conceived by, and constructed in our generation, the real beneficiaries of the space station's unique laboratory environment will be our future generations. Mr. Chairman, we must all understand that the key to our Nation's continued preeminence in space lies in the future of our youth.

A continuous supply of scientific talent is necessary to sustain our technological and economic competitiveness in the world. Our ability to lead in space, our quality of life, and the very security of our Nation is at stake. Space station *Freedom* can be an important link in achieving all of these objectives.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Zimmer-Roemer amendment and continue investing in our next generation by supporting the space station.

Mr. ROEMER. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], a distinguished leader on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I do not mind funding science; I really hate like heck to fund science fiction. And in my view it is science fiction to suggest that we really can afford to spend this kind of money on this program.

Madam Chairman, in 1984 we were told it would cost about \$8 billion to build this flying turkey. It has been redesigned a number of times since then. Now NASA says that this will cost about \$57 billion over the life of the program to construct and to operate. GAO estimated the old design, before

the redesign, would be well over a hundred billion dollars if we take all costs over the extended life of the program.

Madam Chairman, let me suggest to my colleagues that that is the equivalent to what we spend for EPA in 16 years. It is the equivalent to what we spend on child care in a hundred years. It is the equivalent to what we spend at the National Cancer Institute over 50 years.

Madam Chairman, it just seems to me that this package is designed more to fly politically than it is to fly scientifically. We know how the game goes. NASA comes in. They low-ball the cost estimate, they get the Congress hooked on the project. Once it is being built, Madam Chairman, they say, "Well, gee whiz, fellows, you can't stop now because it's going to cost you money. You're going to waste all of the money you've already invested, just like the B-1, just like the B-2, just like star wars, just like you name it, program after program."

Madam Chairman, that is what has happened to this Congress because we have listened to agencies we should not have listened to. I would suggest that we simply cannot afford this flying turkey. We cannot afford it despite the fact that NASA gets this thing to fly politically by salting contracts in hundreds of congressional districts around the country so that we have people from every district calling and saying, "Oh, gee whiz, we got a piece of that. You just have to go ahead and support it."

Madam Chairman, I suggest to my colleagues that we cannot afford it. Our budget is too squeezed. We have other priorities. I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN], a member of our committee.

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] and to cast my vote for the redesigned space station, cautiously optimistic that the program will achieve several critical objectives:

First, it will be on time, on budget and on mission.

Second, it will force the reorganization, even reinvention, of NASA, and that reinvention will reinvigorate NASA's other important missions in science, exploration, R&D, and aeronautics.

Third, a hard freeze on station funding at \$10.5 billion over 5 years will free up funds for programs to develop a new modern expendable launch vehicle to compete with the Europeans, Russians, and Chinese, and leapfrog technologies such as single-stage-to-orbit and low-cost high-thrust rocket engines; to reinvigorate the planetary exploration program and accelerate the frequency of Atlas-Delta class planetary probes;

to undertake a series of low-cost, smaller earth science programs enhancing our knowledge of the Earth and its immediate environment; and to invest in space technology including the advanced x-ray telescope [AXAF].

At a time of scarce resources and in light of NASA's dismal record on this program, it is hard to resist the arguments of my colleague from Indiana, Mr. ROEMER. He is courageously defending the taxpayer's interest as he sees it. And he is right that NASA has been more captivated by Buck Rogers than by responsible control over your bucks and mine.

Concern has also been raised about the safety of the scaled down mission, though NASA responds that a well managed redesign will, in fact, be safer than the bloated version.

This Member is persuaded that we can introduce the prose of good management to the poetry and benefits of station's mission. And I am prepared to undertake a big portion of the oversight needed to assure that this time, NASA gets it right.

In long personal conversations in recent days with NASA Administrator Dan Goldin, aerospace executives in my district, experts on the Vest Commission, my subcommittee Chair, Mr. HALL, and committee Chair, Mr. BROWN, I conditioned my support of station on massive cutbacks in NASA overhead, centralization of program management, and full funding of NASA's other priorities. As a space Subcommittee member, I will carefully monitor what develops and bring my own business background to bear in assessing progress.

The space station program will, I hope, be spared today, but a clear message will be delivered. Focus, discipline, careful planning and sound business practice must become NASA's organizing principles—starting now.

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

Madam Chairman, I listened carefully to the gentlewoman's statements, and I must say that they represent a triumph of hope over experience. The very programs that she thinks are going to be freed up somehow by this space station program are the very programs that have been cancelled or deferred because of the insatiable appetite of the space station program, and there are no plans in the administration or in the committee to restore those programs.

□ 1350

The advanced x-ray study was a wonderful program that was twice delayed because of the space station program. The same with the space exploration initiatives. The same with the new launch vehicle and Earth science initiatives. Every item the gentlewoman mentioned is in trouble because of the space station.

Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. INGLIS], an outstanding freshman Member.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan amendment that would save the taxpayers a significant amount of money and is something we can surely do this day in a bipartisan way.

Madam Chairman, the space station, like many other programs that we could be about, is a good program, and it may have significant scientific advantages. But I liken it much to the situation of a private company contemplating building a brand new headquarters and research facility.

If a private corporation is in good shape, if its debts are low and its profits are high, it has an opportunity to build a brand new glass and steel and marble structure called its new headquarters, with a research facility attached to it.

But if that company is losing money, and if that company is in debt, it just has to get along with the 1950's brown-green carpet it has on the floor, and it cannot afford to build one of those brand new glass and steel and marble structures.

Madam Chairman, that is the situation I think we are in right now in the U.S. Congress. We are about to bankrupt this country. We are \$4 trillion in debt. It is not the time to be building a brand new glass and steel and marble structure as the headquarters building. It is time to stop projects like this, to put them on hold for a while, and get the fiscal house of this Government in order and save some of this money we are otherwise spending to add to our \$4 trillion national debt.

I would also like to say that in hearing some of the speakers, I have heard that this is the only thing that could characterize an American vision. That going to Mars or being part of a manned space station is the only thing that can characterize American vision.

Well, I reject that analysis. There are a lot of other things that characterize American vision. One of them that I think we should all be about in this country right now is getting this fiscal house in order and getting a handle on the \$4 trillion national debt. If we do that, that is a significant vision for us here, the 435 Members here to be about, and that is something that would be tremendously beneficial to the American people, to state that vision, to reinvent government, to make it more efficient, downsized, and right-sized. That is a good vision for America. It is not simply found in space exploration.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of our space station mission. The United

States is clearly the world's only superpower. We are the world's leader. We are the world's leader militarily, we are the world's leader politically, and we have got to remain the world's leader technologically. How can we be the world's leader if we are not the world's leader?

When you look at programs like this, at putting a man on the Moon, for instance, there was an enormous spinoff from this. There was a spinoff in education, a spinoff in the economic community. In Maryland alone there are 275 companies that directly owe their existence to spinoff from this program.

Madam Chairman, the plea is made that we do not have enough money. Let me point out that even poor people go out to dinner once in a while or buy a pizza and bring it in. I think that the amount of money spent on this program is a relatively small amount of money compared to a \$1,600,000,000,000 yearly budget.

Another very important thing is that Americans need to feel good about themselves. Those of you who can remember the decade we spent putting a man on the Moon remember how good we felt about ourselves. We need that feeling again.

When Willie Sutton was asked why did he rob banks, his response was because that is where the money is. If you ask me why we should put this effort into the space station, I will tell you that is where the future is.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the space station.

Mr. ROEMER. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY], a distinguished fiscal leader in the Democratic Party.

Mr. PENNY. Madam Chairman, our offices have been flooded with phone calls, letters and even faxes—all bearing the same message: Cut spending first. It sounds simple, but we have been through the deficit landmines before and we know how difficult it is.

Outside of the entitlement programs, there are only a few big ticket items that offer significant potential for both short-term and long-term savings. One of these is the space station which we are considering today, and the other is the superconducting super collider, which we will have an opportunity to tackle later this week.

The question is not what to cut, but what do we have the will to cut?

If we vote for the Roemer-Zimmer amendment to cancel funding for space station *Freedom* does it mean an end to our dreams for the future? No. To the contrary, killing this project may well protect our children by helping reduce the deficit which, like a Jurassic Park clone, moves across the land devouring their future.

If we vote for the Roemer-Zimmer amendment, have we closed the door on the technological advances that have characterized the space program? No,

according to many scientists, including Doctor Park of the American Physical Society, the technology used to put humans into space is the proven, shelf-stable version of the 1970's. Doctor Park put it aptly when he said: "There is more technological sophistication in an \$80 point-and-shoot camera than in space station *Freedom*." Clearly, we can accomplish better space science through other NASA programs, including the Earth Observing System.

If we vote for the Roemer-Zimmer amendment will we alienate our international partners? First of all, they are not wildly enthusiastic about our program. It doesn't make sense for the United States to spend tens of billions just because our partners may spend a few.

If we vote for the Roemer-Zimmer amendment haven't we destroyed jobs in many areas, especially in the already beleaguered aerospace industry? That's a tough question, because it does affect jobs in 39 States around the country, including some in my own district. But it does not make sense to spend tens of billions of dollars to support a few thousand jobs producing a dubious product, which gets more dubious by the day as it is reformed and revised by this administration. This is just simply not good business. And it is never good business to continue pouring good money after bad. We have been down that road before. We should stop going down this road on this project.

NASA Administrator Daniel Goldin has said that this country is at a crossroads with its space program, and I agree. We are at a crossroads. I would say that it is time for us to boldly go where no Congress has gone before. Let us make a dramatic step for deficit reduction. Let us kill the space station.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, might the Chair inform Members how much time remains on each side?

The Chairman pro tempore (Mr. WISE). The gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] has 14 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has 26½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] has 24 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

□ 1400

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of NASA and the space station. This Nation needs NASA and the space station—it needs a forward-looking, bold, and risk-taking organization that sees to the future needs of our society, to the bold exploration of the unknown, and to the questions we will face in the next century.

Thirty years ago, President John F. Kennedy argued for a strong national space program. He said we go into space, not because it is easy, but because it is hard. Meeting the challenge of the space frontier gave us national prestige, but that was neither the only reason for NASA 30 years ago, nor is it the only prize we take away from our conquest of space today.

Now we have a chance to define a new era in the wake of the cold war, an era with new opportunities for peaceful cooperation in space among the nations of the world. The space program can be a catalyst for peaceful cooperation. We need a world-class space agency to help us open those new vistas of opportunity.

An integral part of NASA is the space station. We are building the space station to enable human beings to safely continue mankind's epic journey into space. The space station will be valuable to us in areas of competitiveness, education, exploration, and international cooperation. This is a partnership of the United States, Canada, Japan, and the European nations which will allow the United States to maintain our leadership in space and continue to be a premier player into the 21st century. NASA, with the space station, will again capture the attention and imagination of American students and motivate them to study the areas of math, science, and engineering, which are necessary to help us maintain a work force capable of competing in the global marketplace. Today, the space station represents thousands of jobs for Americans which help strengthen this Nation economically. If you kill space station, you also kill the American space industry. Let us keep America's leadership in space and refuse to hamstring our future by foolishly cutting funds for our space station.

I believe a society that does not dare to dream, a society that isn't willing to take risks, a society that has forgotten how to be bold, is a society in great peril, a society in decline. History has shown that the great nations have been those that had a spark of risk-taking, of adventure, of being willing to operate at the frontiers of knowledge and exploration. We still yearn for that in this country; we still expect our Nation to do great things and tackle the great unknowns. NASA does that for our society.

Through the small investment, in relation to our budget, we make in NASA and the space station, we Americans are able to see new horizons and explore new frontiers. We know already, with the certainty of three decades of evidence, that these expeditions into the unknown have paid off with new knowledge, new techniques, and new products. You cannot walk into a hospital today without being touched by the wonders that came to us from

space exploration. Our daily lives are shaped by the digital revolution going on all around us, and NASA not only helped usher in that revolution, but has kept it going with new ideas and new products year after year.

We lay the foundation for our future in this small corner of the vast Federal budget. We owe it to ourselves, to our Nation, and especially to our children to keep this dream alive.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my support of the Roemer-Zimmer amendment to eliminate the space station.

In an era of \$300 billion-plus budget deficits, the space station remains one of the most scientifically indefensible and fiscally unjustifiable projects backed by the Federal Government.

The project was only expected to cost taxpayers \$8 billion when first proposed in 1984. More than that has already been spent by NASA, with little to show for these expenditures.

The GAO recently projected the original space station *Freedom* design at a total cost of a staggering \$158 billion. Who can say exactly how much a lesser version of the station will end up costing taxpayers?

The whole redesign effort only serves to illustrate that we can never significantly cut the space station's cost without sacrificing its few identifiable functions. Rather than turning our back to reality, we need to face up to the responsibility to make intelligent choices geared toward easing the strain on the Federal budget.

In short, continuing the space station program is bad science, foolish fiscal policy, and a poor way to set our national priorities. I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON].

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, when I find myself down the line in debate, it is hard to be original, so let me try to recast some of the ideas and put them in perspective.

I have absolutely no proprietary interest in this whatsoever. Certainly, there are scientific projects that have got to be controlled. No question about that. But also there are things like the space station, which cannot be judged on a short-term basis. If we did it that way, we would not do it at all.

Also, we are not sure what we can garner from space science, but we do know what we have seen so far, that there is vast potential there in terms of energy, the environment, understanding, instruments, people, analysis, materials. We are in a revolution of many forms but one of them is materials sciences, composites, metallics, inorganics.

Also, economics are driven by two things. One is the economy of scale.

The second is science. And since 95 percent of the world's population and the economy is moving away from this, we must concentrate on science.

Therefore, we have got to look for leadership in science. If we do not, it is no fun to be second. And space is one of those frontiers, as was TVA in the old days and the Manhattan project.

Although most science is privately sponsored, every so often there is a project, a big item, that has to be sponsored by the Government. It makes the big leagues. It makes the other things possible. It makes fallouts in terms of jobs and science and new opportunities and improvement in our balance of trade possible.

I ask my colleagues this: In this age of cost cutting, if I told my colleagues about a project that could put us in the No. 1 spot in the most exciting new area of science, which inexorably produced new jobs and new opportunities and almost guarantees fallout in a variety of different areas, which I have described, and at the same time saved 30 percent of the people's costs, I think they would think it was a pretty good idea.

I urge my colleagues to defeat Roemer, and I urge them to support the space station.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to another distinguished freshman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STRICKLAND], a member of both the Committee on Education and Labor and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Chairman, this debate is about choices. Some choices are difficult. Others are easy. This is not a difficult choice for me.

My list of priorities contains many programs that are far more critical to the well-being of this country than is the space station. I would love to say that we had a space station. Who would not? I would also love to have every child who is eligible for Head Start be enrolled. I would love to say to my constituents, the Federal Government has so much money we are going to give you a tax break this year. But that is not reality.

What is reality? Reality is facing up to the ever-escalating budget deficit. Reality is cutting Medicare and veterans benefits in order to meet deficit reduction goals. Reality is 125,000 of my constituents without health insurance, 35 percent of whom are children. Reality is an American community where infrastructures are crumbling.

Cutting the space station at this time is a responsible decision. It is the right decision. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA].

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the amendment to terminate the space station program.

Before I begin my remarks, I wish to point out that a statement by Speaker FOLEY in strong support of the space station will be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The distinguished Speaker of the House, like so many of us in this Chamber, knows that a first-rate American space program is not a luxury, it is a competitive necessity.

Mr. Chairman, for several years now Congress has debated the merits of the Space Station Program. As a result, the program has undergone several examinations and redesigns.

Following his election, President Clinton called for yet another redesign and eventually recommended a plan similar to that supported in H.R. 2200; that is, a space station plan that retains the major attributes of the current space station design, but which achieves significant cost reductions—especially in the management and operation of the program.

Mr. Chairman, each time the Members of this body have come to the floor to argue the worth of the space station we have voted overwhelmingly to continue our involvement—and our investment—in the program.

Still, there are those Members who oppose the space station and argue that we must cut the looming deficit. I imagine that many of those same Members voted to support the President's stimulus package when it reached the floor. I would point out to them that, if the Congress cancels the Space Station Program, we will directly and indirectly cut 70,000 jobs.

But what really is at stake here, Mr. Chairman, is much more than the space station. What is at stake is our international competitiveness and ability to succeed economically.

I have often pointed out that it was no accident that the most dramatic growth in our high-technology industries paralleled the years of NASA's greatest activity and accomplishment.

A first-rate Space Program is today a competitive necessity, made more so by the fact that aerospace employment in the United States is now approaching 7 percent of all American manufacturing jobs. In addition, the return on investment for NASA has been estimated at \$7 to \$9 for every \$1 spent.

And as importantly, as defense spending continues to decline in the years ahead, many high-technology industries will find themselves in jeopardy unless the United States commits itself—as I believe it should—to use those resources for our civilian space program.

Unfortunately, our space program will continue to remain at risk from cynics, and from those who are unwilling to commit to long-term national policies and stick with them.

I agree wholeheartedly that the United States can ill-afford to throw money at programs that neither justify their

means, nor meet their stated ends. That is why it is so essential to set clear priorities and stick with those that are attainable, affordable, and in the best interest of the Nation.

There are many spending priorities that are essential to a more productive U.S. economy. These include education, national health care, job training, energy policy, and transportation.

The space station is also such a priority.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that human exploration of our solar system and the universe is both desirable and inevitable. I also believe that the United States must be at the forefront of this effort. But that can only occur when we achieve permanent manned capability aboard the space station.

Mr. Chairman, the space station is a necessary building block to whatever we decide our specific future goals in space will be.

I strongly urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment to kill the space station program.

□ 1410

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA].

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, today I do not want to spend my time debating the merits of the science of the space station. There will no doubt be some benefit from the spinoffs of that program. I recognize the importance of research and development. I came from a company that spent 15 years researching, developing, and growing into one of the most successful companies in this country.

However, there comes a time when our programs must be reevaluated. Congress must control spending and show restraint. I hope that the vote on this issue does begin an era of costcutting. Today, we know that that has not been the case for Congress.

This year we face another \$250 billion deficit. We have a \$4 trillion debt. When a company continues to run deficits of 20 or 25 percent, they are required to cut costs, increase sales, or do whatever it takes to show a profit.

Typically, research and development is one of the last areas that a company faces cuts in, when they are facing tough times. That is why I do not like to cut R&D; but I believe that that is the situation we find ourselves in. We are unwilling to show restraint in other areas, so we ought to start taking a look at research and development.

The space station has shown itself to be one big black hole that continues to suck in the dollars of the American taxpayer. That is not appropriate. Congress has to learn to show discipline, to show restraint, and to show self-control. The problem is not an issue of science, it is Congress.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, we have had a long debate, and all the benefits of the space station and the space program have been enumerated. If the Members have lived any time at all since the 1960's, they know of all the wonderful things that we enjoy now because of the space program.

I want to answer some of our critics. Our critics of the space program in this country say that NASA is making mistakes and there are overruns, and we have to stop this. Yes, there have been some mistakes made, and there have been some overruns made. Some of the mistakes are legitimate and deplorable but most of the mistakes and overruns were because of poor management models.

Mr. Chairman, we correct that in this new redesign. I have been pushing very hard to make one prime contractor in charge of building the space station; to make one center, instead of six, in charge of building the space station; to have one program director in charge of building the space station. We have that in the redesign.

In fact, because of that management change, we get a lot or most of the savings that are realized in the redesign. Also, this is the first time that we have built a space station. We are going to run into mistakes, because it is the first time that we have built a space station. It just makes logical sense that we are going to make some mistakes.

It has been said, I think, on this floor that there is a lack of science. Dan Golden, Dr. Gibbons, and many others have said that most of the science that the Members voted for when they voted for space station *Freedom* will be done on space station *Freedom*-derived. So we are going to get a little bit less science, but if we are going to have these kinds of savings, we have to give up some science, but some very basic science, some very real science in all kinds of areas, will be done with this redesign.

To my colleagues on this side of the aisle and to the authors of the amendment that say, "We have to reduce the deficit," I have the amendment right here. I do not see anywhere in this amendment that says this savings is going to go to deficit reduction. We know how this place works. The freshmen that are against this, listen up. If the money is cut out of space station, it is going to go somewhere else.

I serve on the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations, and we can very easily, and it will be, take money from space station *Freedom* and put over into HUD, or as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STRICKLAND] has said, he has already made a list of things he wants to spend this money on: Medicare, veterans' benefits, health insurance, infrastructure.

We know where this money is going to go. This is going to go out of good,

basic science into warm, fuzzy programs that they are all for. That is why there will be no deficit reduction from this savings. We know how this House works.

The choice is, do we have a manned space program, do we have exploration of space, and do we excite our young people to get into these sciences? That is the choice.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair would announce that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] has 23 minutes remaining, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] has 9 minutes remaining, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] has 13 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has 21½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would just respond to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] by saying if he would like to work with me with report language or colloquy on very strong language to have this go directly to the deficit, I would be happy to work with him on that, if he would change his vote.

In the meantime, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Indiana [Mr. JACOBS].

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Members, have they ever noticed that some people are against any Federal spending that will not make a contractor richer? To the people all over the country, have they ever noticed that we have pretty short debates on things like college deferments during the Vietnam war, 60 seconds for the entire House, but debates where somebody can make some money rage on and on and on.

To quote the philosopher, Abe Martin, "There is always plenty of money for everything but the necessities."

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FINGERHUT].

Mr. FINGERHUT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am as frustrated as we all are with having 1 minute to lay out all of the arguments that we would like to make on behalf of this project and against the amendment. Let me confine myself to only one comment.

This new Member of Congress, along with the 110 others, has inherited many, many difficult problems for us to solve. In solving those problems, we must always keep our eyes on the future.

Mr. Chairman, I was 4 years old, I would say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS], when President Kennedy died. Little did I expect or have any notion that 30 years later I would be standing here as a Member of the House of Representatives with a responsibility to help keep that flame

alive, and not just out at Arlington National Cemetery, in the life of our Nation.

□ 1420

In protecting the future and reducing the deficit, I am going to do it in such a way keeps this country looking forward to the future. I urge opposition to the amendment.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time, and I congratulate Mr. ZIMMER and Mr. ROEMER for introducing this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is easy to cut spending in the abstract. It is easy to say that we have to confront our Federal deficit crisis in the abstract. But the Federal deficit crisis is not an abstraction; it is a reality. And to confront this reality means that we are going to have to make some very tough choices.

It is tough to say no. It is tough to set priorities, particularly when congressional districts across this country are going to have a piece of a particular project. But the reality is that there are things that we would like to do that we simply cannot afford to do. And what we need to do during those times is to say no.

Households across America understand this. Successful businesses across America understand this. It is time that we in Congress understand this.

Some proposals that have come to the floor, Mr. Chairman, have been labeled pie in the sky. This proposal is pork in the sky, and I think that it is time that we bring this pork down to Earth by supporting the amendment before us.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of space station *Freedom*.

I am pleased that President Clinton chose an option that closely resembles the current space station *Freedom* design and rise against the amendment to kill the program. Today I want to talk about the manufacturing processes involved in designing and manufacturing the SSF, as well as the project's importance in maintaining our dominance in the aerospace industry.

The SSF imposes new, incredibly challenging requirements on manufacturers and engineers. The space station is scheduled to spend between 10 and 30 years in orbit. During that time, astronauts cannot call the local repairman if the air-conditioning or plumbing fails and there will not be a lot of storage room for spare parts. So the engineers who design everything, from space toilets to environmental control systems, must build complex, self-regu-

lating systems that simply will not break down.

So space engineers must design systems that will function perfectly for 30 years. Manufacturers must manufacture parts that will function perfectly for 30 years. This 30-year function standard is without precedent in our industrial experience, and will set new standards of excellence throughout manufacturing in the decade to come.

For freshman Members of Congress who are voting on this issue for the first time, I urge you to tour some of the manufacturing facilities that are making components for the space station. I have, and let me tell you I have been amazed, as a Member who represents a manufacturing-oriented district, by the level of technological sophistication these companies possess and the implications of manufacturing other products to a 30-year function standard.

Consider the complexity in designing the environmental control systems that must recycle every ounce of air and moisture—from body sweat to all other bodily fluids—into water pure enough to drink and air to breathe. What we are learning in meeting this challenge will help us clean up underground pollution at Superfund sites and enable us to support research in hostile areas, such as in the depth of our oceans and the heat of our deserts. The SSF is a clear example of the critical and unique role Federal tax dollars play in scientific research.

Furthermore, and just as important, by building the SSF we will maintain our dominance in the aerospace industry. In 1990 we exported \$39.1 billion in aerospace products and had a \$27 billion positive balance of trade. But while we used to dominate the market with a 90-percent market share, we now have only 68 percent with the Europeans, Japanese, Russians, and Taiwanese poised to make significant gains. With military spending on aerospace R&D declining and defense conversion a challenge high on our agenda, maintaining SSF funding and the high skilled engineering and manufacturing jobs that funding supports is more critical now than ever.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues, that if we fail to build the space station, not only will we undercut our strength in aerospace and the science that underlies the products of the future, but we will open the door to a joint venture between the French and the Russians to build their space station. If we pass up building space station *Freedom* and the Russians accept French overtures for a joint venture the French and other European nations will close what is currently a 15-year technological gap with us and control the aerospace research that will create the next generation of aerospace products. As Charles Ordahl of McDonnell Douglas said, if we fail to build the

SSF "America will have lost the next generation of aerospace talent and its leadership role in a key high-tech arena." We have an obligation not only to ourselves but to all other nations which are aligned with us and to our young people who count on us for their career opportunities of the future, to direct and benefit from future discoveries that space station *Freedom* promises. I urge you to join me in defeating this amendment.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE], another distinguished freshman.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, this debate over the space station pits a bizarre bipartisan coalition on one side against a bizarre bipartisan coalition on another. We find that we have space science enthusiasts and Representatives of districts with substantial employment that would be affected by the termination of this program. On the other side we have people who are preoccupied with the problems of the deficit and our Nation's priorities.

I would simply ask two questions. First, would you support an income tax increase to finance this program? Second, if important programs are being cut or substantially scaled back in other areas, would you agree that the space station also should be subjected to that type of reduction or elimination?

I submit the answers to these questions are obvious. If we are not willing to pay for the space station with a tax increase, it must be a part of a reduction along with a substantial number of programs across our entire Federal budget and operation in order to balance the budget. That is the problem that we face.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, again, with regret, I yield only 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, today we face a decision of great importance: whether to continue as leaders in space, or follow more determined nations. The issue is a clear one: Killing the space station means stopping the space program dead in its tracks.

The space station is the platform of man's future in space. Though its mission has narrowed, its potential for reward has not. The weightless environment of space will provide an exceptional laboratory for science. In our future, man will make medical and scientific discoveries in space that we can not yet imagine. Today, men and women are preparing to meet these opportunities: cancer research, advanced treatments for disease, biomechanical devices, and perfectly formed semiconductor.

These promising advancements do not stand alone. In the weightless environment of space, biological materials

separate more completely and protein crystals grow larger and more perfectly, allowing us to develop new and purer forms of pharmaceuticals that can be used to treat disease like emphysema, high blood pressure, AIDS and cancer. Space physiology research can lead to treatment for osteoporosis, motion sicknesses, and diabetes. Research on the biotechnological and biomedical applications of cell, tissue, protein and molecular processes can lead to new insights into how our bodies work, grow and repair themselves.

Our trading partners understand the space station's potential; the Japanese, Canadians, Europeans, are all prepared to follow our leadership. If we renounce our commitment, they will surely look elsewhere. They will also move ahead of us in this fierce competition for the future.

We stand in the shadow of the end of the cold war, looking ahead to a new century with great challenge and responsibility. Our generation owes much to the leaders of the past, who made decisions that set America on a course of space exploration and achievement. And I refuse to believe, that history will say of us and our time: "They were the greatest, most powerful and successful nation on Earth, but when called upon, they faltered, they stood still and let the opportunities of their future pass them by."

Let us build the space station.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER].

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Chairman, I have a scientific background and others have spoken more eloquently to the science of this project. And I have a financial background, and the fiscal sides have been addressed.

But we must begin to remember that we are a nation of dreamers and frontiers. America was a frontier 500 years ago when government money sent Columbus here. And indeed, the Louisiana Purchase was too expensive for our Government to make, and yet it has enriched us all. American money sent Lewis and Clark west and opened the entire West to gold, and farming, and even wine production. And indeed, not that long ago Seward's folly was a folly that yielded the largest cache of oil since Texas.

Mr. Chairman, we must remain a nation of dreamers at the frontier. The only frontier left in the world is space, and it would indeed be a folly for us to turn our back on it.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to yet another distinguished freshman, the gentleman from North Dakota, [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Roemer-Zimmer amendment to eliminate funding for the space station *Freedom*.

I was 16 years old when we landed Neil Armstrong on the Moon as the first person to set foot on the Moon, an outstanding achievement for our space program. I believe then as I believe now that the United States must be a leader in space exploration.

This does not mean, however, that we can afford a totally open-ended financial commitment, and unfortunately, the space station *Freedom* represents such a commitment.

Today, the budget deficit threatens the very underpinnings of our Nation's economic security. The time to cut spending is now. We cannot afford to allow huge and hugely unsuccessful programs like the space station *Freedom* a death with honor, throwing billions of dollars at it as it leads to an inevitable termination some years down the road.

□ 1430

NASA has been scrambling to reconfigure the space station to meet lower cost projections.

Last week President Clinton announced he would favor a modified version at a 5-year cost of \$10.5 billion. Unfortunately, the unreality of this cost projection was quickly exposed as administration officials were unable to elaborate on either the revised space station design or how it would meet new cost limits. A more honest budget project is that completion of the project will take much more than this amount even to accomplish a substantially stripped-down mission.

I would like to emphasize that for me a "yes" vote on the Roemer-Zimmer amendment is not a vote against U.S. space exploration. It is not a vote against NASA. It is a vote against the space station *Freedom*, a project that is rapidly losing its scientific mission and values even as it continues to add billions to our staggering deficit.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I yield, again, an inadequate 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN], a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, let me just point out a couple of very simple facts in the brief time that I have.

First, not 1 dollar of NASA's budget, and certainly not a single dollar of the money spent on space station, is spent in space. It is spent in the good old U.S. of A., providing real jobs for real people doing really important work on the real issues of the future of this country: science and technology, medical research, engineering, jobs that will create the future economic strength of our country.

It has been said here today that NASA returns \$7 to \$9 to the economy for every dollar spent. There is no better investment in the future of America than investing in the technologies and the science that will keep America strong.

Let us defeat the Roemer amendment. Let us vote for the future of this country, its young people, its science, its technology, its economy. Let us vote for the space-station program.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT].

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, when President Kennedy promised to put a man on the Moon within a decade, Americans really did not understand much about the space program—but they supported it.

They supported it because they believed that man should not be bound by what he understood, but, rather, should be challenged by what it was possible to understand.

They supported it because they believed that the universe might hold secrets which could help people on Earth live better, longer, and more productive lives.

And, they supported it because they believed that it was part of the American dream to dream of things that had never been done before, and then do them.

Mr. Chairman, America needs the space station. We need it for biomedical research. We need it for biotechnology research. We need it for materials research. We need it for noise and vibration research. We need it for integrated circuit research. We need it for literally hundreds of scientific experiments.

But, most of all, Mr. Chairman, America needs the space station for the same reason we needed to send a man to the Moon.

We need the space station to continue the quest, to renew the dream.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOAGLAND], who has a very sharp whip.

Mr. HOAGLAND. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], for that kind introduction.

I want to join this amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER], two longtime friends, and praise them for bringing this to the floor.

I continue to oppose the space station, as difficult as it is, recognizing that we have many of our most capable scientists who have invested enormously in this project. But the reality is that we simply cannot afford it.

Estimates are that we could spend as much as \$100 billion over the 20-year lifetime of this project.

Americans today are running a \$300 billion annual deficit. We are suggesting to the American people deep cuts in Medicare, in food stamps, the earned-income tax credit, in our vital defense programs, in a whole range of programs that need to be cut back if we are to reduce the deficit. In light of this, I just

do not think it makes sense to fund a multibillion dollar space station.

If we are to turn this economy around and create jobs, we must reduce the deficit. That is what this spring's whole exercise is about. The administration presented a very difficult bill that many of us supported 3 weeks ago. We are asking Americans to sacrifice to reduce the deficit.

We are not going to turn around the economy, we are not going to create jobs for working families in America without reducing the deficit. In light of that, I cannot for the life of me see how we can support a project that could cost up to \$100 billion before all is said and done.

It is inevitable, colleagues, it is inevitable that this program is going to get postponed at some point, and as the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], recognizes, and all we are asking is that we postpone this 10 or 15 years until we can afford it. Let us just postpone it until we can afford it.

If we lose this amendment today, it is inevitable this project will be postponed at some point. If you look at the budget resolution, at the budget limits for the next 5 years, there is no way we are going to be able to sustain this program even if we approve it today.

I think it makes sense to discontinue it now while it is still in the drawing stage before there has been a significant investment in hardware, put it behind us, make this definite decision today, as difficult as it is for all of us.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, a Congress that votes for huge foreign aid bills but kills the space station is un-American. A Congress that keeps military bases open overseas but closes the bases in Philadelphia is out of touch.

But to then kill our space future is un-American.

A Congress that will extend unemployment benefits and provide billions for retraining, yet kill our space future is out of sync with reality.

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker; 75,000 jobs in 40 States, high-technology jobs, scientists, and engineers, just the jobs that Congress keeps promising to all of these laid-off workers in America.

Now, I did not hear anybody suggest financing the foreign aid bill with a tax increase like I heard today, and I say on the House floor that a Member that will vote for foreign aid but kill the space industry in America is not only out of touch but, in my opinion, un-American.

□ 1440

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment. The gentleman means well, but this is not well-meaning for the future of America.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Member from Rhode Island, Mr. REED.

Mr. REED. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Roemer amendment to eliminate funding for the space station.

Today, the question before us is not, do we support space exploration and scientific research? The question is, how do we invest our scarce resources prudently and wisely? This amendment is about whether we are willing to listen to our constituents' calls for additional spending cuts to reduce the deficit. It is about making tough choices and deciding what this Nation's budget priorities are.

The space station is a wonderful idea, but unfortunately, the space station is an incredibly expensive goal with engineering and design problems, serious cost overruns, as well as no specific mission.

Now is not the time to continue funding for a program that has lost its way, it is a time to address down-to-earth issues like the deficit and the economy.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to remember their constituents when they cast their vote on this amendment.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the very eloquent gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, yet another vote on the space station program.

There is only one reason that you could even consider voting against this space station; that is if you are convinced that the United States has no future role to play in manned space.

Many people have supported the concept of a station but have in the past expressed reservations about this NASA program.

Well, if you were concerned about the cost of the program, you need to understand that the President assembled a redesign team and an independent blue ribbon advisory panel to undertake an extensive design review of the space station to cut its costs. We now have before us a space station program which will cost the taxpayers \$4 billion less in development costs over the next 5 years and \$18 billion less in operations costs over the life of the program.

If you were waiting to learn whether the President supports a space station program, you now have your answer. President Clinton continues the long-standing bipartisan support for this program by endorsing a redesigned

space station program and requesting that Congress fund the initiative.

If you are skeptical about Government's management of such large programs, you should feel comfortable knowing that the administration has charged NASA to reduce civil service employment and support contractor personnel by 30 percent, and the agency is moving quickly in this regard.

If you think that eliminating this program will only affect our Nation's role in space—you must not forget about the high-level intergovernmental agreements of treaty status that the United States entered into with the 11 countries in the European Space Agency, Japan, Canada, and Italy to develop space station—and that these partners are committed to spending \$8 billion. Further the administration is negotiating with the Russians on ways that they can participate in order to make the program truly global.

And finally, if you are worried about space station competing too severely for scarce dollars with other domestic programs, as a member of the appropriations subcommittee that funds NASA, I can ensure you that our chairman has successfully funded the space station program in a NASA budget that grows at only 1.6 percent, while at the same time funding: Veterans Affairs at a 4-percent increase, HUD at a 3-percent increase, and the National Science Foundation at a 10.5-percent increase.

So as you can see NASA is not eating any one else's lunch.

The space station is a critical NASA program and one of the true tests of American leadership in a post-cold-war era. I urge defeat of the Roemer amendment.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 minutes.

When I grew up as a child of the fifties, our space stations were treehouses and our spaceships were cardboard refrigerator boxes. Men and women had not yet flown into space, but we knew that they would. And when our dreams became reality in the early sixties, the Nation experienced an unprecedented pride in its technological prowess and its unique place in history.

Thirty years later, we still measure that which we want to achieve with our demonstrated ability to go to the Moon. But today's debate here on this floor shows that some among us are willing to be satisfied with those past glories and now ridicule and retreat from tomorrow. The space station represents the necessary next step in man's conquest of space. You cannot seriously say you are for continued manned spaceflight and be against the station. You cannot seriously say that you believe in an aggressive space program and be against the station.

Our ability to do the great things which fulfill the dream of space exploration depend on building a space sta-

tion. If that station is not built now, it will be built by someone, sometime in the future. If we choose to say today that the space station cannot and will not be built by us, it will be our decision to rest on past glories and not to move ahead.

Are there questions about the space station which need to be raised before committing scarce national resources to its completion? Of course there are—important questions. Station opponents will raise the question of cost and they have, and they should, and questions of mission of the space station. Those questions deserve good answers. The cost issue must be decided on the basis of whether the station is a wise investment in our technological future. I believe it to be.

I believe that it is an investment which will pay us back many times over in leading edge technological developments. And the mission of research and development in a wholly unique place is a mission enough for any project. The ability to do real work, in an environment so hostile that it allows no mistakes, is a mission which cannot be duplicated in any other way.

But the opponents' questions are not the only ones deserving of an answer. Because this decision is historic in its implications, we should look at some of the issues which future generations will use to evaluate whether we did the right thing or the wrong thing.

If we are capable of doing something of great significance and decide not to take the risk or commit the resources, history is likely to judge that decision harshly. We are certainly capable of building a space station. The failure to do so will not be a failure of competence but a failure of will.

If building a space station contributes to our technological capability and we choose not to provide ourselves with that economic edge, future generations probably will question why. The technology demanded in a space station is absolutely leading edge. Just building a space station demands that we do things that we must learn to do. Creating that leading edge of technology and technology innovation also creates a wake behind it, much in the same way that a power boat plowing through the water creates a wake. In the case of space station, however, the wake is a series of technology development in computers, robotics, materials, pharmaceuticals, closed-loop environmental systems, and the like, all of which contribute to our global competitiveness.

If building a space station gives us the capacity to do things and discover things that are beyond our dreams and our imagination, then it is worth doing for that reason alone. Those who oppose station do so in part because they do not believe we will learn enough aboard it to justify it. I believe we will

learn more aboard station that we do not even know how to describe today than we will in the prescribed mission. In other words, what we do not know we are going to learn on station is more important to the future than what we now know. And that is the adventure of discovery and exploration. It is an adventure which has always been part of our Nation's legacy and very much a part of its greatness.

Shall we be the generation which abandons that legacy? I hope not.

Since the day when John F. Kennedy committed this Nation to its future in space, we have looked upward and outward, confident of that future. We went into space as President Kennedy said, "Not because it is easy, but because it is hard."

Today if we reject that future by abandoning the space station, we will no longer look skyward. We will begin to look down—down toward our feet planted firmly on the ground. We will accept a future defined by what we know rather than what we do not know—something easy, rather than something hard. And having made that decision, we will be the lesser for it.

The renowned British statesman, Benjamin Disraeli, described the history of nations as moving from bondage to faith, from faith to courage, from courage to freedom, from freedom to abundance, from abundance to complacency, from complacency to dependency, and from dependency back to bondage.

□ 1450

To me the space station speaks to freeing ourselves from the bondage of Earth-bound constraints, but the building of it requires unbounded faith in the future, courage of a special kind, and belief in the manifest destiny of freedom. The reward will be new abundance for ourselves and our posterity in large part because we will find new things that we do not know about today and cannot begin to describe. How can I say that with confidence? Because history tells us so. It tells us that nations willing to take a risk on the future, prosper as a result. And those who drift toward complacency and dependency? They drift away from defining destiny and allow others to take their place in leadership.

The space station is about scientific leadership. It is about technological innovation. It is about being at the forefront of exploration in an age of revolution. But most of all it is about history. The space station is about choosing to extend the reach of humankind beyond the Earth to a new place of permanent habitation. We are capable of taking this historic and necessary step. Not to do so will be a mistake of historic proportion.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman on a very statesman-like speech, a very eloquent speech. I know the gentleman meant it from the heart.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] on a very good speech, even though I disagree with some of it, a very high-level and good content for a speech on an important topic.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the very talented gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN], a gentleman with a great sense of humor.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I just learned that the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations has cut \$11 million from the Coast Guard for drug interdiction, has cut the funds for necessary replacement of 50-year-old buoy tenders to keep our waterways safe, has cut the funds for the VTS systems, the systems that are going to go into our ports and harbors to keep vessels from colliding with one another.

And why? Because they want the money for public works projects.

I think it is time that we face the music. The space station can be defended in a hundred beautiful speeches, because it is a good project, just as a good highway project in your district is a good project.

The space station is going to have incredibly good effects if we ever build it, but I can tell you here and now that it is time for us to face the music. If we cannot cut the big ticket items in our budget, items we would like to have but cannot afford, and at the same time cut interdiction funds on drugs and cut our ability to keep oil from spilling on the waters in this country and cut the ability of the Coast Guard to protect the lives and the fortunes of folks who ply the waters of this country, then I suggest to you, what else are we going to do? Where are we going to go? Will we all be forced to increase taxes on the backs of Americans again and again to try to deal with a budget out of control because we cannot discipline ourselves here today?

Here is where we start. If we cannot cut these big ticket items that are very flashy, very friendly, if we cannot cut these, how on earth will we get this thing under control? How on earth will we avoid the massive tax increases that we are going to have to put on the backs of Americans to balance our books? How do we avoid this fiscal insanity?

Here is where we start. Here is where we must finish the job of cutting spending first and doing it in the same manner for the sake of this country and its economy.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to my very

good and patient friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPELEGATE].

Mr. APPELEGATE. Mr. Chairman, I think the question today is whether or not the United States is going to continue to move on in the space age or if we are going to retreat into the stone age. If we fail, future generations are going to lose. Our school children who want to look to space for educational purposes are going to lose, and what a shame that would be.

We are nothing more than a grain of sand in the sea of space. We need to seek new horizons.

Can you imagine if the naysayers had defeated Christopher Columbus where we would be today?

Congress must not allow itself to be fooled by the cost-cutters who do not know the difference between cost and value. You save a billion in cost, you lose \$100 billion in value.

I could show you a booklet. I could tell you about a lot of the benefits that come out of the space program, and the Neanderthals will come forward, and they did with Columbus, and discount all the benefits; but the facts, my friends, are there.

We can let Germany do it. We can let Japan do it; but I say that the United States must not get out of the way. The United States must not follow. The United States must lead.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes to respond to the eloquent and passionate remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] made a statement that talked about romance and history and leadership. It is those sorts of things that make me want to support the space station, but my head tells me that we are not buying those things for the money that we are spending, and we cannot afford what will be delivered because it is not worth the money that we are spending.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] was candid enough to say there remain serious questions about the space station and they have to be answered. Let me focus on what those serious questions are.

Last week there was a briefing in the White House by senior administration officials. After the President made his decision as to what he thought the space station should be, those administration officials could not tell us what features of NASA's option A and option B would be included in the new space station.

There was a question: "Are you going to go up to the standard NASA orbit or are you going to go up higher after the Russian orbit?" That is a \$400 million question.

The answer: "That decision has not been made."

There is another question. "Can you tell me the impact on the Canadian contribution?"

Answer: "Those negotiations aren't complete."

Another question: "What can you tell us about contracts?"

Answer: "I can't tell you enough yet to be informative."

Question: "Can I follow up on the Russians? Will there be an effort to go beyond incorporating the Soyuz as part of Space Station to involve Russians in this project?"

There is a long, long answer, the last sentence of which is: "And that's goobly-gak, I know, but it was sort of intended to be."

Finally: "Who's going to make the final decision about the inclination?" That is the orbital question. "Will the White House make that?"

Answer: "Beats the hell out of me."

Mr. Chairman, these are the questions that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] was referring to. We are being asked to buy not just pork in space, but a pig in a poke.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the future of this Nation's effort in space and space station *Freedom*. Let us not fail to realize that these two are inextricably linked. The space station defines our very vision of space—a vision that must include humankind. If we are to continue our commitment to manned exploration, then the space station must be our next stepping stone.

Sadly, today's debate largely revolves around the shortsighted issue of cost. Sadly, we are close to defining our character on the basis of price. That is not what Americans have done in the past. Will the station be an expensive proposition? Of course, but should such concerns mean we turn away from exploration—from the proposition that we must continue to grow and reach into the world around us? I think not. There is no stronger proponent of deficit reduction than myself, but I will not sacrifice the long-term good to our short-term cost concerns.

For those who can scarcely see beyond their green eyeshades, I would add that cost today is less of a concern than just a few months ago. The President has made very clear a personal commitment to bringing costs into line and to fielding a station that NASA can manage effectively and efficiently. The design revision that the President has picked will save this country some \$18 billion over the life of the program.

Finally, the space station should be regarded properly as an investment in our future—both on Earth and in space. The skilled engineers and craftsmen we employ through this program will continue to move our knowledge base ever outward. The seed we sow today will be an abundant crop for tomorrow. This program is critical to both the Califor-

nia and national economies as a springboard for high-technology growth. Our Nation's greatness has been based on the visionary, forward thinking that space station exemplifies. When we lose that vision as a nation, we will, I fear, lose the very element that has made us great. I urge my colleagues to rally behind the station. It represents the path to the future.

I would take the President's commitment on the Republican side and say this is certainly very valid and I believe the President when he says that, and I would urge my colleagues to support the space station, not stop the American adventure, and to fulfill the dreams of not only young people in society, but all of us who want this Nation to be the leader in this area in the years ahead.

□ 1500

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME], the articulate chairman of the Black Caucus.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], and the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] how heartened I am at the level and the quality of debate on this very crucial issue that is so significant in determining our Nation's future.

I was taught as a child to work hard, play by the rules, love our country and to cherish our faith. It is because I love my country that I stand here today in support of this amendment to stop, once and for all, this expenditure, and, at the risk of being the idealist that I am, let me also offer for my colleagues' consideration, as I say it to my colleagues and remind myself, that the people of this Nation and the quality of life in America is far more important to me than being able to establish a floating laboratory in space. Canceling this project at this time will give us an additional \$11 billion in budget authority that we could use. It gives us an additional \$10 billion in budget outlays that we certainly could use. It says that the \$9 billion that we would have already spent by the end of this year ought to stop, and it says also that maybe we ought to look at putting our effort, and our time, and our money into space science and space exploration and not just this laboratory.

Now I know that there are some who still want to boldly go where no man has gone before. The question is: At what expense and at whose expense? And I would suggest to my colleagues that it is the expense of the taxpayers of this Nation. If we want to establish some space stations and we want to really go about the job of trying to establish efforts to do things that are new, and meaningful, and will propel us into the future, let us establish some stations to reduce homelessness, to end

hunger, to fight crime, to educate people throughout this Nation, to make our streets safe for the citizens who have to walk, to give us new hope, and new energy and new meaning to really deal with our budget deficit.

But we should not at this critical time, Mr. Chairman, take money that we do not have and toss it almost aimlessly away, and I urge Members to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Roemer-Zimmer amendment to terminate funding for the space station. The House of Representatives must start listening to the American public, and come down to Earth now. Congress must eliminate wasteful spending, like the space station, now.

The space station program is so fundamentally flawed that President Clinton's current design option only satisfies one of its eight original design objectives. NASA currently estimates the latest space station design will cost American taxpayers \$10.5 billion over the next 5 years and roughly \$30 billion to complete.

Moreover, each time NASA redesigns the space station its utility diminishes, its cost escalates, and it directs desperately needed funding away from other scientifically valid programs. The space station has always been of dubious scientific worth, and the scientific benefit to be derived from the current space station design is even more illusive.

The news for taxpayers gets worse, however! The space station's total development costs are expected to exceed \$40 billion, and its estimated lifetime cost is likely to reach \$120 billion. At such a price, the space station is clearly directing funding away from other science programs. But, most importantly, the space station is steering money away from deficit reduction.

All the lofty arguments aside, the space station is a luxury pork project the United States cannot afford when the Federal Government has accumulated a national debt in excess of \$4 trillion.

Mr. Chairman, it seems ironic that proponents of the space station argue it is a gift for future generations. When, in reality, the space station's greatest gift to future generations is its contribution to our Nation's enormous Federal debt.

In Washington, DC, \$1.9 billion may not seem like a lot of money, but to average American citizens it is a huge fortune. It is money the Federal Government does not have. It is good money being thrown after the approximately \$9 billion already wasted by Congress on the space station. It is money that is desperately needed here on Earth!

Mr. Chairman, this project should have been jettisoned years ago. No more good money after bad. I urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to examine our Nation's priorities and to vote for fiscal responsibility in Government by supporting the Roemer-Zimmer amendment to terminate the space station.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], my friend, for yielding this time to me.

I remember about a year ago we had a very similar vote, and I was very struck by the rhetoric that day because it seemed to me that it came to the heart of what this decision is really all about, and person after person got up, and they talked about what it had meant to them as young people when they first heard President Kennedy talk about going to the Moon, and what it meant to them when they first began to think about America's leadership visibly around the world in space and what it meant to them to think of a better engineering and better scientific future.

Mr. Chairman, I used to teach history, and I could not help but remember that early in the 15th century, about 1410, the Ming dynasty sent a huge fleet out, and they went all the way to Madagascar, a much, much bigger fleet than any European country then, and they found many, many things to look at, and they went back home to China, and the Chinese Government said, "No, no, there is too much risk in going beyond the middle kingdom. There is too much danger. It is too big a waste of money." And so China quit looking at the future, China quit expanding, and the Ming dynasty closed down Chinese society and stopped at the borders.

Four hundred years later, Chinese civilization, which for 2,000 years has been the most complex and sophisticated on the planet, disintegrated under the weight of the assault of the Europeans.

Now in the early phases, 1410, 1450, 1500, if my colleagues looked at those tiny Portuguese ships and those tiny Spanish ships, and if my colleagues looked at the giant junks of the Chinese fleet, they would have said clearly which side was going to win. But one side had the courage to continue to explore. One side was prepared to go into the future. One side, no matter how small the ship, no matter how fragile, no matter how unknown, was prepared to dare.

Mr. Chairman, that is what this vote is about. This vote is about turning our back on the future and leaving the future to Japan, to Europe, to Russia and China because the question is not man in space. The question is Americans in

space. Man will be in space. Whether it is a Russian/Chinese/Japanese alliance or a Russian/European alliance, man will be in space. The question is whether Americans will be in space.

Mr. Chairman, this may be the most important single vote we cast this year seen 50 years from now. Imagine that Isabella had said to Columbus, "You know, we just can't afford it this year. I don't think you ought to discover America." Imagine that the Portuguese had decided they really could not afford to go south along the African coast so that they would not have discovered the East Indies. Imagine, if my colleagues will, that the Wright brothers had said, "You know, we can't get that train ticket all the way to Kitty Hawk. What the heck. We don't need an airplane."

Mr. Chairman, that is what this decision is about. This is not about money. This is about whether or not we Americans have enough faith in our children and grandchildren, enough commitment to the future, enough willingness, to do something right because the truth is the amount of money we are going to spend today is not decisive to the national debt, but it is decisive to our future in the universe. It is not decisive in terms of getting down the deficit, but it is absolutely literally a binary decision like turning a light switch on and turning it off.

I say to my colleagues, if you vote in favor of the space station, you are voting to turn on the light switch of the future, but, if you vote to kill it, then don't kid yourselves. Fifteen years from now, when your children watch a Russian, or a Chinese, or a Japanese, or a European in space, and there is no American there, on this day you sealed our fate for a generation on whether or not we're in space.

I urge everyone to vote to keep the space station. This is a vital vote for America's future.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN], a distinguished freshman.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of this amendment to cancel the space station program. I ask my colleagues to think long and hard before casting their vote today. Can we really afford a \$12.7 billion project with limited scientific merit? Can we really say that we are serious about deficit reduction and that we will control spending?

I will not dispute that there may be merit in this \$1.9 billion project or that it will create some jobs, but can we afford this technology at this moment? I know that there will be some job creation. There are companies in my district and throughout the State of Massachusetts that could benefit under this program.

However, I believe we could better invest this money in real job creation

and in real deficit reduction. We need to face the hard reality that the most important thing we can do to improve our economic situation and to create jobs would be a long-term reduction in the debt.

For the past 6 months I have heard a lot of talk about reducing the deficit. We have passed amendment after amendment to cut appropriations bills by a few million. Now when we have the chance to pass a real deficit reduction amendment, we are told that this is good spending. As far as I am concerned any spending that relies on borrow and tax, cannot be good.

For all those Members who have come to the floor to speak about real deficit reduction, I ask how will you vote today? We can no longer take a not in my backyard approach to deficit reduction.

Only a few months ago President Clinton asked the American people to make sacrifices and increase their contribution to deficit reduction. How can we stand here today and say that we are not willing to do the same? Can we justify borrowing to fund this project? Will the jobs created and the scientific merit be enough to justify passing this debt on to our grandchildren?

□ 1510

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON], the President of the Democratic freshman class.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, it is important for us to remember during these fiscally troubling times, that in order to reduce the deficit, we all must sacrifice. Although scientific research, especially that done in space, has been vital to the progress of our Nation, now is not the time to make great expenditures for its sake.

How can we ask our families, our senior citizens, our students and our ailing to bear the costs of sacrifice—we must share the burden along with them. This is the time to be fiscally conservative. This is the time to invest in our families, our children, and our communities.

Also, if we continue to fund the space station as has been requested, other, more important NASA projects will pay the price. Robbing Peter to pay Paul does not provide the means for significant investment in good, as well as efficient, scientific research; which in turn ultimately affects all of us and our quality of life.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. WISE). The Chair would announce that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] has 7 minutes remaining, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] has 2 minutes remaining, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] has 5½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, in order to hear the eloquent words of the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN]—and I may regret doing this—if the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BACCHUS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] need an additional 2 minutes of my time, I would be happy to yield those 2 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is extremely generous, and we will give him gold stars in his crown for doing that.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to kill the space station. I have been a longtime opponent of space station *Freedom*, and that is no secret. I once authored the amendment to kill the space station. But this year, I have kept an open mind about it.

When the administration proposed a redesign of the station, I said—OK, let's see what you can come up with. I invited Dan Goldin to meet with me and other longtime opponents of station, my colleagues, Mr. ZIMMER and Mr. ROEMER, the authors of this amendment. I wanted to hear straight from NASA what it was that would make the redesigned space station different from the problem-plagued disaster it has been. I also wanted to give an administrator charged with cleaning up a troubled and floundering agency a chance to make that happen.

But I am disappointed. The redesigned space station is just more of the same: a scaled-down version of the old model that still costs too much and does too little.

I have repeatedly weighed the value of the station against the need for deficit reduction and the need for fiscal responsibility at NASA and there is no question that the new design is still just a waste of money and a program hopelessly in search of a mission.

The original eight missions are cut down to maybe one and a half. The projected cost has gone from \$8 billion to build to—oh, who really knows what this thing will cost if we ever finish it. It has already cost us \$9 billion and nothing is even up there yet.

As for precisely why we are building the station, I would only quote from an interview with John Gibbons, the President's Science Adviser. When asked earlier this year what he thought a space station should do, Mr. Gibbons replied,

That has been one of our problems. We have not defined our objectives as well as we could, or should. If you are a solution looking for a problem, that is much more difficult than a problem looking for a solution.

Inadvertently or not, Mr. Gibbons put his finger right on the problem. Space station is a solution looking for a problem—and a very expensive solution at that. We want to spend billions

and billions of dollars on something we don't even know what we want to do for us.

Now, I know this is a tough vote for some of my colleagues. For some this might be an issue of NASA's direction, the viability of our aerospace industry, or maybe even jobs in their district. And I don't belittle these concerns.

But in the last week or so we have taken votes on amendments to cut programs in the name of cutting the deficit. When we vote to cut funding for former Speakers of the House and for former Presidents, those amendments took hours to debate and saved us less than \$12 million. Those were easy votes. We cut \$2 million from BATF and \$4 million from the Customs Service—more easy votes. Time and time again, these measures were characterized as votes for fiscal responsibility and deficit reduction.

But the reason those votes were easy is because there is no huge constituency back home in the district for BATF, the Customs Service, former Speakers or Presidents. There is no one telling you that cutting a little here and a little there may cost people in your district jobs—and cost you votes in the next election.

Congress would have to pass 500 amendments the size of the U.S. Customs Service amendment to equal the \$2 billion savings in this amendment. Do you really want to cut the deficit or are you just pretending? For those of you who are looking for real deficit reduction, a cut that matters this year and next year and for years to come, this is your chance. Killing the worthless space station will save us almost \$2 billion this year and tens of billions of dollars over the next 20 years.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes to respond to the minority whip, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] made a point of putting this debate in historical perspective, and I think that is entirely appropriate. But rather than using the analogies the gentleman picked, I think, because this space station is in fact a technological dead end and will draw away resources that are needed for true manned space exploration in the future, the appropriate analogy should be to our recent technological flops in big science such as the wisely abandoned supersonic transport, the Syn Fuels Corp., the Clinch River breeder reactor, or, if you want to get truly classical, the great pyramids of Egypt.

The problem with this space station is that it will not bring us closer to the ideal of going back to the Moon and on to Mars. It is starving the only program we had which planned to do so, the Space Exploration Initiative.

This is a program that will keep us from reaching the dreams of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], which are my dreams as well, and those of the American people. We have become obsessed with this piece of hardware that is sucking up money. We think it is going to make our dream come true. It will thwart those dreams.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, could we get some idea as to how many more speakers each side has left? That would help me in understanding what we ought to do in terms of yielding time.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BACCHUS] to close on our side. If I have 1 extra minute, I will speak briefly.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, my intention was to yield the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] a minute so that he would have a bit of time to speak on the amendment, in addition to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BACCHUS], and I will be happy to do so at this point.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] if he has additional speakers.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I do not. I would just reserve my remaining time for my closing.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I have no more speakers, and I will close as well.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], and it is also my intention to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BACCHUS] for his summation as well.

□ 1520

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. WISE). Could the Chair inquire, does the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] wish to take his time to close now?

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, the Chair is going to let the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BACCHUS] close, and the Chair understands that he has been yielded an additional minute by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] and a minute by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], which would give him 4 minutes, and I would have 2 minutes if the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] each yield me a minute.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of higher math that goes into the space station.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will announce the time available to all Members before the time swaps begin.

The gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] has 3 minutes remaining, and the

gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] has 4 minutes remaining.

The Chair would announce that is after the gentleman from Pennsylvania has given his minute, I believe, to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. That is right, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WALKER. I yield 1 more minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], so he has all of the time to yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BACCHUS], because my intention was to give a minute to the chairman and also one to Mr. BACCHUS.

The CHAIRMAN. So the Chair understands it, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] would have 6 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] would have 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, may I use that time to again express my appreciation to all of the participants in this debate. I think the debate has been a good one in which each of the speakers has made a succinct and important contribution to our understanding of the space station. Obviously, I did not agree with all of the positions taken, but I think they were well presented.

I would particularly like to commend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] for the way in which they have handled themselves in this debate. I attribute that to the fact that they have served on the committee I have the honor to chair and have learned how to conduct themselves very well on that committee, and they have presented themselves very well here today.

Mr. Chairman, may I just make one or two small points here? It has been said that there is very little scientific value to the space station, and I think that that has been rebutted over and over again. I was particularly struck in a meeting that I had recently with the representative of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineers, who pointed out to me that the most important aspect of the space station was that it would provide humans with a first experience in constructing complex structures in space, and that no further human exploration could take place until we had that experience in space with humans constructing and then living in those complex structures.

The laboratories will make some additional contributions to science, but I think the laboratories themselves, which are independent units attached to the space station, will not carry the significance that the mere feat of having humans for the first time erect and construct a massive structure in space, learn how to operate it, learn how to repair it, learn how to live in it. That in itself represents an important step

for mankind which more than pays for the cost of the space station itself.

Mr. Chairman, I firmly believe that that is our destiny, for human beings to go into space. We cannot do it without this experience of creating, operating, and understanding the space environment through a space station.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] wish to yield time?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair would ask Members and those in the gallery if they would please be silent. This is the conclusion of a very, very important debate, and the Chair would ask that everyone devote their full attention to it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I, too, believe there have been a number of important and invaluable issues raised on the floor today, and the debate has helped us, I think, understand the various aspects of this issue.

I think, though, that it is important to realize that when people say that there is nothing for the station to do, that this is simply a flying machine without a mission, it seems to me they have not yet looked at the reality.

If we go to the Johnson Space Center, they will show us a bioreactor that is working today on Earth. The bioreactor has the ability to grow new human tissue. They are literally growing microminiature lungs. They spin them out, this new human tissue, and the problem is in the gravity forces that tissue drops to the bottom of the vessel and is destroyed.

In space, on the space station, when they use that bioreactor, they will be able to grow new human lungs. They will be able to grow new optic nerves, new spinal cords. They will be able to grow skin tissue.

What does that mean? Ultimately it means once we get the transportation down to space, we may have the ability to do transplants that are absolutely compatible with the human body, and would not be rejected. We would be able to grow that tissue for those people in the future, and not have to worry about donors. Would that not be a wonderful thing to have come out of that?

That is a ways off. What we do know is that the human tissue could be used for research and development. It means that instead of doing animal experiments, we will do experiments on real human tissues and have the capability of understanding things we do not now have the ability to understand in laboratories. That is not only using a laboratory in space, that is enhancing laboratories on Earth as a result of what we do in space. That is the capability that space station is going to give us almost immediately, upon its permanent habitation.

That is the great thing about this. We are going to permanently inhabit an environment that mankind has never inhabited before. We are going to learn all of these things. We know a little bit about what we are going to learn. We do not know all about what we are going to learn. What we do know is, we are going to learn great things.

My friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] says that is the romance of this. It is romance, yes, but it is reality, too. Nothing that he can tell us about the future, that he envisions, gives us those capabilities. No robotic spacecraft can do it, the space shuttle cannot do it, nothing in their plans for the future gives us any of those capacities. Only space station gives us those capacities, and only space station gives us the capacity to move from here further into the universe, because we have to learn the life sciences, we have to learn how men and women perform in weightlessness over long durations of time before we can hope to explore the universe beyond.

I happen to believe that is one of the destinies of humankind. We will determine that destiny for Americans here today.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address my comments to the 110 new freshmen of this body that I think will hold in their hands and their voting cards the outcome of that very, very important vote. We have had bipartisanship. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] and I as sophomores have worked very closely on this issue. We have had a high level of debate. We have not just talked about pie in the sky or black holes on Earth, we have debated this issue as we have in committee.

We have had an open rule, and we have shown the freshmen when we want this institution to work, it can work. We can debate issues. We can disagree, and we can elevate debate for the citizens of this great country.

I grew up in the 1960's and used to put boots and gloves on and pretend like I was an astronaut, running around the back yard jumping out of trees. We heard Mercury astronauts talk about "Let us light this candle up." We heard John F. Kennedy talk about putting a man on the Moon. We heard Neil Armstrong's words echoing beautifully around this country.

□ 1530

But now that is not the same NASA, the glory and the dream, and we freshmen and we sophomores came here not just to say yes, keep doing the same thing. We came here to fight for change, to fight for the taxpayers' money, to reform NASA when NASA is not doing the right thing.

I am a strong supporter of manned space and a strong supporter of NASA.

But what we face, freshmen and sophomores in this body, is not just institutional reform of Congress, but reform of the agencies that we have the constitutional ability to oversee and perform our oversight function.

Robert Louis Stevenson said each of us will eventually sit down to a banquet of consequences. Our older generation is going to have the banquet, and our children are going to face the consequences.

Let us work on small programs like MESUR, the Mars Environment Survey, to help reform procurement and contracts in NASA. Let us not fail to dream and to dream big, but let us also dream of reforming our institutions and Congress, and starting with NASA to make this place work better in a bipartisan fashion and not forget our dreams.

Richard Fineman, in genius, said it is not just boldness and risk. It is common sense that makes our genius in this country.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. WISE). The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] has 4 minutes remaining and the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] has 4 minutes remaining.

The gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] has the right to close debate.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING].

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Zimmer-Roemer amendment to eliminate the space station *Freedom*.

I have met with NASA officials about this program and I see the scientific and research merits of a space station. The supporters of the station have put forward many good arguments for investing in this program and I certainly respect their support for the program.

My opposition to the space station is not grounded in the merits of the program, it is based on the tremendous costs of the station and I will be voting against the station in the interest of deficit reduction. The space station is a luxury we cannot afford.

Mr. Chairman, the American people are crying out for Congress and the President to make the tough decisions to put our fiscal house back in order. The American people know that Congress and the President have run up the public debt to \$4.1 trillion, quadruple the size it was a decade ago. The American people know that Congress and the President have run up a debt which amounts to \$16,000 for every American man, woman, and child. The American people are tired of business as usual and politicians who are afraid to make tough choices. We need to get serious about cutting spending and reducing the deficit, and we can make a good start by eliminating the space station.

The space station is a very expensive project. The General Accounting Office has reported that the total program would cost over \$121 billion. The recent proposal to scale the program back

would bring this total down to \$103. Either way you look at it, this is a tremendously expensive program. In light of the deficit, we cannot afford it.

I also want to state that if the space station is cut, this Congress should guarantee that the savings will go toward deficit reduction. Savings should not go toward new spending on social programs or anything else.

Mr. Chairman, Members of Congress keep talking about making the tough choices necessary to reduce the deficit. Now is the time to make good on that commitment. I urge my colleagues to support the Zimmer-Roemer amendment.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard about our international partners and what a terrible thing it would be to leave them in a lurch by giving up on the space station. This is a serious issue, and our credibility abroad is very important. But I would like to read from a recent edition of Space News about two of our most important international partners.

It says:

The apparently crumbling interest in the Space Station in Germany and Italy, which together had been scheduled to pay for 69 percent of Europe's Columbus Space Station Laboratory, has been accelerated by the Space Station turmoil in the United States but also is independent of it, officials said.

"Germany clearly thinks Columbus is no longer valuable," said one European Space Agency official. "The tight budgets in Germany keep getting tighter. In Italy, the new (space) minister has apparently installed a new policy—he only wants to spend the money he has, and Italy has no money."

The Germans, the Italians, and I believe the Japanese and the other foreign partners recognize that they have got serious fiscal problems, and that this space station is not worth the money, and they cannot afford to spend money they do not have on it.

The unpleasant truth is that the dreams we have heard about and the destiny we have heard about will not be acquired for the \$2.1 billion a year that President Clinton wants to spend for the next 5 years. That will not buy us a completed space station which can accomplish anything. The tens of billions of dollars extra will get us a scientifically inadequate space station which will have sucked dry other space programs, including the ones that will take us back to the Moon and on to Mars. They are being abandoned. It is like being on a ship where you have run out of fuel and you consume your own sails and mast in order to keep the engine running. You cannot continue to do that, and that is exactly what we are doing.

The fact is we cannot afford it, and that is the view also of the National Taxpayers Union, who will be rating this vote. Citizens Against Government Waste is rating this vote in their scorecard. Citizens for a Sound Economy,

Businesses for Social Responsibility, the American Physical Society, the leading physics organization in this country, the Planetary Society headed by Dr. Carl Sagan, other civic, social, and environmental groups say this is not the way we should spend our scarce resources, and that they can be spent more effectively and more productively in space as well as on Earth.

Please vote for the Roemer-Zimmer amendment.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

Mrs. MEEK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the space station.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support not of a costly program, but of a worthy one.

As a former biology teacher I know the importance of a sound science research program. The committee's proposal that includes funding for the space station is just such a program.

Human exploration of space is one that offers many benefits to humanity. It will provide the tools of basic research we need to move our country forward. NASA's past efforts have given us many practical technologies that are helping us today. Just a few examples include: Smoke detectors developed from air monitoring systems;

Portable dialysis that bring needed help faster and cheaper evolved from inflight waterfilter systems;

Medical diagnostics that monitor the brain and assist in brain surgery that have saved many lives come from sensor systems.

While we have been enjoying these and many benefits of NASA's research, another benefit has been taking shape. It is the inspirational impact the space program and NASA have on the education of our Nation's young.

In the past, NASA's human exploration programs have been a powerful inspiration for many young people. Our space program encourages young people to turn away from the many negative things in life and look to the future, giving them the opportunity to pursue an education and a career in the sciences or engineering.

It is this inspiration that has created direct correlation between our investment in the space program and the number of doctorates awarded to American students in Physics, Engineering, and Math.

Just as past inventions and discoveries moved great American's like Thomas Edison, George Washington Carver, Charles R. Drew, Alexander Graham Bell, and Jonas Salk in their work. Today's research efforts by NASA will propel a new generation of inventors to find the answers to the many problems that plague us today, problems like AIDS, pollution-free energy generation or improved communications.

A particular group this inspiration is most important for are people of color—African-Americans, Hispanics, and women. Many members of our Astronaut Corps which in recent years has grown in its diversity were so inspired by NASA. Imagine the many students whose lives these astronauts are touching today through their example. The possibility of the cures they will find are endless.

To this end I am especially pleased that NASA has renewed its commitment to ensure all Americans are included in the many new discoveries to be made in the exploration of the last frontier by making available opportunities for people of color through university based research.

NASA is also accelerating the implementation of its multicultural education, equal opportunity, functional and educational review. These steps will enable NASA to take advantage of the talents of our Nation's minorities.

Many of the young people in my district come from poor families. Yes, we must do more to meet their needs in areas from education to health care to housing.

But these young people have dreams as well. And one of the grandest dreams is to be a scientist who cures a deadly illness such as AIDS or to be the first astronaut to set foot on Mars. Let us not destroy those dreams by killing the space station.

If we kill the space station program, we will close a door on research that will lead to a better future in which the talents of all Americans will be used to solve today's problems and explore new worlds.

Please vote for the investment in the future the space station represents.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, for purposes of concluding the debate on our side, I yield the remainder of our time to the distinguished sophomore Member, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BACCHUS].

Mr. BACCHUS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I insert for the RECORD a letter from the European Space Agency to Mr. ZIMMER refuting virtually everything he just said.

The letter referred to follows:

EUROPEAN SPACE AGENCY,
June 15, 1993.

Hon. RICHARD ZIMMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ZIMMER: I noted with some concern your comments during yesterday's House floor debate on H.R. 2200, NASA's FY94 Authorization Bill, in which you quoted from a *Space News* article entitled "Europe's Station Plans Crumbling Under Pressure".

In the article an unnamed "ESA official", is quoted concerning the budgetary situation in Germany and Italy. Such a statement should be treated for what it is; an unofficial and inappropriate comment by an unidentified member of the Agency executive, relating to member state government policy.

Europe's up-to-date position on the Space Station Programme and the redesign is summarised in the two official statements made at last Friday's Space Station Partners meeting, convened under the terms of the Intergovernmental agreement governing the cooperation. These statements were delivered by the European spokesman and represent a consolidated viewpoint of all ESA member states participating in the programme. I have attached a copy of both statements for your information.

I think you will agree, on reading the statements, that Europe remains committed to the International Space Station programme and wants to "continue to participate in its development, assembly, operation and utilization through our own significant contributions". Our participation is, and will

continue to be, governed by the Intergovernmental Agreement, signed by all participating ESA member states, and the related ESA/NASA Memorandum of Understanding.

Should you require any further clarification on this matter, please do not hesitate to have your staff contact me.

Sincerely,

IAN PRYKE.

SPACE STATION PARTNERS CONSULTATIONS ON THE IGA, WASHINGTON, DC, JUNE 11, 1993

THE EUROPEAN PARTNER'S OPENING STATEMENT

Thank you for arranging this meeting, which is taking place at a key point in the very tight schedule of decision making currently underway.

In the meeting of the IGA partners in May, some important European statements were made. Later in today's meeting, I intend to make a further detailed statement, on behalf of the European partner, relating to the overall redesign process. Therefore, I shall limit these opening remarks to some general comments.

The international space station cooperation is a unique, ambitious and far-reaching undertaking. We, the European partner, the participating member states of ESA, want to maintain this cooperation, we want the partnership to succeed, we want the space station and we want to continue to participate in its development, assembly operation and utilization through our own significant contributions.

At the ESA Council at Ministerial level held in Granada in November last year, our ministers identified the financial envelope necessary to pursue the implementation of the European partner's contribution to the space station programme pursuant to the IGA. The actual situation regarding the U.S. redesign, the third in the last couple of years, has slowed our decision process. We are actually in a transitory phase, and I must add, that we still have to solve some critical issues, notwithstanding the questions resulting from the uncertainties relating to the future design of the space station.

The European partner understands that the redesign has been undertaken at the President's direction, in order to bring down near-term development costs and long-term operations costs of the programme. The European partner wishes to express its understanding for this situation and wishes to point out that the European budgetary environment relating to its own contribution also requires adaptations, with the view to reducing development and operations costs. This is necessary, as you certainly will understand, to make the outcome of the redesign process acceptable in Europe.

We are confident that reliable decisions that will now be taken in your country, Mr. Chairman, will ensure the maintenance of the space station, and its stable development and operation in international partnership.

Let me address one further issue, namely that it is essential that the International Partners are notified of the decision of the U.S. President prior to any public announcement. We welcome the opportunity to discuss this matter at today's meeting and to agree on the logistics of how this will be achieved.

Such notification will, however, form an insufficient basis on which we can enter into a dialogue with our respective governments on how the programme is going to continue in the future. We would expect, at a minimum, that in the very near future the U.S. will send a delegation to Europe to review the details of the decision with us. Such a

visit would also allow the U.S. to explain how the matter will be dealt with in their budgetary process, in the coming months, and to initiate preliminary discussions on the technical implementation of required adjustments to the programme.

In closing let me say that there is currently widespread support for enhancing international cooperation in science and technology. We have no doubt that this will be borne in mind as decisions on the future of the International Space Station programme are taken.

STATEMENT OF THE EUROPEAN PARTNER

1. The European Partner wishes to express its strong support for the continuation of international cooperation in the framework of the Space Station Project, in accordance with the principles and programmatic approach described in the Space Station Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) and the related ESA/NASA Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The European Partner remains interested in pursuing its participation in the project through the mechanisms set up for this purpose.

The European Partner considers that the current Space Station redesign exercise provides an opportunity to achieve a substantial reduction of development and operations costs.

2. Noting with satisfaction that one of the requirements for the current redesign exercise was to maintain the international partnership, the European Partner looks forward to discussing today the means of ensuring that the views of the International Partners continue to be communicated to and taken into account by all US authorities concerned throughout the decision-making process.

3. Subsequently, discussions should be held between the Partners, in accordance with the mechanisms already in place, so that consequent adjustments to the existing co-operation scheme are made in an orderly manner, respecting the genuine partnership established through the IGA. Finalisation of the whole adjustment process should be done carefully and expeditiously in order to restore full confidence in the project, both at Partner Government and at Industry level, so that activities can then proceed without undue disruption.

4. Each of the Partners must be able to satisfy itself as to the technical and programmatic viability of any options proposed as a result of the redesign process referred to above, particularly as regards cost and schedule of the development, operation and utilisation of its hardware contribution. The Partners should be given all the information necessary to make any consequent decision related to their continued participation in the project. Any significant departure from the current baseline is likely to lead the European Partner to review its contribution. The European Partner is of the view that options that do not provide the basis for the continuation of a balanced cooperation, such as option C, should be excluded.

5. The European Partner believes that any benefits identified as a result of the redesign process of Space Station Freedom going on in the United States must be actively pursued and any consequent savings, both in development and operating costs must be shared by all Partners in an equitable manner.

6. Current and foreseeable European capabilities in the areas of space transportation and in-orbit operations, such as Ariane 5 and the proposed European-developed Automated Transfer Vehicle (ATV) and Assured Crew Return Vehicle (ACRV) using the Ariane

launcher and the Data Relay System (DRS), should be realistically evaluated and taken into account with a view to constituting a European contribution to the common system operations costs.

7. In the European Partner's view, and as already envisaged in the ESA/NASA Space Station MOU, negotiations should start expeditiously between ESA and NASA, and similarly between NASA and the implementing agencies of the two other Partners, on the determination of the common operations costs, including the shuttle transportation costs, of the International Space Station.

In this connection, ESA has to obtain, through the negotiations referred to above, a commitment from NASA that the European Partner's contribution to the Space Station annual common system operations costs will stay beneath a firm fixed financial ceiling. A commitment will also have to be obtained from NASA so that a significant portion of the European Partner's contribution can be made through the provision of in kind goods and services, such as those mentioned above, in order to reduce to a minimum the level of exchange of funds between the Partners.

8. The European Partner notes that, as a result of the redesign process and the consequent decisions to be taken by the Partners, there is a possibility that a proposal be made to involve Russia in the provision of assets necessary for the development, operation and utilisation of the international Space Station. The European Partner supports the idea of cooperation with Russia, which should be envisaged as a means of facilitating the fulfillment of all the current Space Station Partners' own objectives, including the possibility of overall cost savings. Russia's actual involvement in the Space Station project is a matter for further consultations between the Partners.

9. It should be understood that the European Partner will have to consider its final decisions in the light of the decisions taken by the U.S. in the ongoing redesign process, taking into account the Partners' budgetary environment.

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to thank the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Pennsylvania for their extraordinary courtesies in allowing me the time.

Mr. Chairman, when I was a boy in Florida, my eyes first turned to the skies. I stood in my backyard in my bare feet with my family gazing toward the horizon. Shading the sun from our eyes, we watched the rocket ships climb into space. They carried men named Shepard, and GLENN, and Cooper. They carried the American spirit toward a beckoning, endless frontier.

I believe in the necessity of an endless frontier. I believe that killing the space station will kill the space program and keep us from reaching toward that frontier.

Without the space station, there will be no ongoing mission for the space shuttle. Without the space shuttle, there will be no manned space program. And despite what some may say, without a manned space program, soon we will have no space program at all.

Some say wait, wait, wait until later, wait until we can better afford it. We cannot wait. If we wait, if we abandon the space station, then our inter-

national partners will abandon us and go into business with the Russians. They will finance and build a Russian space station without us, and we will be left to watch the further exploration of space from afar.

Without the space station, our aerospace industry will wither away. We will lose our leadership in still one more area of manufacturing and industry, and we will lose the chance to live and work in space permanently, and to discover wonders beyond our very imagining.

Perhaps worst of all, without the space station, for the first time in our history, the American people will be left without a frontier. The lure of the ever-present frontier shaped the American spirit that has reshaped the world. If we turn away from the space station today, we will for the first time in our history be turning away from the challenge of the frontier and the best instincts of the American spirit. We will lose something unique in America. We will lose part of what it has always meant to be an American.

Monday morning in Florida I stood in my backyard, in my bare feet, with my family. My wife, Rebecca, and my 12-year-old son, Joey, stood by my side. I held my 2-year-old daughter, Jamey, in my arms, and together we watched the rocket ship called *Endeavour* climb into space.

The shuttle's trace trailed along the horizon. The Earth trembled beneath our feet. Once more the American spirit soared toward the boundless, endless frontier of space.

I am just one among many in this House, yet I speak for many today. I speak for those who fly above us now in the *Endeavour*. I speak for those who sent them there, and those who preceded them there. I speak for every American, young and old, who has ever watched a rocket ship rise into space and dreamed of rising with it.

I speak for Joey, who wants to make rockets, and for Jamey, who still is talking about that rocket ship she saw in our backyard.

I speak for the very future of America as I challenge you: Be true to the American spirit. Reach toward the frontier. Build the space station.

Mr. FOLEY. Madam Chairman, I wish to express my strong support for H.R. 2200, the NASA authorization bill before us today. I am particularly pleased the committee has seen fit to include funding for a redesigned space station.

At the outset, I want to commend full committee Chairman BROWN and ranking member WALKER, as well as Space Subcommittee Chairman HALL and ranking Republican SENBRENNER, who have crafted a bipartisan bill that addresses the needs of America's space program in an era of increasing fiscal restraint. Credit must also be given to President Clinton who has recommended a scaled-down version of space station *Freedom* that significantly reduces the costs of the program while main-

taining its critical research missions and America's international commitments.

President Clinton's support for the space station has been enthusiastically received around the world. The international space station partnership consists of the United States, Canada, Japan, and the 13 nation members of the European Space Agency and is the key to the long-term space plans of all the partners. This endeavor represents the largest international scientific and technical cooperative effort ever undertaken. Our international partners will spend \$8 billion on their hardware development and make significant technical contributions to the space station, including the European Space Agency Columbus module, the Italian mini-pressurized logistics modules, the Canadian mobile servicing system, and the Japanese experiment module. They have already spent about \$3 billion on this project and will share proportionately in the common operating costs over the life of the space station.

Since the 1988 intergovernmental agreements between the United States and each of its partners in the space station are considered by the partners to have treaty status, an American decision to abandon the project would have serious international ramifications. Despite this obligation, however, it is important to remember the significant benefits of international cooperation to the United States. The partners have currently contracted for \$137 million of U.S. hardware and support. In addition to use of the U.S. laboratory, 46 percent of experiment facility space of the foreign modules is reserved for U.S. use. Moreover, U.S. research results will remain proprietary throughout the development and operation of the station, even if developed in a foreign module.

Madam Chairman, the space station will be a valuable research facility in space, but it is of far greater significance than that. It is a fundamental cooperative engagement by many nations toward a common goal of advancing and applying science and technology for peaceful purposes.

Mr. MICHEL. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment to scuttle the space station, and in favor of continued investment in our future.

Earlier this year, President Clinton made a distinction between investment and spending. If ever there was a project that fits the investment label, it is space station *Freedom*.

According to the dictionary definition, investment means, "Property acquired for future income or benefit." The future benefits of space station are obvious. From greater competitiveness to education, from jobs to medical technology, the spinoffs from the space station will benefit every American citizen.

I am a strong supporter of the efforts of many to cut Government spending. But this doesn't mean we should cut willy-nilly with little regard for the future of our country. We shouldn't cut our defense capabilities beyond a certain point. We never cut other vitally important programs. And we shouldn't shelve the space station.

In fact, the space station has gone through several changes to make certain it is a cost-efficient program, keeping with the tough budgetary times that face us all.

The space station is a large investment in our future, but it's potential benefits are worth the cost.

I oppose this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. TORRES. Madam Chairman, today we will vote on the future of our Nation's space program.

This vote is a referendum on our Nation's commitment to excellence, our vision for the future and our ability to compete in the global marketplace.

Yes, this is a difficult decision in light of the budgetary realities Congress must face. I weighed the pros and cons of the NASA's space station. I've looked at its budgetary and economic impact.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have worked to get assurances from NASA that new management reforms will bring tighter budgetary controls on the space station.

There is no question in my mind that for this society to progress we must have a lofty goal to reach. Space station *Freedom* embodies American frontierism.

This Congress must realize the importance of providing the platform for scientific, educational, and cultural leadership.

Our action on the space station will affect over 230,000 Americans working on NASA's programs.

In the State of California alone, space station *Freedom* employs 4,261 people.

These individuals are among America's finest in the world's scientific community. They are the engine that powers our Nation's technological progress.

Let us not forget the countless number of young students that are motivated and encouraged to pursue science, engineering, and mathematics as careers.

Madam Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support space station *Freedom* and keep American frontierism alive.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Madam Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues not to shirk their collective responsibility to the technological legacy of our country. As we consider H.R. 2200, the fiscal year 1994 NASA authorization bill, the linchpin of our space program, the international space station, is under heavy fire by its critics. This is the monumental decision we face today: either we will choose to lead the world in developing the very instrument by which advanced technology will be measured, or we will allow this unique opportunity to pass indefinitely, perhaps only for someone else to pick up where we fell short.

The Roemer amendment ignores the political realities of this program. Just when it appears that the administration and Congress are coming to an understanding on how to reconcile the cost needs of the space station with the benefits it will yield, its critics are mounting a collective campaign of rhetoric to bring it down. The space station's detractors are trying to kill it by appealing to our impulses for fiscal responsibility—the raw nerve of the body politic. But the space station cannot be reduced to baseline budget figures and deadlines. Space station *Freedom* is more than an effort to produce another space vehicle. It is a long-term research and technology project,

and it must be handled as such. Yes, it is a large and costly program. Yes, it is exceedingly difficult for a definitive price tag to be placed on such a massive undertaking. But none of the advances researchers hope to realize through production in space—which it appears will impact largest on electronics and medicine—will be possible without it.

This truly is a crossroad in our Nation's space program. The world looks to us for leadership in space exploration. But a new spirit of dedication and a new agenda is required if we are to realize any of the benefits of maintaining our leading role in space. A credible space program simply is not viable without engaging, well-defined goals, and in my view, the space station is a vital element in the demonstration of American commitment.

The space station is on the cutting edge of technology. And the people who work in these high-cost, high-risk areas deserve to know of our commitment to what is really the future of our Nation's competitiveness. And let us not forget that these are the undertakings that inspire our Nation. The future of our economy depends on projects like space station *Freedom*. But even more, we cannot flinch from our opportunity to participate in one of the most compelling achievements of mankind. Indeed, our space program inspires the globe.

Madam Chairman, H.R. 2200 adequately funds all of the essential programs NASA must pursue, and contrary to what could have been the case, does not rip out the backbone of the space agency. This is why it enjoyed such wide bipartisan support in the committee. The Roemer amendment, however, does rip out the backbone of NASA. I urge my colleagues to support space station *Freedom* by voting against this amendment, and in favor of the full NASA authorization bill, and give future generations of Americans a reason to keep reaching for the stars.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Madam Chairman, I am a fan of space exploration. I believe in the need to push forward the frontiers of human understanding. That is why it is difficult for me to vote to cancel the space station. But the need to govern responsibly demands that we do just that.

We face a crippling deficit. We are not adequately investing in education, infrastructure, and other research and technology. Facing these realities, how can we justify spending untold billions on a project that is of limited scientific value?

Voting for the Roemer amendment will not end space exploration. Neither will it compromise good science; we can do more to advance scientific research by spending some of these dollars on Earth. This vote is about facing up to the task of cutting spending, taming the deficit, and tending to our Nation's long-term economic health.

I urge my colleagues to support the Roemer amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Chairman, the aerospace industry is one of the few where the United States still enjoys world leadership and a favorable balance of trade. Currently, our Nation's aerospace industry has a \$31 billion surplus on \$44 billion in trade—we lead the world, but for how long?

Building the space station allows us a firm grip on that leadership position. Why? By

working on leading-edge programs like space station, aerospace companies develop new technologies and advanced manufacturing processes which strengthen American industry. Through active technology transfer programs, NASA and other Federal agencies drive these new tools and technologies out into the U.S. economy, helping businesses of all sizes and in all industries become more competitive.

Space program advances in basic materials, information technology, manufacturing processes, medical and optical technology, tools, propulsion, aerodynamics, and many other fields have kept U.S. industry ahead of the global competition for decades. But as numerous other nations pursue their own space programs, the gap is narrowing.

Space exploration in the last years of the 20th century and the first half of the 21st century is where leaders must make smart, long-term investments. Without America investing in the space station, other competing nations are eager to displace America as the world aerospace leader.

Continuation and completion of the space station will prompt the health of this vital industry by continuing a flow of challenges to sharpen our industrial tools and skills and this will lead to the expansion of our domestic economy in precisely the kinds of jobs that we desire.

Cancelling the space station program now would be a devastating blow to the aerospace industry, and something we cannot afford to let happen. Let's keep the United States at the forefront of the aerospace field, let's keep the space station alive.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the space station and the NASA authorization for fiscal year 1994. As serious and distressing as our fiscal problems are, we would be ill-advised to kill the station and retreat from technological leadership in space.

Less than a week ago, the President reaffirmed his intent to proceed with the development of the space station. The station—an objective of our space program since 1984—remains the critical next step in our ongoing exportation of space. It will serve science and evolving research needs over many years.

The space station will provide the opportunity to study the effects on people of long-duration space flight, a prerequisite for future space exploration. Eventually, the space station will provide the opportunity for a permanent human presence in space. Killing the space station would mean the end of our manned space program.

I want to make three essential points. First, we have reduced costs. Over 5 years, the new design of the space station will save taxpayers \$4 billion. These savings increase to more than \$18 billion over two decades. The administration and both the authorizing and appropriating committees all agree on these funding levels.

Second, this is an important investment in our economy. As our world moves from military threats to economic competition, investments in aeronautics and space programs are necessary to maintain our country's high-technology leadership and provide jobs.

We need to make investments now in advanced technologies to get our economy back

on track. This bill helps transfer technological advances from space research to the commercial sector. It also helps industry-led consortia to identify and commercialize space technologies that increase U.S. competitiveness.

NASA's research remains critical to the development of new and better products. Space research has led to technological advances as mundane as improved sneakers and as life-sustaining as improved care for diabetics. For business, space research has yielded the laser fax machine. For industry, a robotic hand that can mimic human movements; lightweight composite building materials and microlasers for precision drilling. For health care, improved breast cancer detection and programmable pacemakers. And it has played a key role in the aerospace industry.

Third, this is an inspiration for young people. For 30 years, the space program has provided an incentive for our students to study mathematics and the sciences. The space station will capture the imagination of all Americans. By showing young people exciting and challenging opportunities, we will encourage them to continue their education and pursue high-skill careers.

In summary, the space station will lead to advances in science and technology and to new research and development programs. The space station provides jobs for American workers, technological advances for industry, and an improved quality of life. It is an inspiration to our youth as they look to their future and the careers open to them in the 21st century. I urge you to support the station.

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Congressman ROEMER to terminate funding of the space station program.

This program is a perfect example of where Federal spending can be responsibly reduced.

Federal programs that do not meet the cost-benefit test should be eliminated.

I believe this program fails the test and I will explain why.

The original intentions of the space station are no longer in the working plans of NASA.

The projected cost of the space station, over \$40 billion, is five times greater than the original estimate. And no construction has taken place.

The space station is siphoning away funds from other worthy and scientifically justified programs of NASA. As well as other more worthy programs and projects of our Government.

If we are to reach our goal of reducing and eventually eliminating the deficit, tough spending cuts will have to be made and scarce resources will have to be allocated wisely.

I believe eliminating this program is a step in the right direction, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by Representatives ROEMER, ZIMMER, PENNY, and other colleagues. This amendment would eliminate \$12.7 billion in funding for the space station over the next 7 years.

I support this amendment because of the hard, cold realities facing us and the common sense needed to address it. Imagine if your next-door neighbors had children who were hungry and needed new shoes. Imagine if

these same neighbors then went out and bought a brand new state-of-the-art satellite TV dish or a sleek, modular telephone while their children were still going to bed hungry and still needed bigger shoes. What would you think? Would you consider your neighbors to be irresponsible? Irrational? Cold-hearted? Out to lunch?

In our country, every fifth child lives in poverty and faces hunger. More than 50 percent of eligible children cannot participate in Head Start because there are not enough funds and the Women, Infants, and Children [WIC] Supplemental Food Program serves only half of eligible women and children. The Job Corps Program serves only one in seven of the most needy eligible youth in this country. In parts of my district, the poverty, joblessness, and homelessness is so great that children cannot even imagine what it is like to live otherwise. In the face of these harsh facts, I cannot support funding a multi-billion-dollar outer-space project with questionable relevance to our competitive edge and to advancements in science.

By eliminating funding for the space station, we can redirect our scarce Federal funds toward more cost-effective and scientifically rewarding space programs and other important, underfunded Federal programs. I urge my colleagues to join me and support this critical amendment.

Mr. ZELIFF. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of continuing our commitment to space station *Freedom*.

Madam Chairman, I am one of the most fiscally conservative Members of this body. Cutting wasteful spending has been a priority for me since I came to Congress 2 years ago. In fact, there are very few Members in this body that can boast of a better voting record in saving taxpayer dollars than BILL ZELIFF.

I know the importance of cutting spending, but I also recognize the importance of maintaining our technological edge. This is why I support the space station.

Freedom represents the next logical step in our space program. The United States has always been a leader in space, and we continue to benefit from the science and technology that has evolved from the space program. Significant advances in aerospace, medicine, computer technology, environmental and resource management, industrial productivity, and transportation are all directly attributable to our space program.

Exploration, reaching for the next frontier, is an inherent component of our national character. The United States is the greatest Nation on Earth because we have been willing to accept the challenges that come with being a leader. The space program is just such a challenge. If we fail in this effort, if we sit idly by while other nations move ahead in space, our future will be consigned to a position of a second-rate power. That is not the future that I want for my children and my grandchildren.

I admit that I have serious reservations over the way this program has been run so far, and concerns over the operations of NASA in general. However, canceling the space station and throwing away the \$8.5 billion that we have already invested is not the answer. Instead, we need to fix the management structure that has plagued this program and hold

costs down to a reasonable level. The President has chosen a workable redesign option for the station, and I have confidence in Dan Goldin's ability to make this program work and to implement the reforms needed at NASA.

Madam Chairman, if we fail to lead then we are doomed to follow. The United States needs space station *Freedom*. I urge my colleagues to support this program and oppose the Roemer-Zimmer amendment.

Mr. PACKARD. Madam Chairman, as we consider H.R. 2200 today, I wish to commend the chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, Congressman GEORGE BROWN, and its ranking member, Congressman BOB WALKER.

They have shown outstanding leadership on this authorizing legislation in general and the space station *Freedom* in particular, in this year of tight fiscal constraints.

Despite the fact that there are those who argue that the merits of the space station *Freedom* and man's continued progress in space do not justify the costs, Congressmen BROWN and WALKER have kept their eyes on the prize and crafted legislation worthy of my colleagues support.

I commend Chairman BROWN and Congressman WALKER for crafting a bill that is *Freedom*-based—legislation that takes the space station, and thus America's space program, forward. They recognized that the space station *Freedom* is a centerpiece of NASA; one that focuses many divergent programs and projects on a single, unifying goal. Without a commitment to a viable, manned presence in space, all the money we spend on other programs at NASA goes toward no logical end.

The space station *Freedom* provides a nexus for experimentation and results. The mission of NASA is to extend man's knowledge of his universe and from that experience extract knowledge that can benefit the human condition here on Earth. A fully functional, manned space station *Freedom* is the only logical vehicle for NASA to achieve this goal.

Space exploration and scientific experimentation in space may seem like abstract goals. Especially in a year when we are faced with so many domestic priorities that are competing for funding.

However, I would argue and my colleagues on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee would agree, that funding these programs now and ensuring that America has a manned presence in space is directly related to future Americans' standard of living.

For example, the life sciences medical research conducted in space yield knowledge that improves our computer technology and increases our ability to manufacture drugs to cure illnesses on Earth.

The American space program has generated many other advances in American technology like weather satellites, lasers, CATscans, and pacemakers.

I would also like to underscore my appreciation that Chairman BROWN and Congressman WALKER pressed hard to cut the space station *Freedom* budget while remaining committed to the completion of a real, functional facility by the turn of the century. Numerous redesign attempts would yield a space station that is not viable, not to mention wasting the investment of \$9 billion.

The bill before us authorizes \$1.9 billion for the space station annually over the next 6 years, falling to \$1.3 billion thereafter. This represents a cut from current funding of \$222 million.

This bill will help us to ensure a human presence in space and that continued progress is made in scientific experimentation in space. The bottom line is that it is a fiscally responsible approach to funding a project that will provide generations of benefits to Americans.

Mr. HUGHES. Madam Chairman, today as the House considers authorization for funding of NASA, we must question the value of continuing to fund the space station at the proposed level.

Since its inception, the space station has undergone numerous redesigns in an effort to control its spiralling costs. How many more times will this occur before Congress accepts the reality that the space station we would like to have cannot be built at the costs we can afford, and what the budget allows is not enough to build a worthwhile station? Meanwhile, other programs suffer while the space station gets the lion's share of NASA funding year after year.

The space station has already exceeded its originally projected costs of \$8 billion, and now we are poised to authorize another \$12 billion. And we are still building the space station, we have not even begun to pay for its operational costs. We cannot ignore these expenses, simply because they have yet to materialize.

The price is only part of the station's problem, however. The station's mission remains questionable, and appears to be further whittled away with every redesign. Highly regarded members of the scientific community have expressed serious reservations about the true merits of the program.

Some have said that we must support the space station because exploration is our Nation's destiny. I do not disagree. I just have to question if the space station is the right vehicle to continue in this lofty endeavor.

I will vote for the Roemer-Zimmer amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same. It is the fiscally responsible thing to do.

Mr. KLECZKA. Madam Chairman, today the House of Representatives will be deciding whether or not to spend \$12.7 billion more on NASA's space station program.

The current projected cost to build space station *Freedom* has risen to over \$40 billion. Operating expenses over the life of the station will cost another \$100 billion.

When Congress first voted on this project, we were told the station could be constructed at a cost of \$8 billion. Yet to date, we still have nothing to show for it other than a long list of delays and a roomful of plans.

Last week, the administration announced its decision to once again redesign the space station. The option A choice will cost four times more than the original estimated price, and will have fewer missions and capabilities.

Madam Chairman, I shared the excitement of millions of Americans when we first put a man on the Moon. I shared the pride of the launch of the first space shuttle, and the sorrow of the *Challenger* disaster. I realize our Nation's need to explore new frontiers—to develop new science and technology initiatives

that serve American economic and intellectual growth.

But Madam Chairman, I also have to go into the Ways and Means Committee chamber and—like every one else in this body—try to justify every dollar our Government raises and every dollar our Nation spends.

Last month, I voted in favor of the budget reconciliation package. In passing this legislation, the House asked all Americans to make sacrifices. We asked Americans to continue to pay a 2.5 cent per gallon excise tax on gasoline. We delayed cost-of-living adjustments for Federal and military retirees. We raised postal rates for nonprofit organizations. All of these provisions combined fall well short of paying for the space station.

More importantly, when we voted for the reconciliation package and the tax increases that went along with it, we collectively vowed to our constituents that we would also cut spending. Well my friends, this is our chance.

We can undertake an expensive and risky human space flight program with no coherent purpose, a billion dollar debacle which lacks focus and purpose, or we can put this troubled program out of its misery.

Last November, voters demanded that Congress bring skyrocketing Federal spending back to Earth—by eliminating wasteful and unnecessary programs like the space station, we can start along that path.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Roemer-Zimmer amendment.

Mr. VENTO. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the Roemer amendment to the bill, H.R. 2200, the NASA authorization for fiscal year 1994.

This amendment would require NASA to cancel the space station program by deleting the bill's annual authorizations for the space station, which total \$12.7 billion over the next 7 years.

Madam Chairman, it is time for Congress to recognize that the space station program is no longer a program with a coherent mission; it has literally become a program in search of a mission. The space station has become like a black hole into which Congress pours money that never sees the light of day again.

What is the reason for continuing this multi-billion-dollar program at a time of severe budgetary constraints when some in Congress are proposing cutting aid to education, housing, homeless assistance, veterans, and even Social Security and Medicare recipients?

Some have said that we need the space station for reasons of national security. The Soviet Union is now history and the space station today represents an incredibly expensive surveillance platform compared to satellites which already adequately serve this function.

Some have said that we need the space station to learn more about the long-term effects of weightlessness and space travel on human beings. While the need for such information and data is apparent if we desire to make long journeys to distant planets, the space station certainly isn't the only or the most cost-effective way to obtain such data. In any event, interplanetary travel by humans is probably decades away from realization. The fact is that we already know much about the biological and physical effects of long-term space travel. The former Soviet space pro-

gram, for example, which sent many cosmonauts into space for extended periods, yielded significant information which is now in the custody of the newly independent Republics. Why not fund the evaluation of newly available existing information? There is no reason why the United States and the Commonwealth of Independent States cannot work cooperatively to share this information and to continue studies on this matter jointly.

Some have said that we need the space station to learn more about biomedical research and that experiments that could be conducted aboard the space station could yield extraordinary new information regarding biomedicine and cellular processes. Yet the reality is that tremendous breakthroughs are occurring on an almost weekly basis, not in space, but right here down on Earth in hundreds of medical research laboratories around the world. While we certainly cannot say that there are no secrets in space left to uncover, we must acknowledge reality and the very real fiscal constraints which our Nation faces today. The scarce funding for scientific inquiry of this nature is the limiting factor, primarily because of the billions of dollars being spent on what is more akin to space scrap.

The cost control efforts on the space station project have been a notable failure because even as the space station program has been significantly curtailed in recent years, the costs of the program have continued to soar out of control. It is estimated that there have been more than \$500 million in cost overruns with dollars already spent on the space station program. The space station hasn't even left the drafting board and it's already in outer space with its costs and transparent misrepresentations by the promoters.

I commend President Clinton and those officials at NASA who have recognized the need to reform the space station program. They have attempted to salvage some value from a program which has been mismanaged without effective cost controls and managerial oversight. These problems were largely ignored by the Reagan and Bush administrations. But unfortunately these efforts by the Clinton administration are too little and too late.

We have sustained significant cuts in numerous programs during the past 10 years because of faulty economic policies. The national policy path must be corrected, and that can only occur if we recognize and limit our appetite for spending on such symbolism as the space station.

Can we really justify cuts in Medicare and curtailing health care reform by telling our constituents that we need to fund very questionable medical research in space? Can we really tell those urgently in need of housing that we can't adequately fund housing and homeless assistance programs because we need to fund the \$25.6 billion plus just to build the space station? Should the Nation's taxpayers be expected to foot the bill for a 30-year project estimated by the National Taxpayer's Union and the General Accounting Office [GAO] last year to cost a startling \$118 billion for initial investment and operations? I do not think we can do that and say we are advancing the best interest of the American people for necessary, justifiable scientific achievement.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for the Roemer amendment to terminate the space station program.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of the Roemer-Zimmer amendment to terminate the space station program. I support the concept of space exploration, and in better fiscal times, would support the space station, which is an interesting experiment.

The main issue facing each of us here in Congress today and every day, however, is the question of priorities. There is, literally, no money to spare. Every program which we fund means other needs go unmet. In times like these, we simply cannot afford the luxury of a budget-busting experiment like the space station.

Earlier in the debate, our colleague, Mr. WALKER, spoke of the days past when children played in cardboard boxes dreaming that they were in spaceships. I, too, remember those days. Today, however, my thoughts are with the children of this Nation for whom cardboard boxes are not toys, but housing; for children who dream not of spaceships, but of a hot meal.

Over 500,000 children in America are homeless. Forty percent of our homeless population is made up of families with children, and one-quarter of the homeless population is comprised of children under the age of 18. How can we continue to pour money into the space station when we cannot even ensure access to safe, decent, and affordable housing for this Nation's children?

Many of my colleagues today will argue that the space station is necessary for our Nation's future. I would argue that we can have no future if we do not meet the needs of our children today. A future built on technological experiments is on extremely shaky foundations if its human resource base is weak. And, unfortunately, funding the space station means weakening other important initiatives, including deficit reduction.

The latest round of cost increases have brought the pricetag for construction of space station *Freedom* to over \$40 billion. This staggering amount does not even include the cost of operations, which was originally predicted to be \$78 billion over the life of the program. How can we justify spending this kind of money on a program which many eminent scientists believe may be completely irrelevant to real science and economic competitiveness?

We simply cannot afford to indulge in technologically questionable and fiscally unwise experiments. I urge my colleagues to support the Roemer-Zimmer amendment to terminate the space station. It is a sound move in a difficult fiscal situation.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Chairman, for over 40 years we have devoted money, time, and brainpower to the exploration of space. Why? Because we made a conscious decision that technological advancement is the only way to ensure the growth of our country. Why did our predecessors, millions of years ago, strive to learn how to cultivate natural resources, craft weapons to hunt and farm, and devise means of transportation? The struggle for advancement was not an idea to be debated—it was a given.

Don't be fooled by people who argue that we have advanced far enough—to cease mov-

ing forward is to actually fall behind. If we do not continue with the program, we will be forsaking the fruit of over 40 years worth of work and sacrifice. We will be forfeiting our space superiority. We cannot afford to do this. We cannot afford to turn our back on the space station program.

The exploration of space has led to advances in polymers, lightweight planes, and water treatment systems all of which have been applied in private industries. It has led to progress in the medical field with research systems and training aids. One of the main missions of this Congress is to ensure a future for our children which is full of possibilities. Well, ladies and gentlemen, today we can help make those possibilities a reality.

By continuing with the space station program we can perpetuate technological developments which might create medical advances, protect the environment, create new job opportunities, and even create new industries. The possibilities are limitless. The prospects for our country and our children are limited only by our level of commitment.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2200, the NASA Authorization Act for fiscal year 1994. I specifically wish to address the issue of the space station program.

Today, Mr. Chairman, the American people have heard my colleagues debate the merits and flaws of the space station program. I urge my colleagues and the American people not to be swayed by such sound bites, but to consider the space station program in terms of what it means to the future of our children and our Nation.

Our children do not remember a time when America was not first in space. They take for granted the benefits America has derived from its over 30 years of space exploration. Our children can not comprehend the sense of patriotism we experienced as we watched Neil Armstrong take the first steps on the Moon. We were not divided then. Young and old, rich and poor alike shared a sense of accomplishment. During the turbulent time of the sixties, for one brief moment the country was unified. We shared a dream that one day our children could also take that step. That day, Neil Armstrong expanded our vision of the universe and we were never to be the same. The space station is to our children's generation what Apollo 11 was for us.

In the 1960's it was enough to fund a program in expectation of intangible rewards it may or may not bring. Congress did not face the budget constraints which confront us today. Each year as Congress deliberates reauthorizing programs under the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, opponents of space exploration compare the cost of space exploration to the increased services this money could provide for domestic programs. The space station is one of our premier domestic programs and creates more jobs and economic development per dollar than almost any other federally funded program.

It is undisputed that if we are to maintain our edge in the field of space exploration, the creation of a space station is the next logical step. The space station will expand our ability to perform experiments in space and will allow

Americans their first opportunity to study firsthand the effects on the human body of lengthy visits in space. In the tradition of space exploration in general, the space station will provide real and practical technology to solve dilemmas we face today.

To understand where the space station will take us, we must first consider how space exploration affects our lives today. Nowhere is the benefit of space exploration more evident than in the area of medical research. Earlier this week biomedical researchers from the Texas Medical Center testified before the House Space Subcommittee where they outlined advancements achieved in organ transplantation, heart pump technology, and advanced prostheses which are directly derived from space exploration. In addition to the recognized advancements in laser heart surgery, diagnostic imaging, and CAT scans, our experience in space has enabled us to improve our current technology from athletic shoes to voice-controlled wheelchairs. The space station will allow us to perform even more elaborate experiments than can now be performed. Imagine how the knowledge we stand to gain from these experiments will improve the quality of our lives and the lives of our children.

It is easy to expound on the future benefits of the program. It is hard to ignore the real and immediate benefit of the program: jobs. Not just jobs for astronauts and engineers, but for clerical, manual, and other support laborers. NASA estimates that the space station program provides 75,000 jobs, including direct and indirect jobs, civil service and contractors. Not just jobs for Texas, but for 37 States and the District of Columbia. In addition to being a global effort the space station is truly a national project.

In September 1988, America signed the Intergovernmental Agreement with Canada, Japan, and 10 of the 13 members of the European Space Agency to build the space station. Each year as we debate again our commitment to the program, our partners stand idly by wondering if this will be the year the United States fails to stand by its agreement. Our partners have pledged to spend \$8 billion for their portion. This year we have an opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to the program. By endorsing President Clinton's redesigned space station we will say that we have put our past squabbles behind us and are committed to working together with our allies to put a functional space station into orbit.

By ordering its redesign the President has taken firm control of NASA and the space station. The redesigned version selected by President Clinton will save \$1.6 billion while preserving the integrity and mission of the space station. I urge my colleagues to stand behind the President and to reaffirm our commitment to space exploration by voting against any measure to reduce or eliminate the space station program.

□ 1540

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. WISE). All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 215, noes 216, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 263]

AYES—215

Ackerman	Hughes	Pelosi
Allard	Hutchinson	Penny
Andrews (ME)	Inglis	Peterson (MN)
Baessler	Inslee	Petri
Ballenger	Istook	Pombo
Barca	Jacobs	Pomeroy
Barlow	Johnson (GA)	Porter
Barrett (WI)	Johnson (SD)	Portman
Becerra	Johnston	Poshard
Bellenson	Kanjorski	Price (NC)
Bereuter	Kaptur	Ramstad
Bilbray	Kastich	Rangel
Blackwell	Kennedy	Ravenel
Blute	Kildee	Reed
Brewster	King	Reynolds
Brown (OH)	Kingston	Richardson
Bunning	Kleczka	Roemer
Camp	Klein	Romero-Barcelo
Cantwell	Klink	(PR)
Cardin	Knollenberg	Rostenkowski
Clayton	Kolbe	Roukema
Clement	Kreidler	Rowland
Clyburn	LaFalce	Rush
Coble	Lambert	Sabo
Collins (GA)	Lancaster	Sanders
Collins (IL)	Lantos	Sangmeister
Collins (MI)	LaRocco	Santorum
Condit	Lazio	Schaefer
Conyers	Leach	Schenk
Coppersmith	Lehman	Schroeder
Costello	Levin	Schumer
Coyne	Levy	Serrano
Danner	Lipinski	Sharp
de Lugo (VI)	Long	Shays
Deal	Lowey	Shepherd
DeFazio	Machtley	Shuster
Dellums	Maloney	Siskis
Dickey	Mann	Skaggs
Dingell	Manzullo	Skelton
Doolittle	Margolles	Slaughter
Duncan	Mezvinsky	Smith (MI)
Durbin	Markey	Smith (OR)
English (AZ)	Martinez	Snowe
English (OK)	Mazzoli	Solomon
Evans	McCloskey	Spratt
Ewing	McHugh	Stark
Fawell	McKinney	Strickland
Fields (LA)	McMillan	Studds
Fish	McNulty	Stupak
Flake	Meehan	Sundquist
Foglietta	Menendez	Swett
Ford (MI)	Mfume	Tauzin
Ford (TN)	Miller (CA)	Thomas (WY)
Frank (MA)	Minge	Thompson
Franks (NJ)	Mink	Underwood (GU)
Furse	Moakley	Unsoeld
Gekas	Molinari	Upton
Goodlatte	Moran	Velazquez
Goodling	Murphy	Vento
Gordon	Nadler	Visclosky
Grandy	Neal (NC)	Walsh
Gunderson	Norton (DC)	Washington
Gutierrez	Nussle	Watt
Hall (OH)	Oberstar	Waxman
Hamburg	Obey	Wheat
Hamilton	Oliver	Williams
Hastert	Orton	Woolsey
Hefner	Owens	Wyden
Herger	Pallone	Wynn
Hoagland	Pastor	Yates
Hoekstra	Paxon	Zimmer
Holden	Payne (NJ)	
	Payne (VA)	

NOES—216

Abercrombie	Baker (CA)	Berman
Andrews (NJ)	Baker (LA)	Bevill
Andrews (TX)	Barcia	Billirakis
Applegate	Barrett (NE)	Bishop
Archer	Bartlett	Bliley
Armey	Barton	Boehlert
Bacchus (FL)	Bateman	Boehner
Bachus (AL)	Bentley	Bonilla

Bonior	Goss	Ortiz
Borski	Grams	Oxley
Boucher	Green	Packard
Brooks	Greenwood	Parker
Browder	Hall (TX)	Peterson (FL)
Brown (CA)	Hancock	Pickett
Brown (FL)	Hansen	Pickle
Bryant	Harman	Pryce (OH)
Burton	Hastings	Quillen
Buyer	Hayes	Quinn
Byrne	Hefley	Rahall
Callahan	Hilliard	Regula
Calvert	Hobson	Ridge
Canady	Hochbrueckner	Roberts
Carr	Hoke	Rogers
Castle	Horn	Rohrabacher
Chapman	Houghton	Ros-Lehtinen
Clay	Hoyer	Rose
Clinger	Huffington	Roth
Coleman	Hunter	Roybal-Allard
Combest	Hutto	Royce
Cooper	Hyde	Sarpallus
Cox	Inhofe	Sawyer
Cramer	Jefferson	Saxton
Crane	Johnson (CT)	Schiff
Crapo	Johnson, E.B.	Scott
Cunningham	Johnson, Sam	Sensenbrenner
Darden	Kennelly	Shaw
de la Garza	Kim	Slattery
DeLauro	Klug	Smith (IA)
DeLay	Kopetski	Smith (NJ)
Deutsch	Kyl	Smith (TX)
Diaz-Balart	Laughlin	Spence
Dicks	Lewis (CA)	Stearns
Dixon	Lewis (FL)	Stenholm
Dornan	Lewis (GA)	Stokes
Dreier	Lightfoot	Stump
Dunn	Linder	Swift
Edwards (CA)	Livingston	Talent
Edwards (TX)	Lloyd	Tanner
Emerson	Manton	Taylor (MS)
Engel	Matsui	Taylor (NC)
Eshoo	McCandless	Tejeda
Everett	McCollum	Thomas (CA)
Farr	McCrery	Thornton
Fazio	McCurdy	Thurman
Fields (TX)	McDade	Torkildsen
Filner	McDermott	Torres
Fingerhut	McHale	Torricelli
Fowler	McInnis	Trafficant
Franks (CT)	Meek	Tucker
Frost	Meyers	Valentine
Gallegly	Mica	Volkmer
Gallo	Michel	Vucanovich
Gedensson	Miller (FL)	Walker
Gephardt	Mineta	Waters
Geren	Mollohan	Weldon
Gibbons	Montgomery	Whitten
Gilchrist	Moorhead	Wilson
Gillmor	Morella	Wise
Gilman	Murtha	Wolf
Gingrich	Myers	Young (AK)
Glickman	Natcher	Young (FL)
Gonzalez	Neal (MA)	Zeliff

NOT VOTING—8

Derrick	Henry	Skeen
Faleomavaega	Hinchey	Synar
(AS)	McKeon	Towns

□ 1605

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. DERRICK, with Mr. McKeon against.
Mr. Towns for, with Mr. Skeen against.

Mr. VOLKMER and Mr. INHOFE changed their vote from "aye" to "no."
Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. GUTIERREZ change their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MAZ-

ZOLI) having assumed the Chair, Mr. WISE, Chairman pro tempore 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. 2200) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, space flight, control, and data communications, construction of facilities, research and program management, and inspector general, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous material on H.R. 2200, the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, due to a family commitment in California, I was not present during rollcall votes No. 261, No. 262, and No. 263. I would like the RECORD to reflect the following:

Rollcall No. 261, H.R. 2446, military construction appropriations, final passage. Had I been present, I would have voted "no".

Rollcall No. 262, the Calvert/Hall amendment to H.R. 2200, limiting funding increases for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to fiscal year 1993 levels plus 3.2 percent to account for inflation. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye".

Rollcall No. 263, the Roemer amendment to H.R. 2200 eliminating the authorization of funds for the space station. Had I been present, I would have voted "no".

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I was on leave of absence when roll call votes occurred in the House of Representatives.

Had I been present, I would have cast my votes as noted for the following rollcall votes which occurred during my absence. Votes on which I was paired and announced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are noted by an asterisk:

Rollcall No. 261, final passage, H.R. 2446, Milcon Appropriations Act, "aye."

Rollcall No. 262, Hall amendment to H.R. 2200, NASA Authorization Act, 3.1 percent overall cuts in bill, "aye."

Rollcall No. 263, Roemer amendment to H.R. 2200, NASA Authorization Act, space station funding, "nay*."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of attending my son's graduation. As a result I missed two votes on H.R. 2446 and H.R. 2200. Had I been present I would have voted "nay" on H.R. 2446, the

military construction appropriations bill, and "aye" on the Hall amendment to H.R. 2200, the NASA authorization bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, due to a personal family matter in my district, I was unable to be present for rollcall votes numbered 261 to 263. Had I been here I would have cast the following votes:

Roll No. 261, "aye."

Roll No. 262, "aye."

Roll No. 263, "aye."

My votes to oppose the space station and the superconducting supercollider—Roll No. 263 and Roll No. 269, respectively—merit further comment. Taxpayers in my district and across the country are demanding that we get Federal spending under control and more wisely decide how to spend their tax dollars. There is no easier way to respond to this demand than to kill the funding for the space station and the superconducting supercollider. Our country cannot afford to continue to spend the billions of dollars demanded by these projects when they drain resources from other desperately needed programs and show little promise of a profitable payoff for the many billions invested.

While there is a need for space exploration, funding for the space station should not continue if its at the expense of other proven NASA programs, Federal science projects, public housing subsidies, and other critical Government programs. In addition, design modifications aimed at cutting the cost of the space station have reduced the proposed station's capabilities, and several scientific review boards now are questioning the scientific justification for spending such large sums on such limited uses. In light of budget constraints and the significant narrowing of the space station's mission, I cannot support program that is estimated to cost \$140 billion to build and operate.

According to the GAO, the SSC is already 51 percent over budget for routine, conventional constructions activities alone. Government audits of SSC expenditures have shown that tax dollars have been wasted on perks for contractor employees, including \$12,000 Christmas parties at posh hotels, \$25,000 in catered lunches, and \$21,000 a year to buy and water office plants. It's no wonder that a project that was originally estimated to cost \$4.4 billion is now expected to cost \$13 billion. What do we get for all of these billions? Many experts agree that the practical spinoffs from this research will be negligible. In a recent survey, corporate heads of research and development ranked the SSC dead last in importance among major science projects. The plain fact is that Federal money would be better spent on more promising projects in the biomedical, transportation, energy, and other research field.

Quite simply, we need to kill both these programs and the sooner we do it, the sooner our constituents will thank us for prudently managing their money.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote today on H.R. 2446 and

H.R. 2200 due to an illness. Had I been present I would have voted "aye" on H.R. 2446, the military construction appropriation bill and "aye" on the Hall amendment to H.R. 2200, the NASA authorization bill.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2150, COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1994

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-151) on the resolution (H. Res. 206) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2150) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1994 for the U.S. Coast Guard and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON H.R. 2492, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. DIXON, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-152) on the bill (H.R. 2492) making appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana reserved all points of order on the bill.

□ 1610

REPORT ON H.R. 2493, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1994

Mr. DURBIN, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-153) on the bill (H.R. 2493) making appropriations for agriculture, rural development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies for fiscal year 1994, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana reserved all points of order on the bill.

WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST H.R. 2445, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT 1994

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 203 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 203

Resolved, That during consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union of the bill (H.R. 2445) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30,

1994, and for other purposes, all points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: beginning on page 35, line 17, through line 25. No amendment affecting the subject of the Superconducting Super Collider (other than as part of general reduction of amounts provided in the bill) shall be in order except one offered by Representative Slaterry of Kansas or a designee. That amendment shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by its proponent and an opponent and shall not be subject to amendment or to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Goss], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 203 waives points of order against the consideration of certain provisions of H.R. 2445, a bill making appropriations for energy and water development for fiscal year 1994.

The rule specifically waives clause 2 of rule XXI, which prohibits the consideration of unauthorized or legislative provisions in general appropriations bills and clause 6 of rule XXI which prohibits reappropriations in a general appropriations bill. These waivers are provided against all provisions of H.R. 2445 except provisions relating to the U.S. Enrichment Corporation fund directing it to collect funds from foreign customers. The Committees on Energy and Commerce and Natural Resources, which have jurisdiction over the Corporation, objected to the inclusion of this provision in H.R. 2445 and the Committee on Rules, based on the objection of these two committees, declined to protect this provision of the reported bill.

Mr. Speaker, the most controversial matter in H.R. 2445 relates to the continued funding of the superconducting super collider. Consequently, the Committee on Rules has framed the debate on this issue by providing that no amendments affecting the subject matter or the SSC will be in order except one offered by Representative SLATTERY of Kansas or his designee. The rule provides that the Slaterry amendment shall be debatable for 1 hour which shall be equally divided and controlled by the amendment's proponent and an opponent. The rule further provides that the Slaterry amendment shall not be subject to amendment or to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

The inclusion of this provision in the rule will squarely frame the debate on the continued development of the SSC and will provide the House with the op-

portunity to vote yes or no. This provision does not, however, protect the SSC from any amendment which may be offered to provide across-the-board cuts of the programs funded in H.R. 2445. The Committee on Rules believes this is a fair way to address this most important issue.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the provisions of House Resolution 203 will permit any Member to offer amendments to the bill which do not otherwise violate any rule of the House. In other words, House Resolution 203 is an open rule and I recommend its adoption in order that the House may continue its consideration of the appropriations bills for fiscal year 1994.

Mr. Speaker, with this appropriations bill we again have an opportunity to debate the merits of this Nation's biggest and most ambitious science project—the superconducting super collider.

The SSC is the focal point of our Nation's efforts in the field of physics. Failing to move forward with the SSC at this time would be tantamount to giving up on manned flight prior to Kitty Hawk. My support for the SSC extends from my belief that, just as basic physics research earlier in this century allowed our Nation to become the most technologically advanced country on Earth, research like that to be conducted at the SSC laboratory will provide us with technological building blocks to keep our country strong and allow us to compete globally into the next century.

The SSC is truly a national project. Over 100 universities across the Nation are involved in SSC research and projects. SSC work is being performed in 48 States and the District of Columbia. And the benefits will be shared and enjoyed by the entire Nation.

Leading scientists believe that the knowledge to be gained from the project ultimately will lead to tremendous advances in manufacturing and energy generation.

President Clinton has requested \$640 million to fund the SSC during the coming fiscal year. The Appropriations Committee approved \$620 million. During consideration of this bill, our colleagues SHERRY BOEHLERT of New York and JIM SLATTERY of Kansas will offer an amendment to terminate the SSC. Their amendment would eliminate virtually all funding, leaving just enough to close down the project.

We have already invested \$1.5 billion in the SSC and the State of Texas has already invested about \$300 million.

Critics of the SSC will attempt to make several arguments against the project—that it's too expensive, that there have been cost overruns during the life of the project, and that we have not yet received assurances of substantial foreign investment.

Any project of this nature is expensive. Current estimates are that it will

cost between \$10 and \$11 billion by completion in 2003. We as a country must be willing to make some investment in the future if we are to continue to be competitive in the world market place. Not making this type of forward-looking investment could well wind up costing the United States much more in the long run should we fall behind our major trading partners in developing the technology to make new products.

As to the issue of cost overruns, Congress is presently engaged in vigorous oversight of the project and I have complete confidence that Chairman DINGELL's subcommittee will ensure that the American taxpayers get full value for the money we are investing in this project. If changes need to be implemented in the way the project is managed, then let's get on with those changes. But let's not use cost factors as an excuse for refusing to invest in the future.

On the question of foreign participation, I had the opportunity to travel to Japan with Speaker FOLEY earlier this year. The Japanese expressed legitimate concern over the degree of commitment to the project by our new administration and by the new Congress. President Clinton has now answered the question of his administration's commitment to the SSC. Once we have demonstrated the Congress's continued commitment to the project, there is certainly a good opportunity that Japan and other nations will participate in a significant way.

Mr. Speaker, we frequently talk about the SSC in the future tense. This is understandable, given the importance of the project to our Nation's future scientific and technological advancement. It's important to note, however, that a considerable amount of work is going on right now. In fact, some of our colleagues have visited the SSC site and have seen for themselves the significant amount of progress being made in the project's construction.

For example, four tunneling machines are boring the 54-mile circumference tunnel that will house the super collider's main colliding beam accelerators. As of June 1, 1993, over 7 miles or 13 percent of the tunnel has been completed.

Additionally, research is already being conducted at over 100 universities and colleges across the country. Opportunities to participate have also been extended to historically black and Hispanic colleges and universities, opening the door to minority students to an area in which they've traditionally been underrepresented.

While a lot of activity is going on now, it is the future that compels me to support the SSC. The world has become an increasingly competitive place. Those nations expecting to prosper and grow economically in the fu-

ture will be those nations willing to take risks, willing to invest today in those areas that will yield results tomorrow.

The SSC is an investment that America can make today to help prepare us for the competitive economic battles of tomorrow. The project will promote advances in science and technology, and will help the United States compete in the international marketplace. It is therefore precisely the kind of future-oriented, job creating program we as a Nation should be supporting.

The SSC is an investment that America can make today to help prepare us for the competitive economic battles of tomorrow. The project will promote advances in science and technology, and will help the United States compete in the international marketplace. It is therefore precisely the kind of future-oriented, job creating program we as a Nation should be supporting.

We, as a Nation, are fortunate to have some of the finest research and experimental facilities in the world, as well as many of the world's leading researchers. Much of our remarkable progress in science and technology is due to the ongoing commitments to our national laboratories, from Los Alamos in New Mexico to Brookhaven in New York, Fermilab in Illinois, and the Stanford linear accelerator in California, to name a few. The SSC is the next in a long line of successful, world-class facilities for the pursuit of new scientific and technological knowledge. It is imperative that we continue this tradition for the future of our country.

□ 1620

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

Mr. Speaker, today we have before us a bill that has lots of beneficial projects and a great many Members have a project or two of special interest. Before us is the energy and water development spending bill, that includes water, dredging, beach and power projects, large and small. It has got big ticket science and research items, like the superconducting super collider, which help boost the total of this bill to almost \$22 billion. Traditionally, this House considers appro-

priations bills under an open amendment process, guaranteeing every Member an equal and unfettered opportunity to present amendments for cutting spending. This House was established by the Founding Fathers as the House of Revenue, where all taxing and spending measures begin. As Harry Truman might say, the buck that stops on the President's desk is the buck that starts here in the House. The people we represent expect us to cut spending first as we move through the budget process. No one can deny that strong message is out there across America. So far this year we have considered 4 of the 13 spending bills, and 2 of them were debated without the benefit of a completely open amendment process. In fact, this year we have had only six open rules altogether, which is a fairly dismal 25 percent. Today, as we take up the fifth spending bill it seems we will again, unfortunately, have a less than fully open amendment process. The rule before us allows for the traditional open process for all portions of this bill except the extremely controversial provision of \$620 million for the superconducting super collider, known as SSC. For that one project, the Rules Committee has limited the process, allowing only one cutting amendment. I support that amendment, which basically terminates the SSC project. But I must emphasize that a completely open process would be more fair to proponents and opponents of the SSC. A completely open process would also better serve the taxpayers of this country, who deserve the broadest and most thorough consideration of all expenditures of Federal funds. A completely open process would leave the superconducting super collider vulnerable to the same type of targeting amendments every other project in this bill will face, rather than singling it out for special treatment.

Mr. Speaker, two amendments were brought to the Rules Committee to ensure that savings from this bill go toward deficit reduction, a goal I know many of us support. But the Rules Committee declined to make either amendment in order, missing a chance once again to focus debate on reducing

our Federal budget deficit with spending cuts. Finally, I note the frequency of waiver requests to allow legislative language and unauthorized appropriations in these spending bills. What's happening here is that we are approaching our spending process exactly backward, setting aside money to spend before we have agreed on where we want to spend it. That is just what our House rules were set up to avoid. But our budget process has broken down—the rules no longer apply. It is time to revamp our procedures and develop a set of rules we can live with. That is one of the missions of the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress, and we look forward to its conclusions. Until that time, I expect to continue hearing waiver requests to move the budget process forward. That is kind of like using duct tape to seal a crack in the wing of a jetliner. It might work for one flight, but it is destined to crash. But Mr. Speaker, that is an ongoing subject. As for the rule before us, it is not as open as it could or should be, but it is not as bad as it might have been. I suppose around here that is good news.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following information for the RECORD.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES, 95TH-103D CONG.

Congress (years)	Total rules granted ¹	Open rules		Restrictive rules ²	
		Number	Percent ³	Number	Percent ³
95th (1977-78)	211	179	85	32	15
96th (1979-80)	214	161	75	53	25
97th (1981-82)	120	90	75	30	25
98th (1983-84)	155	105	68	50	32
99th (1985-86)	115	65	57	50	43
100th (1987-88)	123	66	54	57	46
101st (1989-90)	104	47	45	57	55
102d (1991-92)	109	37	34	72	66
103d (1993-94)	24	6	25	18	75

¹ Total rules counted are all order of business resolutions reported from the Rules Committee which provide for the initial consideration of legislation, except rules on appropriations bills which only waive points of order. Original jurisdiction measures reported as privileged are also not counted.

² Open rules are those which permit any Member to offer any germane amendment to a measure so long as it is otherwise in compliance with the rules of the House. The parenthetical percentages are open rules as a percent of total rules granted.

³ Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules, as well as completely closed rules, and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. The parenthetical percentages are restrictive rules as a percent of total rules granted.

Sources: "Rules Committee Calendars & Surveys of Activities," 95th-102d Cong.; "Notices of Action Taken," Committee on Rules, 103d Cong. through June 22, 1993.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES, 103D CONG.

Rule number, date reported	Rule type	Bill number and subject	Amendments submitted	Amendments allowed	Disposition of rule and date
H. Res. 58 Feb. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 1: Family and medical leave	30 (D-5, R-25)	3 (D-0, R-3)	PQ. 246-176, A. 259-164, (Feb. 3, 1993)
H. Res. 59 Feb. 3, 1993	MC	H.R. 2: National Voter Registration Act	19 (D-1, R-18)	1 (D-0, R-1)	PQ. 248-171, A. 249-170, (Feb. 4, 1993)
H. Res. 103 Feb. 23, 1993	C	H.R. 920: Unemployment compensation	7 (D-2, R-5)	0 (D-0, R-0)	PQ. 243-172, A. 237-178, (Feb. 24, 1993)
H. Res. 106 Mar. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 20: Hatch Act amendments	9 (D-1, R-8)	3 (D-0, R-3)	PQ. 248-166, A. 249-163, (Mar. 3, 1993)
H. Res. 119 Mar. 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 4: NIH Revitalization Act of 1993	13 (D-4, R-9)	8 (D-3, R-5)	PQ. 247-170, A. 248-170, (Mar. 10, 1993)
H. Res. 132 Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 1335: Emergency supplemental appropriations	37 (D-8, R-29)	1 (not submitted) (D-1, R-0)	A. 240-185, (Mar. 18, 1993)
H. Res. 133 Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H. Con. Res. 64: Budget resolution	14 (D-2, R-12)	4 (1-D not submitted) (D-2, R-2)	PQ. 250-172, A. 251-172, (Mar. 18, 1993)
H. Res. 138 Mar. 23, 1993	MC	H.R. 670: Family planning amendments	20 (D-8, R-12)	9 (D-4, R-5)	PQ. 252-164, A. 247-169, (Mar. 24, 1993)
H. Res. 147 Mar. 31, 1993	C	H.R. 1430: Increase public debt limit	6 (D-1, R-5)	0 (D-0, R-0)	PQ. 244-168, A. 242-170, (Apr. 1, 1993)
H. Res. 149 Apr. 1, 1993	MC	H.R. 1578: Expedited Rescission Act of 1993	8 (D-1, R-7)	3 (D-1, R-2)	A. 212-208, (Apr. 28, 1993)
H. Res. 164 May 4, 1993	O	H.R. 820: National Competitiveness Act	NA	NA	A. Voice Vote, (May 5, 1993)
H. Res. 171 May 18, 1993	O	H.R. 873: Gallatin Range Act of 1993	NA	NA	A. Voice Vote, (May 20, 1993)
H. Res. 172 May 18, 1993	O	H.R. 1159: Passenger Vessel Safety Act	NA	NA	A. 308-0 (May 24, 1993)
H. Res. 173 May 18, 1993	MC	S.J. Res. 45: U.S. forces in Somalia	6 (D-1, R-5)	6 (D-1, R-5)	A. Voice Vote, (May 20, 1993)
H. Res. 183 May 25, 1993	O	H.R. 2244: Second supplemental appropriations	NA	NA	A. 251-174, (May 26, 1993)
H. Res. 186 May 27, 1993	MC	H.R. 2264: Omnibus budget reconciliation	51 (D-19, R-32)	8 (D-7, R-1)	PQ. 252-178, A. 236-194, (May 27, 1993)
H. Res. 192 June 6, 1993	MC	H.R. 2348: Legislative branch appropriations	50 (D-6, R-44)	6 (D-3, R-3)	PQ. 240-177, A. 226-185, (June 10, 1993)
H. Res. 193 June 10, 1993	O	H.R. 2200: NASA authorization	NA	NA	A. Voice Vote, (June 14, 1993)
H. Res. 195 June 14, 1993	MC	H.R. 5: Striker replacement	7 (D-4, R-3)	2 (D-1, R-1)	A. 244-176, (June 15, 1993)
H. Res. 197 June 15, 1993	MO	H.R. 2333: State Department, H.R. 2404: Foreign aid.	53 (D-20, R-33)	27 (D-12, R-15)	A. 294-129, (June 16, 1993)

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES, 103D CONG.—Continued

Rule number, date reported	Rule type	Bill number and subject	Amendments submitted	Amendments allowed	Disposition of rule and date
H. Res. 199 June 16, 1993	C	H.R. 1876: Ext. of "Fast Track"	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (June 22, 1993).
H. Res. 200 June 16, 1993	MC	H.R. 2295: Foreign Operations appropriations	33 (D-11; R-22)	5 (D-1; R-4)	A: 263-160, (June 17, 1993).
H. Res. 201 June 17, 1993	O	H.R. 2403: Treasury Postal appropriations	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (June 17, 1993).
H. Res. 203 June 22, 1993	MO	H.R. 2445: Energy and water appropriations	NA	NA	

Note.—Code: C-Closed; MC-Modified closed; MO-modified open; O-Open; D-Democrat; R-Republican; PQ: Previous question; A-Adopted; F-Failed.

□ 1630

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], the distinguished ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule. As has been discussed, we have had a number of closed rules already this year before the House. I, for the first time in a good many years, have found that I have voted against the rules. I have always felt like this body should have the opportunity to discuss and act upon legislation, even though I might have been opposed to it.

In this particular instance, of course, I do favor this legislation, so I do support the rule. As has already been discussed, there are three provisions in the rule which one might consider to be semiclosed. We used to call these modified open rules.

First, we have had to necessarily waive the provisions against unauthorized legislation. I doubt if there really is anything that could be called authorizations in it, but we have had to appropriate for some agencies, some of whom have gone for many years without any authorizations, such as the Appalachian Region Commission, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has not been authorized for many years, the Power and Marketing Administrations, and the defense agencies. A number of those have not been authorized, and because this committee does appropriate for the Department of Energy for certain defense activities.

Also, another provision of the rule provides for certain transfers of unobligated balances that we have proposed in previous years. That money will not be required today for the agencies that we had proposed, so there is use today for some of these programs. This rule does provide that we can transfer some of those funds that have already been proposed in previous years. It helps meet our obligation this year.

The one that we might consider to be controversial is the 1-hour provision for the discussion of the superconducting super collider. It does provide for just one amendment that would strike the \$620 million project. I know there are some who would like to offer modifications from that. However, I think it was wise for this Committee on Rules to have either an up or down vote after just 1 hour of debate.

I realize many new Members of the 110 new Members might like to debate this a longer period of time, but I think all of us fully understand what the issue is here. We have had ample opportunity through our mail to understand this, so I ask, since this is a good rule, it is the best rule we could come up with, and the Committee on Appropriations does not appreciate the fact that we do have to make certain waivers as far as authorizations. It is not our fault.

However, if this body, this Congress, is to finish its work in due course, in due time, and be out of here before Christmas, we have to get started in appropriating money. That is the reason we did have to have certain waivers in this bill that were absolutely necessary.

The committee did not accept any new programs. We did not accept any requests for authorizations for programs that were not authorized or projects that were not authorized. We rejected those, and they are not contained in this bill, so this is essential if we are going to have our work done. I hope it will be supported.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the bill, which I think has been a very good production by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] and the other members of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, and I would like to commend the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Appropriations, Mr. BEVILL, and the ranking minority member, Mr. MYERS, for their work in crafting this bill and bringing it to the floor.

Title V of the bill contains language to enhance minority participation in the superconducting super collider. A recent audit of the SSC laboratory's Small Business Program by the Department of Energy's inspector general concluded that the SSC laboratory had failed to award a sufficient number of subcontracts to businesses owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals.

These deficiencies in achieving minority participation in the super collider were first pointed out to me by the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON] and it is my intention to include similar corrective provisions in H.R. 1432, the Department of Energy Laboratory Technology Act of 1993, which the Science Committee expects to report to the House later this year.

Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the cooperation extended to our committee by the gentlemen from Alabama. I want to thank him and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. NATCHER, for consulting with the Science Committee on the provisions of title V. We have worked with the Appropriations Committee, the leadership of the House, with Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, and with the Department of Energy to fashion this language.

Normally, I am hesitant to accept legislative language in appropriations bills, and I know the gentleman from Kentucky is loathe to include it; but in this case, there is some urgency to see that these deficiencies are corrected as soon as possible, and so I am happy to accept this language and support the rule to bring the bill before the House.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and the superconducting super collider.

We have all heard about the importance of the SSC to our Nation's scientific research program and the technological advancements we can expect from SSC research. These are vitally important to our long-term economic interests.

Just as important, many companies in the defense industry are making the difficult transition from manufacturing military equipment to a much broader base of high technology products. Many of the engineers, technicians, and manufacturing workers in these companies are now involved in engineering and building the advanced components required for the SSC accelerator.

The SSC technology which is being transferred to U.S. industry will provide the applied science for many of these former defense equipment suppliers to build new civilian product lines based on superconductivity. Potential commercial applications of this critical technology include: Superconducting magnetic energy storage for utilities, Maglev vehicles for future transportation needs, highly efficient electric generators, ultrafast computers, and numerous other budding technologies.

I believe the SSC is an important step toward the future in developing our high-technology research capabilities, assisting economic conversion, repositioning our defense industries, and most important, keeping Americans working. In my district, Babcock & Wilcox, a major defense contractor that supplies all Navy nuclear fuel, has shifted highly trained employees from

their defense-related industries to SSC production in order to lessen the impact of diminishing defense dollars. This is going on—not only in my district—but all over the country. And it is a trend we must encourage to maintain our competitive edge.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and support the superconducting super collider.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to try to defeat this rule. That would be both futile and unnecessary. I do want to draw attention to the way it structures the debate over the superconducting super collider.

The rule allows only 1 hour of debate on the SSC, a single hour to discuss the most expensive basic science project in our Nation's history, and a project that has generated great public controversy.

Why is the time so limited? Because the supporters of the project want to stifle debate. SSC proponents note that the facts work against them, as we will prove later. They want to make it as hard as possible for Members of this body and the public at large to hear the facts.

Last year, we voluntarily agreed to hold the debate to 2 hours. This year, proponents did not even pay us the courtesy of trying to arrange a time limit. They just went to the Committee on Rules and preempted a full-scale debate. I suppose some proponents would argue that only a short debate is needed because we have all heard these arguments before. But almost one-third of the Members of this body are new, and more significantly, new information is being made available every day, like the DOE inspector general's report on SSC excess spending that was just released this week.

I wish we could rely on everyone remembering what was said in past debates. We would remember a project that started out with an estimated cost of \$4.4 billion, a project which is now estimated to cost in excess of \$11 billion. We would remember the SSC proponents promising us last year that the project would not be built if foreign contributions did not hit at least \$650 million, a figure that remains a pipe dream. We would remember a whole string of unfulfilled pledges.

I, too, accompanied the Speaker to Japan earlier in the year to meet with officials of the Japanese Government at the highest level, including the Prime Minister. Do the Members know what I found? There is not a constituency in Japan for the SSC.

I wish we had more time to hammer home the failures of the SSC, but the evidence is so overwhelming I expect our 30 minutes will be enough. I just wish the Committee on Rules had allotted time commensurate with the cost and significance of this project.

□ 1640

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, my friend from New York is his usual eloquent self. But I would point out to my good friend from New York, with whom I share a considerable interest in the sport of baseball, that we now have an hour during this rule which we can debate the SSC, we have an hour during general debate on the bill, and we have an hour specifically for the amendment. We have 3 hours.

I indicated to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY], an opponent of the SSC, that I would be happy to yield him time during the rule for him to state his views. Certainly we will have adequate time to discuss this very important matter.

Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I am from Ohio. That is right, and I am not from Texas. I am hearing a lot of talk about Texas here today. I am for the superconducting super collider.

I want to remind the Members of this House that when the project was started States were able to bid for this project to locate it in their particular regions. Most of the States in the Union bid to house and be the home State for this great project. Ohio was one of them. No one worked harder than I did for the State of Ohio. The bottom line is there was only one State that would prevail. Texas prevailed and today I support Texas and this great project. Let me say this: Last time I heard, Texas was in the good old U.S. of A.

There are 45,000 separate contracts in 48 States of our Union that will in fact be part and parcel to this great project. We keep talking about all of these high-technology jobs for our workers, ladies and gentlemen. Where are the high-technology jobs going to come from if America will not be the leader in new technology initiatives?

I keep hearing about the complaints that none of these foreign countries have made commitments. Why would anyone make a commitment to any entity that is attempted to be killed every 6 months? Ladies and gentlemen, we have to assure the world that America will be the leader in the superconducting super collider, high-energy physics programs of the future, or we will not get those funds. BOB WALKER and GEORGE BROWN will come up with the foreign commitment if we give them the authority and tell them we are going ahead with the super collider program.

I support this project.

Let me say one last thing. The Department of Labor manual has listed new jobs. Listen to some of them. I say to my friend from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT]: Pantyhose crotch-closer, bras-

siere cup molder cutter, zipper trimmer, gizzard skin remover, sanitary napkin machine operator, ladies and gentlemen, impregnator helper. What in God's name is an impregnator helper? Maybe we will want to leave Congress and apply.

I say this to everybody in the Congress. If we are going to develop jobs in the next century for America, it will not be simply with infrastructure programs. America will reach out.

I commend the House for the tough vote on the space station, and I encourage and urge the House to vote for an American project, the superconducting super collider.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], if he would like to engage in a colloquy with a member with whom I agree on both the superconducting super collider and the space station.

Mr. BOEHLERT. I would just like to say to my distinguished colleague from Ohio that in his usual eloquence he pointed out something that we should all pay attention to: the need for jobs for America. As a matter of fact, jobs is my favorite four-letter word.

But I would point out that we have to look at the cost as well as the cause. This is one of the most expensive public works jobs programs in the history of man, a guesstimated \$120,000 per job.

Also, I would like to point out to my colleague in the well that I am not a Texas-basher. As a matter of fact I enjoy Texas, and I supported the space station because I think the space station is good for America.

But we have got to start establishing some priorities here. Our national debt exceeds \$4 trillion. We are spending \$900 million every 24 hours just on interest on that national debt.

The American people are calling for change. They want us to establish some priorities. They want us to go with those things that offer the greatest promise for the future of America, and I suggest it offers great promise if we kill this project and redirect our resources to more promising activities.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, a little while ago, I voted to end funding for the space station. Having designed amateur rockets as a teenager, and having been an early and enthusiastic supporter of space exploration, I was very reluctant to do so. But with a \$300 billion deficit and a \$4 trillion national debt, difficult choices must be made, and, although the space station would be a good, useful tool for scientific experimentation, it simply does not rise to a high enough priority level to compete with social service and other essential programs for the inadequate funds available.

But essential projects must continue. I firmly believe the superconducting super collider is an essential project for this Nation. I am aware, of course, of the spinoff benefits of the super collider—the medical research benefits, the benefits of progress in superconductivity, the transportation, communications, energy, and computer technology applications.

But these are really secondary. They derive from the applied research necessary to develop the super collider itself. The real benefit of the super collider—the real necessity for completing it—consists of the knowledge to be gained by basic research into the forces that shape the universe. This is the most fundamental basic research. We are learning how matter and energy are formed and put together—how the very universe is constituted.

One cannot predict the technological, economic, medical, and other benefits that will be gained from this fundamental basic research. What we do know is that history shows that this kind of basic research always pays for itself many times over. For example, it was basic research into the nature of electrons—with no particular benefit at all in mind—research carried out with x-ray machines and with early particle accelerators—ancestors of the super collider—that led to the entire electronics industry and everything associated with it. It was basic research into sub-atomic particles and the forces acting on them—carried out with later generations of particle accelerators—the synchrotrons and the Bevatrons at Brookhaven and Fermilab and CERN in Europe—that led to modern, medical imaging technology.

It is in the nature of basic research that one cannot predict the specific outcomes or benefits. I am reminded of the story of Benjamin Franklin, who, when asked what possible benefit there might be from early experiments with flight, answered, "Madame of what use is a newborn baby?"

Unlike many of the uses of the space station, there is no possibility of doing this kind of basic research with any other machine, any other technique, in any other way, than with the super collider. One could make a case, if we had not already started work, that we could postpone the super collider for a few years, but with construction already begun, and billions already spent, to stop now is foolishness.

We should learn from the experience of history that this investment of a few billion dollars will pay off many times over in benefits to human welfare, to scientific knowledge, and to our economy. It is an investment in the welfare of our children, because we know it will redound to their economic, medical, and general welfare. We must not turn away from this.

□ 1650

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am very honored to welcome one of our great

new Members of Congress, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY], who has offered an amendment in the Committee on Rules. Tragically, the amendment is not made in order, and I think he might want to speak about that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY].

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Claremont, OK, for yielding me this time.

The SSC has been a valid project with good science, but increasing costs in the schedule cannot be justified considering the current Federal fiscal crisis.

I was elected, and I ran, to cut spending, and we are not doing it with this project. This is not the project to continue the spending. But that is not what I am doing here.

I am here in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] to delete the fiscal 1994 funds for the SSC which means to eliminate the funds. However, his amendment does not require that the cut SSC funds be used strictly for the deficit or for reducing the deficit.

When I saw that no one else was going to do this, I went and prepared an amendment to his amendment stating that the deficit would be the beneficiary of this decision to cut the SSC. The Committee on Rules, however, refused to allow that to come to a vote, and that is what I am here today for, to object to that.

My amendment would require the SSC funds that are cut to be retained in the Treasury and used to reduce the deficit, not be made available for other pork-barrel projects or tradeoffs or the normal appropriations process.

If the House accepts the proposal to end the SSC project, we must make sure the money is actually saved and not otherwise spent. The intent of my amendment is to provide for that assurance.

What I hope as a freshman is that that decision of the Committee on Rules was not because I was a Republican, not because I was a freshman, or not because I was on the wrong side of the issue. It is time that we earmark these funds for the deficit. That is what the American people want, and that is what I am committed to do, and I am going to continue to do it until somehow we get that attention across in this body.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Texas, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and in opposition to the forthcoming Slattery amendment and in support of the SSC project.

There is no solution to this country's economic problems that does not require and involve a regeneration of economic growth in this country, and there is no formula for the regeneration of economic growth in this country that does not put science at the cutting edge, in the forefront.

In the early days of the country, the issue was transportation: How can we move our trade around the world and prosper? And we figured out a way, and we did it. In the early days of our country, the issue was agriculture: How could we become the most productive and efficient and prosperous agricultural society? And we figured out a way and we did it. Earlier this century, the issue was: How could we turn to mass production? How could we be the best and the most efficient at producing consumer and industrial goods for our country and for the world markets? And we figured out a way and we did it. Each time that we figured out a way, we were willing as a private-sector economy and as a government to step forward and invest the resources and the basic science and the basic research to figure out that way.

Mr. Speaker, the SSC project may never lead to one direct dollar of commercial spinoff. It may never lead to one job or one new company. But if the technologies that spin off of it are coherent and real and viable, if we do not have them, then someone else certainly will.

The cost of not trying, the cost of burying our heads in the sand, the cost of watching as our industrial and commercial competitors around the world move ahead as we sit on the sidelines is an opportunity cost that we cannot bear. In the next century, in the next millennium, the key to economic progress will be information, science, and the mastery of high technology.

Going forward with this project may not mean that we master those three areas, but failing to go forward with this project, I think, will certainly mean, certainly mean that we are passing up an opportunity to achieve that mastery.

I urge my colleagues in the House to oppose the Slattery amendment. Support the SSC project and support this rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON].

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, being a Texan, I have known about the super collider before its inception, and many States wanted to get the super collider, and some tell me that they are not supporting it now because it is not in their State. Well, this really is not a State project. It is a project for this, our America.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the superconducting super collider.

I, like many of my colleagues, have heard the claims of the detractors of this project who claim it is too expensive for too few returns. But I would like to highlight why this project is important to me and why I urge my colleagues to support the project.

Over the past decade, we have seen the United States fall behind in the race of economic competitiveness. We have seen industry after industry shipped overseas to Japan, to Germany, or Southeast Asia. There is, however, one area that we retain a significant edge and that is basic research.

We are not stealing from our children or our children's children or their children yet unborn. We are looking out for them, because we have been looked out for in the past. Just think of the things that we have today because somebody believed in research. We have lights, we have the technology of letting our voices go out, we have x ray, we have scans we have all kinds of testing.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today alive and well because of testing that tests for cancer and was able to catch it in time to treat it. So I understand the meaning of research and the outcome of research. Many of you probably have had the results of good research and not recognized that this is what we are attempting to invest in now.

Now many of the arguments against this project are based on the uncertainty of what benefits this project would yield. I would argue that this project is about research, basic research. Mr. Chairman, I stand here today as a living, breathing example of what benefits basic research yields. I was stricken by cancer twice and I survived. Had it not been for the many nameless, faceless, research scientists who delved into the complex nature of matter, explored the properties of atomic-sized particles, I might not be here.

Let me share a few of the benefits of basic research. Through the study of particle physics in the fifties, research scientists were able to refine radiotherapy treatments to the point where the amount of radiation necessary in the treatment of breast cancer was reduced by 90 percent, saving the stress and wear and tear on the body, saving the money and yet getting the treatment done.

Particle physics research led to the principles which have enabled the development and improvement of imaging capabilities which allow us to identify tumors early on in their development.

Mr. Speaker, the scan machines, all of these developments came about because somebody 30, 40, 20 years ago did the research, and nobody complained because we knew it was great investment for the future.

In 1963, a study conducted by the health insurance plan of greater New

York found that only 40 percent of breast cancers were discovered through mammography. A subsequent study conducted by the National Cancer Institute found that by 1982 91 percent of all tumors were discovered through mammography. Much of this progress was based on that investment in basic research 40 years ago.

We now are poised on the brink of new discoveries. High-energy physics research, basic research, has given way to the use of the cyclotron in proton emission therapy and has proved to be a promising new treatment in the fight against cancer.

Two weeks ago, I met a young woman, who had undergone proton emission therapy treatment at Loma Linda University Medical Center. She had been diagnosed with a type of ocular cancer, which if treated by traditional means would have left her with a 30-percent chance of keeping her eye and no chance of keeping her vision.

Conventional treatments would have also required her to check into the hospital undergo invasive surgery, incur the costs of a prolonged hospital stay and loss of time on the job. But through proton emission treatment, this woman was treated on outpatient basis at a tremendous savings to her and the health care system. She lost no time from her job and was able to keep her eye.

To me this illustrates the value of high-energy physics research to society. The research that will be conducted at the SSC will extend the study of those particles and that technology to one level beyond which it currently stands. There is no telling what will be revealed through the pursuit of this research.

Now the opponents of the SSC are passing out literature that says "the SSC is an inefficient way (at best) to conduct cancer research." No one is saying it is. But what the opponents of the project are actually saying is that they do not even want to pursue the basic knowledge that is necessary to create better and more efficient cancer research and treatment.

I realize that it is difficult to explain high-energy particle physics research to lay people. But the need to pursue basic research is not. The results are self-evident.

Over the past 50 years, we have built in this country the finest research complex on the face of this Earth. The ability to pioneer technological advances has been the backbone of American industry, both manufacturing and high technology and driven the innovations which have created the society in which we live.

I would like to remind my colleagues of our heritage as Americans. We are the Nation which developed the vaccine for polio, and put the first man on the Moon. We are also the Nation which made the investment in basic research

which made these achievements possible. We have never before questioned the value of the quest for pure knowledge and we should not begin now.

I urge my colleagues to reflect carefully before they cast their vote on this project. We cannot pull the plug on the future of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to close by saying that we have a responsibility to look out for our children. We have a responsibility to our children.

We have talked about waste of money. This is an investment.

I would urge you and plead with you, do not pull the plug on our future. This is America. We must look out for our country, our children. We are here holding their trust.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY].

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to commend the Committee on Rules and express my appreciation to them and particularly my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], for making sure that we will have a clean opportunity to debate the merits of the superconducting super collider, and the rule before us this evening certainly makes that debate possible. I commend the Committee on Rules for doing that.

Let me observe that, in spite of the fact that my friend from Texas and I vigorously disagree on this particular issue, he has been more than fair in crafting this rule to enable the House to have the kind of debate this project certainly deserves.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that, as we move forward in the debate later this evening and tomorrow on the question of the superconducting super collider, that we will have the quality of debate that we heard earlier this afternoon on the question of the space station that was addressed by the amendment offered by our friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

□ 1700

As we debate the superconducting super collider, we must do so in the context of what we can afford. We must measure the costs of this project against the benefits of the project.

One of the points that I think we have to focus on is the fact that this whole project was originally conceived with the view that we would obtain \$1.7 billion in foreign contributions. The fact of the matter is those foreign contributions have not materialized. This body, if my colleagues would recall, last year went so far as to adopt an amendment that said that if we did not have \$750 million in the bank by April 1, 1993, then we would not move forward with this project.

So when I offer my amendment tomorrow, I hope that my colleagues will keep that in mind. I am merely asking this body to keep our word.

In addition to that, I would point out that we will have the opportunity under the rule to debate this issue and also focus on some of the severe management problems that have been brought to the attention of the country by the General Accounting Office and also by the inspector general's office of the Department of Energy.

Again, I express my gratitude to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] for his fairness in the handling of this whole issue. I look forward to the debate.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

Mr. BOEHLERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding this additional time to me.

I would like to address, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, some of the remarks made by the proponents of the SSC. Like them, I am anxious to have the United States expand new horizons and new frontiers in science. But I would point out that this single expenditure for this single project is crowding out other, very important science. For example, my colleagues and the American people should understand that we will be funding fewer, rather than more, scientific projects at the National Cancer Institute this year.

This year, two out of three of the applications for science projects in the National Science Foundation are going unfunded, not because they are not meritorious but because we simply do not have the resources to fund those projects.

The National Institutes of Health had to turn away many scientists with promising projects simply because we do not have enough money to fund them.

If we want to make advances in agriculture, it makes sense to me to invest in agricultural research; if we want to make progress in combating the dreaded disease of cancer, it makes sense to me to invest in the National Cancer Institute.

All of these ideas make a great deal of sense to me, but more than anything, I am hearing the clarion call from around America: "Establish some realistic priorities."

I would point out to my colleagues, to those who say this is a jobs program and this is something that industry supports, yes, a narrow phase of the industry, if they have a piece of the action. But 3 years ago the Industrial Research Institute, which consists of the top people in the private sector in corporate America who are in charge of R&D programs in America, were asked to rate five big science megabuck projects in terms of their return to the American economy for the investment.

They rated them in the following manner. The most promising, the

human genome project; second, the national aerospace plane, they said, offers great excitement; third, the space station; fourth, the strategic defense initiative; and dead last is the superconducting super collider.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to one of the most eloquent proponents of the superconducting super collider, my friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON].

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker and Members of this body, I rise in support of the rule for consideration of the energy and water appropriation bill. Specifically, I rise to support the continuation of the world's greatest high-energy physics research project, the SSC, or the superconducting super collider. I would ask my colleagues to cast a "no" vote against the expected amendment to kill the project.

The SSC is an idea whose time has come. Beginning in 1982 the scientific community began to discuss whether it is technically feasible and, if technically feasible, if it was in the scientific interest of this Nation to build what we now know as the SSC. They decided that it was. The U.S. Congress agreed with that decision in 1984 and, beginning in 1985, we have been funding moneys for the research projects beginning in 1989 to build the project. It is now 17 percent complete. Only 3 percent of the contingency fund has been used.

At the end of this fiscal year, including the State of Texas money, \$2 billion will have been expended on the program. It will work. The magnets are working beautifully. The scientists guarantee that somewhere in the energy range that the super collider will operate at, that they will discover some of the answers they have been looking for for the last several thousand years.

I would urge my colleagues to listen carefully to the floor debate tomorrow on the super collider, and I would urge them to vote "no" on the amendment to kill the project.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we have decided, on the minority side of the aisle, that we are going to support this rule. But I should say we do not do so with a great deal of enthusiasm. We call this a modified open rule. That still classifies it in the restrictive category.

The reason we are supporting it is that we do believe that it does give people on both sides of this very controversial issue, the superconducting super collider—I think I said it appropriately there, I say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS]—the opportunity to debate this issue fully. And while I will proudly stand in this well as an opponent of the Slatery amendment, I am proud to stand here as a proponent of his right to offer that

amendment. It is for that reason that we will be supporting this rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the remaining 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. COPPERSMITH].

Mr. COPPERSMITH. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I will offer an amendment to cut \$32 million from this bill, funding intended for the advanced liquid metal reactor [ALMR].

I would like to point out that the advanced liquid metal reactor is not economical. It is not cost-effective compared to the lightwater reactor. As the price of uranium has dropped, the ALMR is not useful as a generation technique, and last year the Department of Energy rated it 21st of 23 programs as an energy-generation strategy.

Nor does this program make sense as a waste-reduction tool. It is not environmentally sound. There is no great advantage to recycle high-level radioactive waste; the ALMR does not address water-soluble wastes; it generates new, lower-level wastes, and we still would need long-term storage facilities for the high-level wastes remaining.

The ALMR is also a proliferation threat. It creates plutonium, or could create plutonium, and anyone sophisticated enough to operate this type of reactor can figure out how to separate out the plutonium.

Let me say also what this amendment is not. It is not antinuclear. The nuclear industry wants research on more cost-effective advanced lightwater reactors. The largest utility in my State, Arizona Public Service Co., which just received the Edison Electric Institute's Utility of the Year Award as the best utility in the country, operates the largest and safest nuclear facility in the United States, generating about 40 percent of APS' power.

Thus, I am not antinuclear. What I want is for our energy research money to be spent in the best way possible. This amendment does not close the nuclear option. Instead, what Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. SHARP, and I want to do with this amendment is to prevent a fiscal meltdown.

This amendment has bipartisan support as well as support from a unique collection of groups, including the National Taxpayers Union, the League of Conservation Voters, and the Sierra Club—together at last.

I urge my colleagues: Reduce the deficit, protect the environment, bag the breeder. Vote "yes" on the Copper-smith-Sharp-Zimmer amendment tomorrow to cut the advanced liquid metal reactor.

□ 1710

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOURLY OF MEETING ON TOMORROW, THURSDAY, JUNE 24, 1993

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous material on the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2445) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2445) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair designates the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole and requests the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN] to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1711

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2445) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, with Mr. CARDIN, Chairman pro tempore, in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the bill was considered as having been read the first time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL].

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may use to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the energy and water development appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994. This is the fifth appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994 to come before the house.

I want to commend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], chairman of the energy and water development appropriations subcommittee, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], the ranking minority member on the subcommittee for bringing out a fine bill.

This bill funds important water resources projects in the Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation and Important Energy Research and Nuclear Energy Defense Activities. We need to continue these activities so that these type projects and activities can provide important benefits to the country and to the people.

This is the last appropriations bill on the floor this week. Next week will be an active one on the floor as the House considers the seven bills reported by the Committee on Appropriations this week. We are continuing to move our bills for consideration prior to our Fourth of July work period according to the schedule.

I want to commend all members of the subcommittee for a job well done.

I urge adoption of this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, we bring to you today for your favorable consideration the bill, H.R. 2445, making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year 1994. I am joined by this effort by my colleagues on the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee who have worked long and hard to bring this legislation to the floor. Let

me express my special appreciation to our ranking minority member, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS]. As in years past, he and I have worked together with the subcommittee without any trace of partisanship to fashion a bill that meets the present and future needs of our entire country. I also want to express my appreciation and thanks to the members of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. PASTOR], the gentleman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLO], and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS]. I want to also thank Chairman NATCHER, a member of the subcommittee, and Mr. MCDADE for their assistance. I would like to note that we have four new members on the subcommittee this year, and they have been very valuable members of the subcommittee. They all worked very hard in a bipartisan manner to bring this bill to the House floor for your consideration.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset, I want to point out to Members of the House that this bill is within the section 602(b) allocation for both new budget authority and outlays. It is right at the 602(b) allocation for outlays, and \$63,828,000 below the 602(b) allocation for budget authority. I caution members that any amendments offered to increase appropriations for any programs in this bill will put it over our allocation amount as we are right at our ceiling for outlays.

Mr. Chairman, the committee believes that this is the best bill that could be developed within the severe budget constraints that we faced. The bill before the committee today would provide \$21,953,172,000 to the Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Energy, and nine independent agencies and commissions. This amount is \$285,476,000 lower than the President's budget and \$126,375,000 lower than the fiscal year 1993 appropriation.

I would like to note that the total amount recommended in the bill is \$22,187,618,000 in budget authority. However, the Congressional Budget Office has scored the bill at a total amount of \$21,953,172,000 due to various adjustments needed to compensate for \$234,446,000 of excess revenues and other adjustments credited to accounts in this bill. The \$21,953,172,000 is less than the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation for budget authority.

TITLES I AND II—WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Chairman, the committee is committed to a policy of development of the vital navigation, flood control, shore protection, water supply, irrigation, environmental restoration, and hydroelectric projects that are nec-

essary to the well-being and economic growth of the entire Nation. No part of this country is immune from the problems of water—too little or too much—and all States of the Union must join together cooperatively to foster a truly national water policy which responds to the unique needs of each State and region.

Title I includes \$3,901,353,000 for the Corps of Engineers which provides for 551 water resource projects in the planning of construction phases.

Title II includes \$859,397,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation which provides for 126 water resources projects in the planning or construction phases.

Title I and II also provide for research and development activities, other studies which are not project specific, and projects in the operation and maintenance category. Within the available funds, the subcommittee has attempted to accommodate the most critical needs, within budget constraints, identified through the extensive hearings conducted with administration witnesses, the public, State and local officials, and Members of Congress.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

In title III, for the Department of Energy, the recommendation provides a total of \$16,822,304,000. The amount recommended for energy research programs maintains a balanced energy research program and a healthy scientific research effort. The recommendations include many changes in the request which are summarized in the report. I will mention a few.

In the energy programs of the Department of Energy, several items are worth mentioning:

For solar and renewable energy programs, we are recommending \$326,191,000, an increase of \$257,334,000 over last year's funding level.

The Magnetic Fusion Program was funded at \$347,595,000, the same as the budget request.

In basic energy sciences, funding of \$22,000,000 has been provided for the advanced neutron source to fund the detailed technical work required prior to physical construction of the project.

For environmental restoration and cleanup activities at Department of Energy defense and nondefense facilities, the committee recommendation is \$6,189,675,000, which is an increase of \$648,434,000 over the fiscal year 1993 appropriation.

For nuclear energy R&D, the recommendation is \$330,956,000, a decrease of \$10,898,000 from the fiscal year 1993 level. The committee has agreed to terminate some of the facilities currently being maintained by the Department, but has continued limited funding of advanced reactor research alternatives.

For general science and research, the committee recommendation provides a total of \$1,594,114,000, an increase of \$176,330,000 over the fiscal year 1993 ap-

propriation. The recommendation includes \$620,000,000 for the superconducting super collider, a decrease of \$20,000,000 from the budget request of \$640,000,000. In addition, the committee recommendation provides \$36,000,000, the same as the budget request, to construct an asymmetric B-meson production facility (B-factory).

The recommendation for defense programs of \$10,924,941,000 is \$1,193,684,000 below the current appropriation and \$596,086,000 below the budget request. The recommended level includes increased funds for defense waste cleanup as I noted previously.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Title IV of the bill includes \$370,118,000 for nine independent agencies. This is the same as the budget request.

We have provided \$189,000,000 for the Appalachian Regional Commission; \$138,973,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority; \$15,060,000 for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board; \$2,160,000 for the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, \$1,000,000 for the Office of the Nuclear Waste Negotiator, and \$1,925,000 for three river basin commissions.

The committee recommendation provides \$542,900,000 for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, which is offset by revenues of \$520,900,000, resulting in a net appropriation of \$22,000,000.

GENERAL PROVISION

The bill contains one general provision regarding the superconducting super collider which establishes a goal of making funding available to business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals.

COMMITTEE REPORT

The report accompanying the bill provides a good explanation of the recommendations reflected in the bill. I would encourage the Members to look through it.

This is a good bill. I recommend its adoption.

□ 1720

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER].

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to address provisions in H.R. 2445 relating to the Army Corps of Engineers' Civil Works/Water Resources Program.

First, let me commend the leadership of the Appropriations Committee for their efforts and their cooperation with the Public Works and Transportation Committee, the authorizing committee for the Corps' water resources programs. In particular, I want to thank Chairmen WILLIAM NATCHER and TOM BEVILL and ranking members JOE MCDADE and JOHN MYERS for their willingness to address funding needs of the Nation's largest water resources agency, the Corps of Engineers.

I also want to thank the Appropriations Committee for its help in implementing various

sections of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992. For example, section 313 of the 1992 act authorized a comprehensive environmental infrastructure and resource development program for south-central Pennsylvania. As one of its primary drafters, I can assure Members that the intent of the Public Works and Transportation Committee was to expand the corps' mission and authorities to meet various environmental infrastructure and resource development needs of rural communities—without in any way competing with opportunities for private sector engineering and other groups. Just as importantly, we viewed section 313 as a critically needed pilot program for the corps to accelerate project study, design, and construction and get assistance to needy communities in a timely manner.

The section 313 pilot program also required equal emphasis on projects located within the Chesapeake Bay and Ohio River watersheds. This would help to provide regional balance in meeting the many diverse environmental, economic and developmental needs throughout the south-central Pennsylvania area and would allow two different corps districts and divisions to get involved in helping to solve these pressing problems.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2445 is consistent with our intent regarding section 313. While it provides only \$10 million of the \$17 million authorized, it will help get the corps moving in the right direction—beyond preliminary study and planning and swiftly into project construction and implementation. This is not merely study money; it is money to get various projects up and running. While \$10 million is less than I had hoped for, \$5 million for each of these watersheds will go a long way in meeting the region's needs.

The Appropriations Committee's report spells out two of the projects that are to receive equal priority attention—one for the Altoona city authority and one for the Forest Hills municipal authority.

Mr. Chairman, I would be remiss if I did not thank Congressman JOHN MURTHA for the invaluable role he has played in both authorizing and appropriating funds for the south-central Pennsylvania program. We worked together on the provision in the 1992 act and again in the drafting of funding provisions in this bill. I appreciate his leadership and help.

I also appreciate the committee's willingness to address other water resources issues in south-central Pennsylvania. For example, the bill provides \$400,000 for a watershed reclamation and wetlands pilot project for the Broad Top Region. It also appropriates \$450,000 for the corps to initiate a comprehensive study of the Juniata River corridor, including a reevaluation of the flood control needs of Tyrone, PA.

These and other provisions in H.R. 2445 are critical to meeting various water resources needs throughout my region. I appreciate the work of the committee not only as it pertains to south-central Pennsylvania but also to the entire Nation's water resources and environmental infrastructure.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] for his

comments and, once again, his Committee on Appropriations for energy and water development with whom I have had the pleasure to work with all these years. They have presented a bill that we bring to the floor today, and he has done a capable and able job, which he always does, of explaining the details of the bill, and that relieves me of the responsibility for doing that.

But I do want to join him in thanking especially the new members of the committee who contributed so much during this year. We have the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] who is here on the floor today. We have the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. PASTOR], the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK], and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], all of whom contributed very much to it, and under the able leadership of our staff director and his fine group here of staff who worked so hard and have worked with the committee, Mr. Chairman, we have been able to bring the bill to the floor, not as quick as usual. Someone here yesterday said, "You're fifth on the order here, and years before you've always been No. 1," and we have prided ourselves. But we had a difficult time this year putting all the pieces together and to prioritize the many requests that we have had.

Mr. Chairman, we had more than 100 Members who testified before our committee, a number of Governors, and we had hundreds of requests from all over the country, as we always have, and all the programs, or most all of them, are very important to the localities, and I know when the chairman and I were on this committee a good many years ago that this was known as the all-American bill because the bill does touch every district in this country and touches some outside the country. But it is a very important bill because it does help provide the energy needs for our future.

Mr. Chairman, we hope we are anticipating the energy needs for the future. It provides for many of the transportation needs of our country. More than 25,000 miles of inland waterways come under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Energy and Water Development, and also the ports which are so vital to our exports of our products, and a few imports coming in are so important, and this comes under the jurisdiction of this committee.

Mr. Chairman, it has been a busy committee, but, as the chairman has said, this year we have \$21,900,000,000 in the bill, of which almost half is for defense activities. This is something that shocks especially new Members because they do not realize that this committee does have, through the Department of Energy, a large responsibility in defense.

We have reduced the defense budget somewhat this year to accommodate

some other needs, but I do not think we have dangerously reduced the defense activities to the point that we are jeopardizing the future of nuclear needs of our country for our naval reactors, as well as repossession of some of our nuclear weapons. We are, as the chairman said, \$126,300,000 below last year's level in budget authority, and, as far as the budget requests, we are under the President's request by \$285,400,000.

□ 1730

But we are right on the money as far as the outlays are concerned under the 602(b) allocations. And for those of you who wonder what 602(b) is, that is the allocation made to the various subcommittees by the Committee on the Budget of how much money we do have to spend on outlays. Outlays is what really concerns all of us, because that is how much the taxpayers will have to raise, either through taxes or through borrowing, to pay for the various programs. So we are right up to the 602(b) allocation in outlays.

We are \$64 million under last year. But when you look at the outlays, we are right up against it.

So, as the chairman said, I hope no one will ask this committee to raise the amount of money we have authorized for appropriations in this, because we will not be able to accommodate. We would have to object. If someone does have a suggestion that we are going to raise money, it is going to have to be also offset. It has to come out of some other program in their State.

Mr. Chairman, the defense activities are something that has always taken in recent years a lion's share here, but this year we have reduced it, and I do not think we cut it, as I mentioned a moment ago, below the necessary levels.

In closing, the administration also complimented us on the fact that we did find some additional savings that the administration was not able to find in defense.

The administration did have some objections, rather mild compared to other years. They do not say they are going to reject the bill, as a few times in the past we have had President who sent us through his Office of Management and Budget, that OMB would recommend the President to veto it.

This is not the kind of message we have received this year. But the President says in his investment program that the committee has provided sufficient funding for most of the administration's investment requests. Of course, there have been some disagreements, as there always are. This committee through the years has learned to learn of certain programs and certain projects that are beneficial and others that we felt through out personal investigation, going out and in-

vestigating, our staff investigation, actually site investigation, found that some of the programs have not been what we feel as high a priority as others, as much as the administration sometimes requested.

The administration also says, in the Corps of Engineers, as well as the Bureau of Reclamation, we have put some projects in that the administration did not request. But then again, we have listened to the Members, to mayors, to Governors, to legislators, to concerned citizens, about these projects, about the need for flood control, about the need of renovating, bringing port facilities up to date for the inland waterways, for certain dams and the gates and the transportation system. When we have to go through the system of transportation, some of the systems get worn out and outgrown, so we have had to make some modifications here that the President did not request.

The President also objected to the uranium enrichment facilities, that we believe will have to continue. We did provide for continuation of the investment in the uranium enrichment facility for the time being, because we realize we are still going to be producing uranium for the future and we are going to be needing nuclear reactors, both for defense as well as for civilian reactors to generate electricity.

In sum, Mr. Chairman, this is the most austere budget that in the years that I have been on, with the chairman, that we have come to the floor with. But every item in this budget we can defend and have defended. They are good programs, they are good projects, and they are worthy of your consideration and your vote. Your committee and the staff have worked hard for the last several months in developing this bill. It is right on the money.

So I hope that all of us can support this bill, that provides so much for the needs of the future of our country and for future generations.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, without a doubt, one of the most challenging tasks in my congressional career has been this year's service as a member of the Appropriations Energy and Water Development Subcommittee. It has been a challenge because of the number of highly meritorious projects that were proposed to the subcommittee in a year when its allocation was less than the previous year.

Difficult decisions had to be made, but today I stand before you confident that the bill under consideration is a well-balanced and bipartisan mix that does not favor any one region of the United States over another. It recognizes the need of this Nation to invest in the future through research to in-

clude the super collider, but I must emphasize—this is not just an SSC project bill. It is a big mistake to focus on a single project in this complex bill.

As an example, this bill provides for our Nation's water resources through the best utilization of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Department of Energy.

It addresses changing world politics by expanding our nuclear defense weapons activities into greater emphasis on the cleanup of past mistakes and development of alternative energy sources for our future.

It, too, recognizes the valuable contribution of our universities to the national research effort. The bill has a strong central thread of environmental restoration and protection running through it.

I must say, that it has been a pleasure to work with Chairman BEVILL, and ranking member JOHN MYERS who have exhibited outstanding leadership and guidance, on this complex task. While not all the projects have been funded that we would have liked to see, I believe it stretches taxpayer dollars to the fullest extent possible.

The bill is below the President's budget recommendation yet represents the Nation's priorities.

For that reason, I urge my colleagues to support this bill as a most reasonable step toward fiscal responsibility and a most sensible step toward a more productive future for America.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLO], whom I thank for carrying this bill last year. I necessarily had to leave the floor last year because of personal reasons, and I thank the gentleman very much for doing that last year, and I thank him as well for his hard work in putting this bill together this year.

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2445 and its accompanying report making appropriations for energy and water development for fiscal year 1994 and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

As a member of this subcommittee, I would like to thank Chairman BEVILL and ranking member JOHN MYERS for their leadership and direction. I would also like to thank the dedicated and capable staff of the subcommittee for their expertise and knowledge of these important issues.

This year the subcommittee had a difficult task balancing our Nation's energy and water needs. However, again this year the subcommittee was able to craft a bill that will continue to move this country toward energy efficiency and energy independence.

With this bill we have also made a significant long-term commitment to the development of new energy sources for our future needs. Often times we find it very difficult to look to the fu-

ture for our energy needs. However, we must make the commitment now. We must provide the economic opportunities today. Without this investment we are dooming our future generations to a lower standard of living and less productive lives.

I believe this bill takes that necessary step. Within this bill we have funded programs that will make this country less dependent on foreign sources of energy. We have funded scientific research that will give us the edge and the capability to take this country into the 21st century. I am pleased that the committee increased the solar and renewable energy accounts from last year.

An important element of this year's bill is the money provided for magnetic fusion research. It is difficult to think of a more worthwhile Federal investment than research and development into future energy alternatives. Fusion holds the promise of an environmentally benign and safe source of energy and it is an investment that I am happy to support.

Fusion is an investment in our future—a future where the growing energy demands of the world are combining with the environmental consequences of relying on fossil fuels to make fusion a clean and necessary energy choice. It is important that we sustain our investment in fusion now so that U.S. industries can harness this technology for the rest of the world. My dream is that fusion machines of the next century are labeled "Made in the U.S.A." and that American companies will be in a position to capitalize on this important Federal investment.

I am particularly pleased that this bill contains funds for the Tokamak physics experiment [TPX] that will replace the country's largest fusion device at Princeton. We have not built a major fusion machine in this country since the 1970's and TPX is unique in world fusion efforts. TPX will contribute to ITER, and it will provide the central focus of the U.S. fusion program in the years ahead and will ensure that fusion talent and technology remains in the United States.

The committee also included funding for the super collider [SSC]. The super collider is an important scientific project for the United States to pursue. The SSC will be the most powerful accelerator of its type in the world and we cannot continue to have our heads buried in the sand when it comes to high-technology American research projects.

It is unfortunate that again the funding for this project is spread out. Every time we continue to spread out the funding for these important projects we raise the total cost for the project. We need to stand firm on our commitment so that cost can be kept down.

In addition, this bill also provides funding for a number of critical flood

control projects throughout the United States. These important projects will help prevent property damage in areas with recognized flooding problems. It is even more important, however, that these projects move forward in order to save the countless lives lost to devastating floods. This bill provides the needed relief to those areas stricken each year by floods.

Preparing for our future needs is never easy, but H.R. 2445 provides the insight and programs that will make it a little easier. I urge the adoption of this important bill.

□ 1740

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to our friend and colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. PASTOR], another member of this panel.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, this has been quite an experience for me. This is the first time I have been a member of this particular subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations, and it has been a learning experience.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] and the ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS]. For someone who did not know the details of the committee, they provided us information, tender loving care, and helped us with this subcommittee, so I thank both these Members for being patient with us as we learned the workings of the subcommittee.

It was very interesting, because for me, I spent a number of weeks attending hearings in which the first hearing we had, I had a chance to see the Secretary of the Interior and old friend, Governor Babbitt. He came before us and gave us what he thought was needed through the Bureau of Reclamation. Through this committee hearing, we are going to provide many projects through the Bureau of Reclamation.

One of the things I personally learned through this experience is the extensive inland waterways that we have in this country, a system that provides transportation to many of our goods, agricultural products, to go from where they are grown or developed or manufactured to the ports and harbors where they are taken to foreign lands. It was an extensive impression that it gave me of this extensive inland waterway that we have.

This bill helps the development, it helps the maintenance and the operation of this inland waterway, which I learned how important it is to our country. Through the Corps of Engineers, through their testimony, we are helping Americans recover from disasters. We are also planning for the future, in that we are providing monies to protect Americans in this country from disasters and floods.

We not only deal with the present or past disasters, but we also look to the future to see how we are going to ensure that Americans will not be damaged in disasters, and especially in floods.

The other department that came before us was the Department of Energy. Here I learned how this department is now going to emphasize conservation, something that we have not done in the past 12 years. This department now is looking to how Americans can conserve the use of energy, which is very important, Mr. Chairman. They are also looking at alternative energy sources, solar energy, wind, thermal, so that we can ensure that we develop these renewable sources of energy so that we do not have to be dependent on fossil fuels.

The department also is going to convert our national labs, who in the past have dedicated their research to defense, to weapons, and this department now is going to work with these national labs to see how they can convert to nondefense research.

Mr. Chairman, I support this bill and urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS]. The gentleman is not a new Member of Congress nor a new member of the Committee on Appropriations, but he is a new member of this subcommittee and was a great contributor to the bill we have before us today.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support, as well, of the energy and water development appropriations bill that is before us. At the outset I want to thank and congratulate our chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], and the ranking Republican on the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], for their work and their support in the interests of the Members of this body, and, consequently, the country in putting this bill together.

As the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] has mentioned, I am one of the new members of the panel. I have only joined it this year, although I have served on the Committee on Appropriations now I think 10 years or so. Barely a handful of subcommittees in this body handle the variety of requests from our colleagues that this subcommittee does, I have learned, or on such a vital array of programs.

These two gentlemen, whose collective experience and collective wisdom and judgment mean so much to this body, a real valuable asset, years and years of experience that these two Members of Congress have given to this subcommittee and to the country, is indeed a very valuable part of this institution.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say something about the staff work on this sub-

committee. I have learned from my experience this year of the tremendous amount of experience this staff has, and the amount of attention to detail that they have devoted to this bill. I am sure this is only the last installment of that. We appreciate the work of the staff and the leaders of the committee.

For those in the country who read about gridlock in Congress, I would like to invite them to come and sit in on a meeting of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations. It is a bipartisan operating committee. We differ on issues, but we do not differ personally, and we try to work together for the benefit of the country. That is a tribute, again, to the leadership, the chairman and the ranking member, who set such a good example for the rest of us.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us continues, as has been mentioned, a number of programs and agencies that are truly vital to the country: The water resources work of the Corps of Engineers; the nuclear programs of the country, both civilian and military, on which our national security depends; research to ensure reliable energy for generations to come; and economic development programs that serve the particularly needy regions of the country.

In particular, as we all know, the Corps of Engineers is an enormously important water management agency within the Federal Government. We recognize the corps for its work to improve the navigation of our waterways, to provide water supply, to operate lakes for recreation and hydropower, and a number of other tasks.

In my part of the country, in eastern Kentucky, we rely on the corps for all those things, but first and foremost, we rely upon the corps to protect our communities from damaging flood waters, to make them safe places to live and to do business.

I am pleased, therefore, that under this bill the corps will be able to continue providing vital flood protection work in the communities in my region and throughout the country. The people of eastern Kentucky are just as entitled as those in other parts of the country to watch a dark cloud on the horizon without having to worry that it might be the one that sweeps away their home or business.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to commend the committee for including funds that continue the work of the Appalachian Regional Commission, helping needy areas of the country and the other Appalachian States in addition to Kentucky to help themselves.

□ 1750

The ARC is the helping and innovative hand without which many of our neediest would go underserved. By pro-

viding the budget request for the ARC, the bill continues to deliver clean water, better schooling and training, highways and other badly needed basic services to an impoverished region of the country.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very good bill, and it has been put together responsibly and conservatively, and I urge our colleagues to support it when the vote comes.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK], who is also a member of this panel.

Mrs. MEEK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address my remarks to all of the Members of the House, but most distinctly to Chairman BEVILL of our committee and to our ranking minority member, JOHN MYERS, who is a good friend and colleague. This is my first year on this panel and it has been most instructive. The staff has been supportive as well as having taken time to give us personal training and personal guidance in what we do on this committee. So it just has not been a haphazard process for the Committee on Energy and Water. It has been purposeful, it has been deliberate and well-guided in this process.

Certain goals were set and they were met. Certainly this could not have happened if it were not for the good leadership and the good staff. So that gives me a great privilege in my freshman year to be a part of this committee.

This particular bill, H.R. 2445, is a very good bill which each of us as policymakers are distinctly privileged to have a part in making this bill come to the floor today. Because of that we know that we are serving the needs of our country and we know that through this committee we will be serving the water needs of the country and we will be serving the energy needs and the many other needs. If there is one bill in this entire Congress that has a broad, eclectic approach for everyone, it is the Committee on Energy and Water's bill, and our committee has done that. There is something in it for everyone.

I am so happy to know that we are now on the forefront of research and development so our universities can point toward what is necessary for the 21st century, and this Congress has had the foresight to do that.

Certainly I take my hat off to the Corps of Engineers and their disaster control, and how they were the saving grace in south Florida when we were devastated by Hurricane Andrew. It is almost 1 year since that devastation, and if it were not for the U.S. Corps of Engineers, certainly Florida would not be in the position it is in today of recovering from that major disaster. This committee funds the U.S. Corps of Engineers, and I think it is a credible way of funding an agency such as that.

Also, the Department of Energy we see stepping out on the forefront of re-

search and development, and the superconducting super collider came before our committee. We feel that that is a reach into the future, a reach into man being able to look into the future and see what is exactly needed in the area of medical research. How do we know but that one of our lives may be saved by the proton research therapy which comes about because of the superconducting super collider?

But all in all, we will go into the next century as a world leader because of this committee and because of the foresight it has. We have had cooperation and advice from all of these agencies, and we have taken a handle on the water situation in this country. If there has ever been a program or a committee that is nonpartisan and nonideological, it is this particular committee. And I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for giving me this opportunity.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN], one of the newest Members of the House who, although he is not on this subcommittee, came to us early on and started working with this committee.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my deep concern on that part of the legislation before us that reduces the administration's request for defense environmental restoration and waste management. I am 100 percent behind cutting Government waste, but we cannot take short cuts when dealing with nuclear waste. The Fernald plant located in my district and similar waste sites around the country where people live with the nightmare of nuclear by-products deserve the full attention of this Congress and full funding for cleanup.

Fernald continues to receive national media attention because of the environmental disaster created by seepage of nuclear waste and the ensuing contamination of ground water and hundreds of acres of land. The careless disposal of waste has elevated health risks and threatened the drinking water of individual citizens and entire communities.

It was unfortunate when we learned a couple of months ago that funding for Fernald would be cut by the administration despite early indications that the cleanup would proceed as planned. It would be a serious setback if the cleanup in progress would now be forced to cut back even further.

The Fernald cleanup is being accomplished using a new vehicle—the Environmental Restoration Management Contract Program. The program offers a new way for the Government to do business—providing incentives for the private sector to complete its work in a timely and efficient manner. We were

told this new approach would be the wave of the future—that it could mean that the days of huge cost overruns and years of delay could be over. This promising program, barely a year old, has not had a chance to succeed, and yet we are talking about the possibility of substantially reducing its funding.

In the case of Fernald, reduced funding now means over \$1 billion in additional costs later. It means the loss of jobs—300 to 600 starting this October. It means that the citizens of my district must suffer longer with the fears of nuclear contamination. I hope that the issue of funding for this cleanup can be addressed in this legislation or in later actions.

Let us give this new approach being tried at Fernald that has so much promise a chance to succeed and let us give some hope to our citizens that this nightmare may soon be over.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I congratulate him on the great work that he has done in bringing this bill before us.

I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN].

Mr. Chairman, I too, rise today to express my deep reservation with a portion of the legislation before us, H.R. 2445. This measure, as recommended by the Appropriations Committee, cuts \$280 million from the administration's request for Defense environmental restoration and waste management.

The Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Program is critical to those communities that host a Department of Energy nuclear weapons facility. At the height of the cold war, these DOE sites were the front line of our strategic defense. Unfortunately, as a result, many such facilities have experienced significant hazardous contamination of soil, ground water, and surrounding structures. The Government clearly has a responsibility to remediate this impact as much as possible and as soon as possible.

While I note that this recommended appropriation is marginally higher than the fiscal year 1993 appropriation, I am concerned that cleanup efforts at these sites will continue to be postponed. I must point out that these expenditures are not indefinite. Unlike so many Government programs, this one is terminal and has an end in sight. However, the longer we deny adequate funding for the cleanup process, the longer we delay completion. The result is increased community fears and increased DOE costs.

Mr. Chairman, I am acutely aware of the size of this appropriation. However, we owe it to those people and commu-

nities that have dedicated so much to our national defense to provide them with a safe and healthy environment in which to live.

I support the administration's full request for Defense environmental restoration and waste management and oppose the \$280 million reduction as recommended by the Appropriations Committee. Should we not restore the necessary funding in today's dispensation of H.R. 2445, I am hopeful that we may do so in subsequent action on this, or a similar, measure.

□ 1800

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], who works with the committee.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, we all know that the appropriations subcommittees are facing very difficult choices this year, and I think the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] have done a commendable job in putting this bill together and getting it to the floor.

Mr. Chairman I especially want to commend the members of the Energy and Water Subcommittee and the full committee for the support which they have shown in this bill for the Environmental Management Program [EMP] on the upper Mississippi River. The program, which is now in its seventh year of funding, is proving to be not only a highly successful mechanism for fostering a comprehensive and cooperative approach to management of the interjurisdictional resources of the upper Mississippi, but a model for a much broader national program for the management of interjurisdictional river resources. This is a program that has worked and is working for the environment as well as for the people of the five-State upper Mississippi region. Chairman BEVILL and the subcommittee's ranking member, Mr. MYERS, deserve credit for the support they have shown the program.

In addition, I thank the committee on behalf of my constituents in the city of La Crosse, WI, for bringing us one step closer to resolution of a problem which has remained unsolved for too long. By specifically directing the Corps of Engineers to credit the city of La Crosse \$1.4 million for the city's share of construction cost of the State road and Ebner Coulees project in the city, the committee directing the corps to do what it was authorized to do in the 1992 reauthorization of the Water Resources Development Act, and again urged to do in committee report language accompanying the fiscal year 1993 energy and water appropriation.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I commend the bipartisan leadership of the Energy and Water Subcommittee for bringing a very good bill to the floor in a very difficult budgetary environment, and I

urge all the Members to give it their support.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to our friend and colleague, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI].

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to discuss the nuclear weapons research, development, and testing accounts. First, let me begin by acknowledging the committee has reduced the budget request for these accounts by over \$100 million. Further, the appropriation containing these accounts is \$198 million less than the fiscal year 1993 funding level. I support these cuts and applaud the work of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittee.

However, I wish to point out the administration has not submitted the report on nuclear weapons testing as required by law contained within last year's Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, Public Law 102-377. This report was due March 1, 1993.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, as you know, these programs have not been authorized. When the House considers the Defense authorization bill later this summer, the House may make additional changes in the research, development, and testing funding levels. With this in mind, will the chairman agree to support the position of the House in these areas in conference committee with the Senate?

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

Mr. KOPETSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, yes, I will support the House position during conference.

Mr. KOPETSKI. I thank the subcommittee chairman. I look forward to working with him and his staff as this legislation progresses.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, there have been a lot of nice words said about the staff and some of the members on this committee, and we all thank you for those nice accolades that you said. I hope they are worthy of the investment.

But I want to close by saying that this is an austere committee bill this year. There were some requests that some of the Members of Congress have made and some of the Governors have made and others have made for funds and programs that the committee just could not find the money to fund this year. Most of the programs sometime hopefully in the future will be funded, but we just could not have the money this year.

In closing, I also want to talk about the SSC, which will be under consideration tomorrow. We may not have time

for all to speak on the SSC. This committee has always funded the SSC, has always believed in it.

It is true you can be critical of the SSC, because it is the most sophisticated, the most advanced system for research that this country has ever, ever attempted.

We do not know for sure. We know that it is going to explore matter. We know that there are elements now that we are not sure about, the putting steel together and some of the other chemicals, some of the things that we put together in equipment, and such as fabrics, and we do not know how they are put together, and we do not know how they will wear, or if they will wear longer, so if this country is going to be on the leading edge and we are going to have the research for the next century, we are going to have to advance programs like the SSC.

As has been mentioned by the gentleman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK], cancer is growing in this country, and one of the side things that we did not even think about when the SSC came up for discussion was the fact that we could take out of this linear accelerator some beams, proton beams, divert them away, and not interfere with the other experimentation, and be one of the vital new treatments that we have considered in advanced proton treatment of advanced cancer such as tumors of the brain and deep tumors in the body that are hard to reach with normal x-ray or gamma radiation. So we can take some of these protons off and use them for treatment of cancer.

We have already had three reactors working in Loma Linda, CA, treating eye tumors and other deep tumors, so this is a side benefit we did not anticipate when this first was being considered.

But we think that this is an opportunity here with the SSC, advancing out and exploring a whole new area that has not been explored in the past.

At Fermi Lab outside of Chicago, we have, of course, two rings of reactors there. We have learned great things there about the conduct of electricity. We have learned to make better magnets that we use in many, many types of equipment in the country today.

This is a great opportunity that we will have in the SSC if we bring it on line.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of our time, 4½ minutes, to our friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST].

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chairman, I want to take a few moments to respond to some things that have been said in the press in the last couple of days about the supercollider. We have had one of the more outrageous things that I have seen in the time that I have been in

Congress, and my friend, the gentleman from New York, mentioned the release of an inspector general report.

The report was not released, and it was not a final report. This was the leaking to the press in an unofficial way of a work-in-progress document that is still being commented on internally in the Department of Energy.

Now, you are going to hear a lot of discussion about this IG report in the next couple of days, so I would just like to take a moment or two to talk about what was in that document, what was not in that document, and that it is not a final document and it was not released, it was leaked by critics of the program.

The release of the draft inspector general report on the allowability and propriety of subcontractor expenditures at the SSC has led to criticisms of as much as \$216 million of expenditures by the laboratory. Although the report has not yet been officially issued, and although its findings are labeled as tentative, it seems appropriate, in light of the premature release of the report, to respond to some of its alleged findings and conclusions. It must be emphasized that although some public portrayals of the report claim or imply that the \$216 million has been wasted, the draft report makes no such claim; rather it suggests problems in the manner in which those expenditures were accounted for and controlled.

The draft report apparently focuses on three particular issues: expenditures at other national laboratories, cost growth in reimbursable contracts, and use of management allowance funds.

Expenditures at other national laboratories: Of the \$216 million in expenditures that the draft IG report finds reason to question, \$156 million is for work done at other national laboratories in support of the SSC. The IG report apparently states that the SSC Laboratory did not select the other laboratories on a competitive basis and that this resulted in inadequate control and accountability for funds and equipment. Quite apart from the fact that Fermilab, Brookhaven National Laboratory, and Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory were the only places in the United States that possessed both the experience and the facilities necessary to carry out the first stages of the superconducting magnet development program, it is worth noting that the involvement of those laboratories has resulted in a remarkably successful technology development program.

The SSC Laboratory has taken advantage of the unique capabilities in both personnel and equipment available at other national laboratories in order to carry out basic research and development in support of the project. This led to construction of superconducting dipole magnets at Fermilab and Brookhaven and of a superconduct-

ing quadrupole magnet at Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory. The completion of the accelerator system string test 6 weeks ahead of schedule is a direct result of the successful collaboration between the SSC Laboratory and the other national laboratories. In general, as soon as the basic research and development on collider systems has been completed, the SSC Laboratory has proceeded to transfer the technology to private industrial firms for the production of those systems.

The use of memorandum purchase orders to obtain work from other national laboratories was reviewed and authorized by the Department of Energy.

Cost growth in reimbursable contracts: The IG questions the use of cost reimbursable contracts even though contracts for major procurements such as those for engineering and construction management services and for development and production of magnets, were placed in accordance with DOE policies and were specifically approved by the DOE.

When initially issued, some of these contracts called for a more restrictive scope of work than was ultimately required. As the scope of the contracts was increased, the total funding increased accordingly, as did the amount of work performed by the contractor. The IG has apparently categorized increases in these contracts, all of which were formally reviewed and approved by the Department of Energy, as uncontrollable growth. To the contrary, the increases have been carefully controlled and, in fact, the ultimate cost of the contracts under consideration is expected to be within the funds budgeted for the activities performed by the contractors.

Use of management allowance funds: The Super Collider Laboratory is run by a nonprofit organization, Universities Research Association, Inc. [URA], which receives no overhead or fee for operating the laboratory. In order to fund expenses that are not directly chargeable to the super collider contract, the DOE, in accordance with its longstanding policy, provides a management allowance to URA. The management allowance for the SSC was about \$1.1 million, 0.2 percent of total expenses, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992. The management allowance was used to pay for the salaries and expenses of URA's corporate offices and personnel. In addition, it included \$264,000 for discretionary expenses of the laboratory director. The largest expense in this category was about \$143,000 for meetings, travel expenses, and hospitality, mostly for the many experts from around the world who visit the laboratory regularly—unpaid—to advise and assist the project. The discretionary allowance also provided \$66,000 for employee morale activities, examples of which

include partial support of a holiday party and maintenance of plants in common areas of laboratory buildings. The laboratory believes that past expenditures have been reasonable and prudent.

Although, as noted here, some of the issues raised by the draft IG report do not constitute valid criticisms of laboratory practices, the report apparently does include a number of useful recommendations and suggestions. When the report is officially issued, the laboratory will carefully review it and fully expects to implement many of the suggestions.

□ 1810

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

Mr. BOEHLERT. I thank the gentleman and appreciate the Chair's indulgence.

Mr. Chairman, let me be perfectly clear: The gentleman from Alabama, [Mr. BEVILL] and the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. MYERS], have brought to the floor a good bill. We are not surprised that they have brought forward a good bill; that is what we are used to from Chairman BEVILL and Mr. MYERS.

The only problem with it, as I see it, is the provision relating to the superconducting super collider.

I expect the vote tomorrow of the full House to speak to that issue, and then we can all enthusiastically support this fine piece of legislation.

But I think, Mr. Chairman, we should all be aware of the headlines which make it easier to dissolve the SSC cult.

For now, let me just cite a few of the most telling examples. The General Accounting Office new estimates that the SSC will cost a minimum of \$11 billion to build, an increase of almost \$3 billion over last year's figure. Keep in mind the steady progression; it started out in 1985 at \$4.4 billion and then it went to \$5.2 billion, then it went to \$5.9 billion, and then it went to \$8.2 billion.

Now, the General Accounting Office tells us—and it is yet to be more than 17 percent complete—that the projected cost is in excess of \$11 billion. So we are talking about 200 percent over the original projection.

Item: The Department of Energy inspector general reports that the SSC managers juggled the books to make it look like they were exceeding their goals for minority contracting, when actually they failed to meet them. And it is very important to note that the Department of Energy accepts these findings.

Item: The Secretary of Energy, who appeared before our Science Committee in her maiden appearance on Capitol Hill, she said at that time that she has no passion for this project—and I can understand why. The Secretary of Energy, echoing her predecessor, ac-

knowledges that foreign contributions for the collider are unlikely to exceed \$400 million, considerably less than project supporters have repeatedly promised.

Now keep in mind that this House, by a substantial, overwhelming bipartisan vote 2 years ago, addressed this issue, and we said a minimum 20 percent foreign contribution would be required to go forward. That minimum 20 percent foreign contribution has not been forthcoming.

Item: The latest inspector general's report accuses SSC managers of imprudent spending, a lack of cost controls, which is a recurring lament, and worst of all, a deliberate effort to thwart auditors.

There are going to be some people during this debate who would address the nickels and dimes and suggest that, "Oh, they had a Christmas party for their employees. What is wrong with that?" I am not offended by that. What I am offended by is a project that is billions of dollars in cost overruns.

In short, while the superconducting super collider managers have not yet reached the level of arrogance and self-indulgence and secrecy and undependability exhibited by Rasputin's patron, the czar, they are getting there.

Let us topple this regime, let us put the project to bed and go on with higher priority assignments.

I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding to me and thank the Chair for its indulgence.

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I agree with the Comments of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] regarding the superconducting super-collider, but I do rise in support of H.R. 2445.

Mr. Chairman, this Member would begin by expressing commendations to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], the chairman of the subcommittee, and the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], the ranking member of the subcommittee for their exceptional work in bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, the 1994 energy and water development appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994 includes funding for several related water projects that are important to Nebraska.

Importantly, the bill provides funding for two Missouri River projects which are designed to remedy problems of erosion, loss of fish and wildlife habitat, and sedimentation. First, the bill provides \$11.8 million for the Missouri River mitigation project. This funding is needed to restore fish and wildlife habitat lost due to the federally sponsored channelization and stabilization projects of the Missouri River during the Pick-Sloan era. The islands, wetlands, and flat floodplains needed to support the wildlife and waterfowl that once lived along the river are gone. An estimated 475,000 acres of

habitat in Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, and Kansas have been lost. Today's fishery resources are estimated to be only one-fifth of those which existed in predevelopment days.

Second, the bill provides \$200,000 for operation and maintenance and \$74,000 for construction of the Missouri National Recreation River project. This project addresses a serious problem in protecting the river banks from the extraordinary and excessive erosion rates caused by the sporadic and varying releases from the Gavins Point Dam. These erosion rates are a result of previous work on the river by the Federal Government.

In addition, the bill provides funding for the continuation of studies important to residents of Nebraska's First Congressional District. It provides continued funding for a floodplain study of Antelope Creek which runs through the heart of Nebraska's capital city, Lincoln, and it enables the completion of a flood control benefit study of the Burt Water Drainage District in Burt and Washington Counties.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this Member recognizes that the bill also provides operation and maintenance funding for the Missouri River Water Control Manual as well as funding for Army Corps and Bureau of Reclamation projects in Nebraska's other two congressional districts at the following sites: Wood River; Papillion Creek and Tributaries Lakes; Gavins Point Dam, and Lewis and Clark Lake, in First and Third Congressional Districts; Harlan County Lake; Salt Creek and Tributaries; Prairie Bend and North Loup Division.

Again Mr. Chairman, this Member commends the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], the chairman of the subcommittee, and the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], the ranking member of the subcommittee and all the members of the subcommittee for their continued support of these projects which are important to Nebraska and the First Congressional District, as well as to the people living in the Missouri River Basin.

Mr. BOEHLERT. I appreciate those remarks because this is a very good bill coming from the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], the ranking member; a very good bill worked out in a bipartisan fashion. That is no surprise to any of us who have served in this institution year after year. We have come to expect that quality of legislation from Chairman BEVILL and Mr. MYERS.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. I am very pleased, Mr. Chairman, to conclude this general debate. I stand in strong support not only of the legislation authored by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], but also in support of the superconducting super collider.

Mr. Chairman, this is a committee that has been, I think, burdened by a number of increasing demands on it but has yearly come through with a

balanced bill that not only meets the Congress's need to tighten funding but does so in a way that allows significant scientific research projects to go forward.

I particularly want to focus on the fact that this is a bill that is below, in budget authority and in outlays, the 1993 appropriation and is a strong statement from this administration about its priorities as well. We have certainly heard a lot on the floor today on the SSC in that regard.

This is an Administration that believes looking into the inner aspects of matter, determining what really caused the creation of Earth and all of the atmosphere around it is just as important as exploring the stratosphere, exploring outer space.

Therefore, I strongly back not only what is in this bill in the general sense for the good of the country, but also for its particular focus on western water needs.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the bill H.R. 2445, the bill providing for energy and water development appropriations for fiscal year 1994. This is a fiscally responsible bill and a balanced bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is \$285.5 million less than the President's budget request, \$63.8 million below the amount approved by Congress in the budget resolution and \$126.4 million below the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1993.

Mr. Chairman, for those Members who are interested in reductions in spending over last year's level, I would like to highlight just a few of the key areas where the committee made substantial reductions.

At the same time that the committee made very substantial reductions in a variety of areas, the committee has been able to provide significant additional support for the scientific infrastructure of the country, increase support for renewable energy technologies, and increase support for key water supply and flood control projects throughout the country.

In California alone, the bill provides support for hundreds of projects from flood control to water supply to fishery and natural resource protection.

Mr. Chairman, I would just point in particular that the bill provides the first year of funding to implement the CVP Improvement Act. This provision will yield an estimated \$45 million in fiscal year 1994 for improvements in the operation of the CVP to reduce the project's impact on fish and wildlife and at the same time provide a more secure water supply to the farms and cities that depend so critically on this project.

I appreciate the committee's willingness to work with me on this and other problems facing our very diverse State.

The bill also continues the Corps of Engineers leadership in wetlands development as well as its more traditional missions.

And, the bill—through its support for the SSC, general science, and other nuclear and high-energy physics research—will also help maintain our Nation's position as a world leader in science and technology.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. BEVILL and Mr. MYERS for their cooperation and support, and their sensitivity to the many water development and energy-related problems facing the Nation. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2445, the fiscal 1994 energy and water development appropriations bill.

I wish to commend subcommittee Chairman BOB BEVILL and ranking member JOHN MYERS for their efforts in crafting this legislation. They did a superb job under very difficult circumstances.

I am delighted that they were able to bring this legislation in some \$126 million below last year's funding level, and some \$285 million less than the President's request.

This legislation assures that adequate funding will be available for our Nation's highest priority energy and water development projects, and is at the same time fiscally responsible. That is a winning combination which I hope will set the standard for all appropriations bills this year.

The energy and water development bill gets right to the heart of our efforts to rebuild our infrastructure and strengthen our Nation's economy.

The hundreds of projects nationwide which are funded under this bill create jobs, generate tax revenues, enhance the environment, and strengthen the very foundation of our economy.

These projects serve far more than just the parochial interests of the States or communities which sponsor them. They also help to fuel our Nation's economic engine. Putting people back to work, and enlarging our economic pie, is a far better way to reduce the budget deficit than raising taxes.

I am very pleased that the legislation provides funding for seven important navigation and beach-erosion-control projects in my district in southern New Jersey. All of these projects are intended to enhance our multibillion-dollar tourism, boating, and commercial shipping industries, which are a major source of jobs in our region.

These projects include: Maintenance dredging along the Intracoastal Waterway and Cold Spring Inlet; deepening of the Salem River; and the continuation of studies which are aimed at developing low-cost, comprehensive navigation and beach erosion control projects along Brigantine Inlet, Townsends Inlet, Cape May Point, and the Delaware Bay coastline.

I am especially pleased that the committee voted to combine the Cape May Point project with the ongoing flood control survey along the Lower Cape Meadows. This will enable us to cut costs and expedite the completion of this work.

I wish we could do even more to support energy and water development projects around our country. Unfortunately, I understand the realities of our budget crisis, and the need to defer funding for those projects which are not critical.

That is one of the major reasons for my vote for the Slattery-Boehlert amendment, which would terminate all funding for the superconducting super collider project. While I understand the potential scientific benefits of this project, I just don't think we can justify the \$11 billion price tag at this time.

In this difficult fiscal climate, it would be more prudent to use those funds for deficit reduction than to continue work on the superconducting super collider.

I urge a yes vote on the Slattery-Boehlert amendment and a yes vote on H.R. 2445, the energy and water development appropriations bill.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose, and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. HASTINGS] having assumed the chair, Mr. HUGHES, 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. 2445) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 1820

RESIGNATION AS TEMPORARY MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS) laid before the House the following resignation as a temporary member of the Committee on Natural Resources:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 18, 1993.

Hon. TOM FOLEY,
Chairman, Democratic Steering and Policy Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This letter is to notify you of my intention to resign my position as a temporary member of the House Committee on Natural Resources effective immediately.

I have been very appreciative of the opportunity provided me by the Members of the Steering and Policy Committee to serve on this important body. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

HOWARD L. BERMAN,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

THE SPACE STATION

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

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of final passage of the reauthorization of NASA and the space station.

In doing so, I ask you to reflect today on the advice of two of our former Presidents from opposing political parties. They served our country at uniquely different times in our Nation's history. Yet both made the critical decision to fund the Space Program not for its certainty, but for its uncertainty.

We do not know what our investment in NASA and the space station will achieve in the next 30 years, just as we did not know what our investment would achieve in 1961. That year, President John F. Kennedy appealed to this body to spend an unprecedented \$7-\$9 billion over 5 years to send a man to the Moon, and to do so during the height of the cold war.

He said in his address,

Now it is time to take longer strides—time for a great new American enterprise—time for this nation to take a clearly leading role in space achievement, which in many ways may hold the key to our future on earth.

Who, in 1961, could have predicted many of the historic events of our lifetimes? The eradication of smallpox, the rapid spread of AIDS, the fall of the Iron Curtain, the development of personal computers and other electronic devices, organ transplants and medical technology advances such as laser surgery, and sending a man to the Moon and then beyond.

Freeman Dyson, an author and scientist, eloquently expresses my thoughts and hopes,

The big jumps ahead are taken by people who disregard the conventional wisdom and do something unexpected. The big jumps are unpredictable. And the same unpredictability reigns also in economics and international politics.

The value of the unpredictable spin-offs from space exploration are immeasurable. Among these are the heart monitor, pollution control devices, athletic shoes, smoke detectors, sunglass lens, solar hot water heaters, fire resistant materials, sewage treatment, magnetic resonance imaging, and breast cancer detection.

Who would have predicted these advances and, more importantly, who would suggest we do without them?

This vote is not an easy one in light of our budget deficit, just as it was not easy for President John F. Kennedy in 1961, at the height of the cold war, or for President Ronald Reagan in 1986, after the death of the *Challenger's* crew. I remember their decisions vividly. I have a sense of what they must have felt then.

A feeling of uncertainty, yet hope. A genuine gratitude for the sacrifices of those in the Space Program who journeyed before us. And, as evidenced by the courageous decisions of Presidents Kennedy and Reagan, a sense of dedication and resolve. A commitment to look forward, to proceed, and to succeed.

As President Reagan said only hours after the death of our *Challenger* astronauts, an event which could have been the end of space exploration and advances, "It's all part of the process of exploration and discovery. It's all part of taking a chance and expanding man's horizons."

Looking back, I could list for you hundreds of products and scientific ad-

vances which resulted from the Space Program over the past 30 years. Looking forward, I cannot see future advances with the same clarity, but I know they are there and I know we owe it to future generations to continue this investment in the future. As President Reagan said, "The future doesn't belong to the fainthearted; it belongs to the brave. The *Challenger* crew was pulling us into the future, and we'll continue to follow them." Therefore, in conclusion, my fellow Members, I urge you to join me in this journey by supporting the NASA reauthorization and the space station.

ACCESS AND EFFICIENCY: REBUILDING OUR ESSENTIAL HEALTH CARE FACILITIES

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today I and several of my colleagues are introducing the Essential Health Facilities Investment Act of 1993. This legislation would provide assistance for the capital needs of safety net facilities, support State review of capital expenditures, and expand Federal efforts to facilitate development of health care provider networks. These initiatives are targeted to expand the availability of health care services—basic primary care service and advanced medical procedures—to residents in all the neighborhoods and communities of America.

Much attention has been given over the past several years to the crumbling infrastructure of our Nation's highways and bridges. These are areas requiring greater Government attention. But just as we need to invest resources in ensuring that our roads are maintained, we must also ensure that our health care safety net does not tear apart. The care of our Nation's uninsured falls to these facilities.

In addition to the emergency care services provided, the safety net facilities—those public and not-for-profit hospitals and clinics which serve a disproportionate share of uninsured and low-income patients—provide tremendous volumes of outpatient and primary care. These facilities provide the only source of health care for many uninsured and insured low-income residents. In effect, they have become the family doctor for many in our country.

Many of our safety net facilities have been the victims of chronic under-investment. As such, these hospitals and clinics face a capital infrastructure crisis, and this crisis continues to worsen. Buildings and equipment have been allowed to deteriorate—putting in jeopardy the delivery of quality health care services to large portions of our population. A renewed investment in these facilities is warranted and required as these safety net facilities will continue to play an essential role in our Nation's health system even as we work to extend health insurance coverage to all in our country.

OUTLINE OF THE ESSENTIAL HEALTH FACILITIES INVESTMENT ACT

In title I of this legislation, Medicare's Essential Access Community Hospital Program

[EACH] would be expanded to all States and a new urban Essential Community Provider Program [ECP] would be initiated. A new designation of essential community provider would be established. Funding would be provided for the creating of hospital and community health clinic networks that improve the organization, delivery and access to preventive, primary, and acute care service for underserved populations.

In title II, financial assistance for capital needs would be provided by the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services to safety net facilities which serve a disproportionate share of uninsured and low-income patients.

In title III, financial and technical assistance would be provided to States engaged in the review of capital expenditures for health care facilities and high-technology equipment. The reviews would be designed to ensure that the health care needs of all the states' residents are met and that consideration to the availability of alternative, less costly or more effective means of providing services would be sought prior to additional capital expansions.

REBUILDING THE SAFETY NET INFRASTRUCTURE

The provision of high-quality health care services requires that the provider institutions be healthy, vibrant entities. Today, many of the safety net providers have seriously deteriorated physical plants and out-dated equipment. A couple of quick facts. The average age of the physical plant of urban, public hospitals is nearly 26 years, compared to a national average for all hospitals of 7 years. The average capital expenditure for urban hospitals is \$12,600 per bed, compared to a national average expenditure per bed for all hospitals of \$23,500. The capital ratio for these public facilities is 5.3 percent, compared to a capital ratio of 11 percent for private hospitals.

A national survey of the Nation's safety net hospitals found that a lack of available hospital beds is resulting in serious overcrowding. Hospital corridors surrounding emergency rooms have begun to resemble triage units at the height of a military battle. In 1 month, 50 percent of the hospitals in the three most severely impacted areas, Los Angeles, Detroit, and New York, were forced to restrict emergency department access over 25 percent of the time.

The extreme deterioration of so many of the safety net facilities requires that the Federal Government assist in their rejuvenation. The Essential Health Facilities Investment Act calls for the creation of a capital financing trust fund to assist with the capital needs of these safety net facilities.

It is valuable to remember that while these safety net facilities provide the only access point for many poor and uninsured individuals, the specialty care services provided at these facilities are used by everyone in the community. Burn and neonatal units, trauma care centers, and other highly specialized services are often located only at the safety net hospital. It is a simple fact that all members of a community benefit from well-maintained safety net facilities.

Health care institutions serving high numbers of indigent patients have long encountered barriers to obtaining and repaying necessary capital financing. The high proportion

of services provided to low-income patients often leads to operating margins too low to support debt service at market rates. Even when revenue bonds may be supported by local revenues, oftentimes the bond ratings are too low, and thus the interest rate too high, to be feasible. These ratings often have little to do with the ability of hospital administrators to manage their facilities well. It is more often the case that market analysts consider the local appropriations that sustain these facilities too uncertain. As such, the facility is simply prohibited from securing the needed capital.

For the facilities with the greatest demand placed upon them in our inner-city and rural areas, the traditional method of financing—Federal funding—is no longer available. Many of these facilities were originally built with grants or loans under the Hill-Burton Program. These funds have not been available for years. With a lack of Federal moneys available to repair and rebuild these facilities, and the strain on the resources of local governments, the result has been that the capital needs of safety net facilities have gone unmet.

This legislation does not propose that the Federal Government take on a massive rebuilding program commensurate with the Hill-Burton Program. Nor does it propose that the Federal Government take sole responsibility to solve this problem. However, this legislation is designed to support State and local efforts—to work in partnership with State and local governments—to upgrade the capacity of these facilities. In drafting this bill, we recognized that the Federal Government has limited resources it can tap for this purpose. Therefore to fund this program, a 0.5 percent, one-half of 1 percent, tax would be levied against the gross revenues of all hospitals. Hospital revenues received from Medicaid would not be subject to the tax.

Revenue from this relatively modest tax would be used by those inner-city and rural facilities across America with the greatest need for assistance. Eligible facilities would be those designated as essential access community hospitals, rural primary care hospitals, large urban hospitals qualifying for maximum Medicare disproportionate share payments, and hospitals or federally qualified health clinics that are members of community health networks.

Assistance from the capital financing trust fund would be provided in the form of loan guarantees, interest rate subsidies, direct matching loans, and in cases of urgent life and safety needs, direct grants. The Federal assistance would be used to leverage State and local government and private sector financing. Repayment would be made back to the trust fund.

For fiscal years 1995 through 1999, \$995 million will be made available each year through the capital financing trust fund for these safety net facilities.

With relatively limited resources available through this legislation and elsewhere to meet the tremendous health facility infrastructure needs across the Nation, decisions to finance the reconstruction, replacement or acquisition of facilities and equipment must be made only after first considering whether existing service capacities could be tapped to meet the needs

of the underserved more efficiently. The next section of this bill is designed to ensure that the capital expenditure decisions supported by this legislation are considered within the context of the entire community's needs and capacities.

MAXIMIZING CAPITAL RESOURCES

As discussed above, many communities, particularly those in rural and inner-city areas, lack the facilities and equipment to adequately meet the needs of their residents. Yet, problems with an oversupply of capital resources also characterize our health care system. One area of oversupply is with hospital beds. In 1981, occupancy rates in community hospitals averaged 76 percent nationally. The average dropped to 66.1 percent by 1991. Redundancies in high-technology equipment and services exist as well. An effective remedy to the issue of capital allocation must be able to deal with both the flood and the famine of facilities and equipment.

This legislation would do just that. It would mandate that each State establish a system to require prior approval of capital expenditures for new, or significantly modified beds or services in excess of \$1 million. Federal financial assistance would be provided to States for conducting this approval process. If the State did not create such a system, Medicare would not reimburse hospitals in the State for their capital expenditures.

Some may question whether this is a punitive approach, requiring States to perform a federally mandated function or suffer a loss in resources. We do not believe this is the case. Under this proposal, 75 percent of the cost of carrying out the capital reviews will be covered by the Federal Government. For the 39 States currently conducting some sort of capital review process, the Federal funds will enable them to expand their efforts. In the remainder of the States, individuals, and businesses will benefit from the elimination of costs associated with excess capacity.

Two specific examples highlight the tremendous redundancies, and potential savings, that currently exist in the health care sector.

Redundancies of hospital facilities and services are well known. The case of dueling hospitals in Kalamazoo, MI, provides a classic example. In Kalamazoo, a metropolitan area of 200,000, there are two hospitals with two maternity wards, two heart programs, two state-of-the-art emergency rooms, and two radiology services. To top it off, the two hospitals each developed their own helicopter ambulance service. Case after case in city after city across the country can be cited that, while they may not be as extreme as this, mirror the experience in Kalamazoo. Whether anecdotally or in the aggregate, these examples provide strong evidence of the need for more coordinated allocation decisions.

A second example highlights not only the wasted resources resulting from excess capacity but also the threat to the quality of care provided. California currently has 119 separate cardiovascular surgery programs. Twenty-five of these were added after the State abandoned its certificate-of-need [CON] program. One might inquire that while the post-CON expansion was great, was it excessive? A clear answer to this question is provided by a quick comparison of Canada and the former West

Germany with the United States. The United States has twice as many open-heart surgical units per million persons as does Canada and nearly five times as many as West Germany. And the ratio in California? It exceeds the national average. The startup costs for each of these programs are between \$6 and \$13 million. Annual operating costs average \$7 to \$10 million at each location. For each open-heart surgery center that is not needed and not created, millions of dollars can be saved each year.

If we move from a consideration of cost to one of quality, this excess capacity can be considered to be even more detrimental. For example, applying the guidelines endorsed by the American Hospital Association and the American College of Cardiologists, 35 percent of the open-heart surgery centers in California perform less than the minimum number of procedures required to achieve an acceptable level of competence and quality.

Another important component of the capital reviews provided in this legislation is their relation to antitrust laws. Quite a bit of debate and legal expense have been expended on the question of antitrust enforcement in the health care sector. This legislation provides much needed clarity as to Federal intent.

The creation of a capital review process by a State—one that meets the criteria described in the Essential Health Facilities Investment Act—would satisfy the requirements for a State to employ the State action immunity doctrine pertaining to Federal antitrust enforcement. As such, implementation of a capital review process would be considered affirmative State policy in this regard and would be considered to provide ongoing, active State supervision as required. The effect of this would be to provide an exemption from Federal antitrust enforcement for those projects approved under the state expenditure review process.

EXPANDING THE EACH PROGRAM

A third provision of this legislation is designed to facilitate the organization, delivery, and access to primary, preventive and acute care services for medically underserved populations by fostering networks of essential community providers.

The Essential Access Community Hospital Program was enacted in 1989. This Medicare initiative provides a unique Federal/State partnership to assure the availability of primary care, emergency services, and limited acute inpatient services in rural areas. The EACH Program was created to maximize resources available to rural residents by establishing regional networks of full-service hospitals [EACH's] connected to limited-service rural primary care hospitals [RPCH's]. Since 1981, over \$17 million has been awarded in the seven participating states.

In a recent assessment by the Alpha Center, the strengths of the EACH Program were clearly articulated. Their March 1993 report stated, "The EACH Program has released an enormous amount of creative energy focused on the development of regional networks that link health care providers in remote areas with those in more densely populated communities."

A letter from the project directors of the seven EACH States contained the following

comment, "We believe the EACH concept is an alternative of value * * * and will assist policymakers, regulators and changemakers in the long process of refocusing rural health care delivery." I am confident that the EACH Program provides a framework for greatly improving the quality and efficiency of primary care, emergency services, and acute inpatient services in rural areas across the country. Because of this, this legislation would extend the EACH Program to all States.

In addition, creating a new urban Essential Community Provider Program would carry the network concept to our Nation's inner cities. While different from the rural EACH Program, the urban ECP Program would concentrate on networking hospitals with primary care service centers, particularly federally qualified health centers. In addition, ECP networks could combine with rural networks.

A February 1993 report by the General Accounting Office found that "more than 40 percent of emergency department patients had illnesses or injuries categorized as nonurgent conditions." The growth in the number of patients with nonurgent conditions visiting emergency departments is greatest among patients with little or no health insurance coverage—exactly those populations served by essential community providers. Networks of essential community provider hospitals and clinics will help steer clients to more appropriate clinical settings and, as a result, maximize the resources available in both emergency and non-emergency settings.

The concept of inner-city provider networks designed to ease access and improve continuity of care is not new. Initiatives are currently being pursued in urban areas across this country to do just that. This legislation would boost these efforts through critical financial and structured technical assistance.

Funding under the ECP program would be available for the expansion of primary care sites, development of information, billing and reporting systems, planning and needs assessment, and health promotion outreach to underserved populations in the service area. Facilities eligible to participate in the ECP networks—those designated as "essential community providers"—include certain Medicare disproportionate share hospitals, rural primary care hospitals, essential access community hospitals, and federally qualified health centers [FQHCs] or those clinics which otherwise fulfill the requirements for FQHC status except for board membership requirements.

In order to facilitate the integration of hospitals and clinics into these community health networks, physicians at network clinic sites would be provided admitting privileges at network hospitals. As well, the placement of residents at network-affiliated FQHCs would be counted in the total number of residency positions when determining the indirect medical education [IME] reimbursement to hospitals under Medicare. In total, the authorized funding level under the entire program, rural EACH and urban ECP, would be increased 10-fold from the current level of \$25 million to \$250 million annually.

My colleagues and I are today introducing the Essential Health Facilities Investment Act of 1993 because we believe this legislation is an important and necessary component of the

effort to reform our nation's health care delivery system. Irrespective of the final form health reform takes, the initiatives in this bill are essential to ensuring access to high quality, efficient services for everyone in our communities. We urge our colleagues to join in support of this legislation.

HEALTH CARE AND PRIVACY: THE NEED FOR FAIR INFORMATION PRACTICES

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

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, anyone who reads the newspapers or watches the evening news is aware that health care reform has become a high-priority issue at the White House and in the Congress. I would like to inform my colleagues what the Subcommittee on Information, Justice, Transportation, and Agriculture, which I chair, is doing in anticipation of general health care reform legislation. While the subcommittee has no direct jurisdiction over health care, it does have a role to play in protecting the privacy of health care information.

Privacy is a vital issue because increased use of personally identifiable medical information will be a part of any health care reform. The sensitivity of health care information can hardly be overstated. Misuse of personal health care information can adversely affect employment, insurance, licenses, and other critical opportunities and benefits. Individuals must be able to visit a doctor and know that the information they provide will be fairly used and properly protected. At the same time, we must also recognize that health care providers, insurers, employers, researchers, and others must have effective access to health-record information in order to deliver services and make decisions in a cost-effective and appropriate manner. Balancing these sometimes competing interests will not be easy.

Today, neither patients nor recordkeepers have a clear understanding of their rights and responsibilities with respect to health care information. There is no comprehensive Federal law governing health care information practices, and current State laws are a patchwork of inconsistent and often unsatisfactory provisions. Health care reform will increase the need for uniform rules for the collection, maintenance, use, and disclosure of identifiable patient data.

The development of uniform fair information practices for health care information is a current project of my subcommittee. This is an outgrowth of the subcommittee's general oversight over privacy matters. Working cooperatively with the health subcommittees of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Ways and Means Committee, we hope to be able to do the hard work necessary for workable legislation. We have begun with an informal consultation with the health care establishment and other interested parties. By the end of the year, I expect to be able to circulate a draft and to consult with everyone concerned about the use of health care records. Eventually, it is my hope that we can hold hearings and then join our work with the overall health care reform effort.

In this environment, I very much welcome the announcement this spring of a comprehensive national survey of public attitudes on a wide range of health care information privacy and confidentiality issues. Equifax, Inc., together with Louis Harris & Associates and Dr. Alan F. Westin of Columbia University, will conduct the poll. Survey topics include: First, the levels of trust Americans have in institutions that use medical information; second, experiences individuals have had with the uses of such information; third, attitudes about the use of medical information for various needs and health care reform; fourth, privacy protection safeguards; fifth, individuals' rights of access to their medical records; sixth, employer access to personal medical information; and seventh, how attitudes toward privacy correlate with attitudes toward health care reform.

This will be the fourth in a series of privacy surveys funded by Equifax. Past privacy surveys by Equifax and by Louis Harris have been the subject of hearings before the subcommittee and have provided very useful background for understanding public attitudes. I very much look forward to the result of the new Equifax survey.

In the meantime, anyone with a specific interest in the development of fair information practices for health care information is invited to contact the subcommittee.

HAITIAN IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have a distinguished Member of the delegation from our State in the Speaker's chair.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of last week I came to this well to speak of the enormous problems plaguing our Immigration and Naturalization Service in dealing with people seeking political asylum, and the larger context of enforcing our national immigration laws. Just to recap: INS knows of approximately 1.2 million illegal entries into this country every year; officials estimate the actual number of people coming into this country illegally to be closer to 3 million. In the specific case of Haiti, since the military coup almost 40,000 Haitians fled Haiti seeking refuge in the United States. Of those, more than 10,000 were granted parole and are now in this country—90 percent of them in Florida—awaiting processing of their asylum claims. We are told that those claims are being processed with the help of non-governmental organizations [NGO's] at a rate of 1 a month—which translates into more than 800 years needed to process all 10,500. Since I last spoke on this issue, the Supreme Court has upheld the current United States policy of intercepting Haitians in international waters and repatriating them. It has been reported that this means we have turned our backs on the Haitians. This is simply untrue. There remains in full force a process for Haitians seeking entry into the United States through the visa process at our consulate in Port-au-Prince. I continue to believe that the Haiti problem must be solved in Haiti, not by encouraging Haitians to take to the seas in leaky

boats to make the treacherous journey to America.

Another element of this problem involves the HIV-infected Haitians recently transferred from Guantanamo Base in Cuba into the United States. As a result of unilateral action by a Federal judge in New York, I am deeply troubled by this decision, and by the inexplicable silence we are getting from the Clinton administration regarding our concerns.

By not immediately challenging the judge's order to admit the HIV-infected Haitians, the Clinton administration has left this country open to a dangerous precedent of immigration policy set by judges, not legislators. Bringing these HIV-infected people into this country is in direct violation of legislation recently passed by Congress and signed by President Clinton. This ruling tells would-be immigrants all over the world that, if you can get a foot in the door, even under a fraudulent political refugee asylum request, you are probably home free. I and over 40 of my colleagues urged the President to seek an immediate stay and appeal the decision. So far—silence. There is never a cop around when you need one syndrome.

Second, immigration is clearly a national problem. For too long, citizens of States like Florida have disproportionately borne the brunt of the financial and social costs of resettling immigrants. I have joined an effort with my Florida colleague, Mr. MICA, to send the Federal Government the bill not only for the present wave of Haitians, but also for the amount owed—but never paid—from the Mariel boat lift: \$150 million total.

□ 1830

Mr. Speaker, I will wind up by simply saying that there is more on this subject, and more will be heard in the days ahead because this problem is not going to go away until this body deals with it and gets the administration to deal with it.

HEALTH INSURANCE—ONE OF THE MAJOR ISSUES FACING THE UNITED STATES THIS YEAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, one of the major issues facing the United States of America this year is the issue of health insurance, and there has been a lot of information put out about this, and there has been a lot of misinformation. Tonight, I and three of my colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE], will try to discuss and illuminate this issue just a little bit so that our colleagues, and possibly the American people, will have a better understanding of the problems we face and a little bit more understanding about what is really correct information and what is incorrect.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer at the outset to two articles before I turn

to my colleagues. One was written in the Wall Street Journal on April 15 of this year, and in this article they point out some very important points that should be known by everybody.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, they say that there are probably 37 million uninsured; at least that is what some of the pundits are saying, but, before turning one-eighth of the economy upside down, they say in this article, to help these souls maybe somebody should try to distinguish between an intriguing problem and a, quote, unquote, crisis. Thirty-seven million sounds like a lot, but that still leaves, and this is very important, 182 million people swimming in the world's best medical care. Some 83 percent of Americans have public or private insurance, or both, including the genuinely poor. Twenty-four million of them have Medicaid.

They go on to talk about how the survey took place that showed we have 37 million uninsured, and what they did was they said at any given point in time is there anybody in your household that is not insured, and, when you start looking at the figures, you find out that many people are uninsured, but for a very short period of time in between jobs, and yet they are counted as part of the uninsured in this country.

They go on to say it turns out that half of the uninsured go without coverage for less than 5 months, and 70 percent for less than 9 months. Among the uninsured capable of or willing to work, three-quarters reacquire coverage within a year. Amazingly this figure holds for both full- and part-time workers.

A lot may be plugging away at low-wage or part-time jobs in industries like retail with high turnover. Eventually their employers will offer them health insurance, but only after a waiting period, and during that waiting period they are without coverage. That is because employers want to make sure that the new hires intend to stick around.

It goes on in another part of the article and says:

What else do we actually know about the uninsured? They tend to be young, low on the earning curve, but not necessarily poor. Nearly half have household incomes above \$20,000 and 17% earn more than \$40,000, according to the Employee Benefit Research Institute.

What this suggests is that many young workers are turning down health coverage from their employers. They'd rather have the cash wages and funnel the money toward rent, car payments or a savings account.

In another part of the article it points out that:

Nobody knows how many of the long-term uninsured are truly needy, how many are just economizing or how many have fallback strategies. They do indeed have a problem, but it isn't that their afflictions will go untreated; it's that if they contract something

serious while they're uninsured, insurance companies will deny them coverage for what's called a "pre-existing condition." But no way do 36 million people have this problem, or "crisis."

And in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, in this article he says:

Despite all the media hoopla and hand-wringing in various medical journals, we think a very strong case can be made that smaller-scale experimentation and innovation would be more apt.

How about medical IRAs, Medicaid vouchers and loosening up state mandates that force companies to goldplate their health benefits, thus driving up health care costs? Each of these would help to lure more folks under the insurance umbrella and trim demand for uncompensated care.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a couple more quotes, and then I would be happy to yield to my colleagues.

This is an article from *Forbes* magazine on June 22, 1992:

This year's big lie, echoed in numerous political speeches, is that 37 million Americans are completely uncovered by health insurance.

The estimate of 37 million was drawn from a survey for a single point in time. It included many people who lost health insurance for a brief period—there are millions of such people, changing jobs, going back to school, moving, getting married, becoming widows, going off welfare and so on.

□ 1840

For most of these people the period of going benefitless is relatively brief.

A more realistic picture comes from a 1990 Census Bureau study entitled "Health Coverage 1986-88." Instead of taking a snapshot picture of a single month, this study took a moving picture over 28 months. What it found was that "4 percent of all persons lacked coverage for the entire period." That means 96 percent of the people did have coverage.

Instead of 37 million people who were continuously without insurance, the long-term uninsured amounted to fewer than 10 million.

Who are the long-term benefitless? Over 27 percent of those without health insurance are under age 16, while another 23 percent are between 16 and 25. Most of these young people are dependents who could be insured through their parents' employers, or through college plans, at some cost. If some parents choose to skip such dependent coverage, perhaps only for a few months, that does not mean they would not or could not pay their children's medical bills. And it certainly does not prove lack of "access" to health insurance.

Let me read one more quote here.

Another study by Katherine Swartz and Timothy McBride of the Urban Institute, finds that "half of all uninsured spells end within four months" while "only 12% to 13% of [the uninsured] have spells that last more than 24 months." It also finds that "people who are employed (either full time or part time) are more likely to have short uninsured spells." That means proposals for federal "play or pay" schemes that focus on requiring employers to provide insurance miss the point entirely. Most of the long-term uninsured have no employers. They are either children, self-employed or living off assets.

Most damaging to the argument that tens of millions of poor Americans lack health

coverage is this finding: Swartz and McBride discovered the highest percentage of short-term uninsured was among those with family incomes above \$36,000 a year.

Let me conclude by reading the following:

They also like to argue that more government involvement in health care could somehow lower costs. This is downright silly. The reason medical costs are out of control is not that the government covers too few of the nation's medical bills, but that it covers too many. Taxpayers now pick up the tab for 42% of all medical bills—up from 37% in 1970. Whenever the government subsidizes any purchases, the effect must be to increase demand and bid up prices. If we stifle that effect with price controls, medical care will have to be rationed by waiting lists or by bureaucratic decisions about who lives or dies.

The government could make things easier for the self-employed and temporarily unemployed by allowing a refundable tax credit for premiums on catastrophic medical coverage, and a tax deduction for building an IRA-like account as a health bank that could be used for major medical bills, or left to grow for retirement.

Instead of listening to the empty rhetoric of those who want to federalize medical services, voters should reflect on the probability that a government health scheme is likely to deliver service with the efficiency of the Postal Service and the compassion of the IRS.

I think those are things that ought to be thought about by everyone who thinks we need to have an all-encompassing Federal health care program such as what the administration has been talking about.

With that, I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE], who has been working very hard on a plan to deal with this problem.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think the information that the gentleman shared shed some real light on this problem of our health care system.

Make no mistake about it, this health care system that we presently have has real problems. I am convinced of that. There are problems that need to be addressed. There are problems of affordability. There are problems of access in some cases, at least access to insurance, although I think the issue has been confused, perhaps deliberately, perhaps unintentionally, but confused to imply to people that there are people in this country who do not have access to health care.

Of course, I think as everyone is aware, there is a Federal law that actually requires that people who show up at emergency rooms to be diagnosed, to be evaluated and diagnosed, to see if they have a medical need, and if they have such a need, for that need to be dealt with, whether they can or cannot afford it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I wish the gentleman would repeat that, because there is a feeling out in the country that there are a lot of people who are going without access to health cov-

erage if something goes wrong. They may not have health insurance, but if they have a medical emergency or problem, they are going to be taken care of.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Well, they are indeed. I think America needs to be very sensitive to what one of the primary controversies is going to be during the Clinton administration. Really it is a clash of world views.

This is a President and an administration that has tremendous faith in the power and munificence of government. They have a philosophy that basically says that we need to have more governmental involvement in our lives in order to improve the human condition.

Now, that is in direct contrast, say, to the traditional conservative philosophy, which holds that we ought to have more individual initiative, more individual control of our lives, and more private choice in order to best meet the needs of human beings.

So we are getting an administration that is seeking opportunities to expand the power of government. That is why in this reconciliation bill being debated by the Congress they are advancing the largest tax increases in history and the largest spending increases in history. They are determined to make government the center focus of our economy.

Now, we hear rumors affecting health care, which is, I believe, one-eighth of our entire national economy, which center around this issue of the health care industry. They are whipping up people's concerns over the so-called 37 or 36 million, whatever it is, who do not have health care insurance.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. If I may interrupt for a moment, I think we ought to stop talking about 36 or 37 million uninsured, because that number, as the gentleman has just proven from statistics, is not correct. We are talking about the wrong number.

The people are insured. It is just that at one point in time some 36 or 37 million may not have insurance. But it is of their own choosing, for the most part, is it not?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. That is correct.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Therefore, if they do not want to buy insurance, but would prefer to risk their health in an emergency room where they know they can get health care without buying insurance today, then that is their choice.

I do not believe and I do not think you gentlemen do either that it is the Government's responsibility to force them to buy insurance if they do not want to. Nor is it our responsibility to take care of them. I think that is what the gentleman is pointing at with regard to this monster tax increase that is going to come on everybody. And I think one of the things that has not been told about that is that the tax in-

crease, which, by the way, is 24 times the amount of taxes on the \$100,000 group as applied to over \$200,000, 48 times the amount on the \$75,000 group compared to the \$200,000 group, means we are really punishing that guy that is out there able to provide the job for the guy that does not have one and able to give health insurance and benefits to the guy that does not have them.

Now, I think that we have to be very careful about how we structure this health program. But we have to talk in truth and not fiction.

The truth of the matter is there are not 37 million uninsured. I think that if we make this clear to America, then it is going to be our responsibility to point out again that with this monster tax increase that is staring us in the face, we are not even talking about funding a health program such as the administration wants to have. We are talking about another little tax creeping up on us and getting burned again.

Mr. HASTERT. If I could comment on that, first of all I want to congratulate the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], for talking about this issue. It is a big issue. It is something that is one of the hot topics of the time.

I think one needs to take some time and analyze this, and you are doing it. We need to analyze.

The first question, the first statement we want, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is exactly accurate, is I do not think Americans are ready for a government health care program. I think that is one of the first red flags that the gentleman raises, and I think that is something we need to do.

Do Americans want to trade off a system which they have today, which is basically a choice system, for a system of big government? We have seen big government and how big government operates. If you go to Canada or England, you will see a health care system that sometimes is touted even here in Washington, but which is less than adequate for the people who have a deal with it.

But who are that 37 million, that number that keeps coming up? The gentleman has hit the nail on the head. A lot of them are people in between jobs or in between health care plans.

Some of those folks are people who are self-employed. And because they do not have tax fairness, and they are farmers and barbers and beauticians, some of them are even doctors and lawyers.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Explain why there is not tax fairness. Corporations get a 100-percent writeoff.

Mr. HASTERT. I will get to that.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Do you not need to say that the gentleman

from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] is probably one of the most knowledgeable Members in our House here?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. He has been working on this for some time.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. I am proud to be standing here by him tonight.

Mr. HASTERT. There is not tax fairness because people who are self-employed, proprietorships and partnerships, only have a 12-percent deductibility. And of course, one of the things that you see every time you can identify a problem, you want to be able to identify a solution. And if you gave people tax fairness, if you gave them 100-percent deductibility, when they buy their family a health care policy.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Like the corporations.

Mr. HASTERT. Like every other business, not just corporations, but every other business has that deductibility as a business expense, and individuals ought to have it, too. So a lot of those folks, you do solve that problem, get them health care access, if you want to use that word, by changing a very simple law. It is a fairness issue in taxation.

Ironically, other issues out there come to play on this health care. Another group of those folks are people who are people who work for part-time. They work for McDonald's and Sears, big corporations. But they work part-time.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. There are some employees in the retail sector, which you are talking about, who do not get insurance right off the bat because the company is trying to see whether they are going to be a long-term employee or just one that is in and out. I can understand the cost of doing business in that way.

Mr. HASTERT. And you will find that a lot, when you get back and start to talk to employers in your district, you find a lot of those people are hiring temporaries, temps, employees, because they do not know what Government is going to do. We talk about big-time unemployment, and we talk about not turning the economy around as fast, employers become very reluctant to hiring more people because they do not know what the Government is going to do to them. Instead of going out and making those new hires, they pay overtime to the folks they already have on board. And I have got a couple of companies who are paying 60 hours, they are keeping people on board 60 hours a week because they do not want to hire new employees.

Some of them are going out and hiring temporary employees, putting them to the test before they hire them.

The issue is, some of them are working for McDonald's and Sears and on a part-time basis. And if you are part-time, they may be feeding a family off that. But they are not covered by insurance.

Some of those people, too, are small business. Of course, I think small business is really the heart of our economy. It drives the economy. And the NFIB tells us, National Federation of Independent Businesses, if you start to mandate Government mandates on small business, we are talking about businesses under 50 folks, 50 employees, the first thing that happens is before half of those businesses will go out of business, as usual, because they already provide health care. Twenty-three percent of those small businesses will pretty much narrow down, the mom-and-pop organizations, they will let people go because they cannot afford to pick up that health care responsibility. And 22 percent of the small businesses will close their doors because they are so marginal. And that is where some of those folks are. So we have to be sensitive to that.

We also have to start to be really sensitive about what we do to businesses when we start to put on huge mandates for those businesses. I think it really comes down to two basic things.

No. 1, how do we start to solve the problem if there are some people out there, and I think the tax fairness is an issue, how do we start to solve the problem of bringing those people into the system, because they, if there is 37 million people out there, they still get sick, they still have automobile accidents, they still have heart attacks and they end up in the hospital, usually in the emergency room, not primary care but in the emergency room, and they get care. And what hospitals do, when you tie your insurance or if you are an employer, they are charging you 140 to 160 percent of what your actual services are to cross subsidize those people who are getting hurt.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. So they can write off those that walk in.

Mr. HASTERT. It is a cross subsidization. They have to do it. So that is what our goal is. And we need to find ways to get those people in the system, good American free enterprise ways of doing it. And that is a real challenge.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me just interrupt for just a second. I think you made some great points. You have been working as chairman of the Health Care Task Force, and we really appreciate the yeoman service you are putting in on behalf of all of us.

But there are two things that I would like to point out. And we can discuss these. I would like to welcome the gentleman from Georgia, who has just come out to the floor.

First of all, in addition to the huge tax increase that is going to be coming to this floor before too long, the Senate is working on it, I guess today, which is going to be somewhere between \$300 and \$400 billion, they are looking at probably between \$100 and \$250 billion for this health care scheme that Hil-

lary Clinton will be proposing to the Congress sometime this fall. That is probably double to triple the largest tax increase that we have faced in 1 year in history.

The second thing I would like to point out is, every time this bureaucracy in Washington takes over another function of the private sector, they screw it up. If you do not believe that, look at the S&L crisis and some of the other debacles that have taken place in this country.

I submit to my colleagues, and I would be happy if they would discuss this, what do you think is going to happen if we end up with a national health care program that the bureaucrats are going to be running here in Washington instead of the competition of the private sector?

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. I talked to a Canadian the other day and I said, "Why don't you go back to Canada?" He said, "I'm not going to. They don't have any health care."

That is a national program up there, and I think everyone fails to realize that everyone is insured, no doubt about it, but you have got to wait in line to find a doctor. You do not get to pick your own hospital. You do not get to pick your own doctor. Many times you probably do not even know what kind of medication you are going to get.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON]. I want to tell a story after a while about a friend of mine that went to Canada and got into their health care plan.

Mr. KINGSTON. I want to bounce off the comments of the gentleman from Texas real quick in terms of Canada. The other thing that Americans need to remember is that in 1986, Canadian doctors went on strike. And when I tell the folks back home in Georgia that under the Canadian system, if we go that way, their doctor will go on strike, if he or she wants to, as do Canadian doctors, that does not sit well with people. People do not realize when we are comparing the Canadian system to the American system, we are comparing apples to oranges. It is a much smaller country, I think 26 million people, that have a completely different system in terms of the marketplace. It is just not a good comparison.

I did want to go back on this small business taxes and the deductibility. I do have an insurance background. I sold insurance for 13 years before getting elected.

One of the things that the small mom-and-pops tell me, the pet stores, the beauty shops, the clothes stores, and so forth, which is where most of the jobs come from in the economy, is that they would love to provide the health care benefit to their employees, but the typical scenario is now that the employees that they have a spouse

that works for the Government or a large corporation, the school board or something. They are providing health care for the family.

The person who works for the small mom-and-pop shop is covered as a dependent. But if these shops had the 100-percent deductibility that large corporations had, then more of them would purchase health care. And if that happened, then obviously, it would be more accessible to a large number of people.

I believe right now that 60 to 80 percent of the people employed in America work for small business. It is so important, if we help small business, we will be helping them.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Can I just make one quick point? The businesses, small businesses, absolutely need 100 percent deductible on their health care. That is part of the reason why they did not provide insurance and part of the reason we are talking about uninsured. But I think your point earlier, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], where you talked about 182 million Americans who are insured, have insurance, and of that 182 million, 24 million of them are extremely poor and receive Medicaid, which means that the insurance is out there. It is just that we have not made the laws such as would allow small business, for example, to provide insurance for their employees, as you stated.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE].

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank all of the Members for appearing and participating tonight. I think this is exactly the type of a national discussion that we need to have about health care.

□ 1900

There is much that is good with our present health care system. There are some real problems that need to be solved, and you all have just touched upon this. That is the idea that if a person changes jobs, then they lose their health care. Then when they sign up for a new job, then they have to qualify. If they have developed what they call a preexisting condition at their previous job, now they have lost that insurance and they go to the new one, and in many cases they may not even be able to get insurance.

I think one of the goals as we seek to reform our health care system, since employees really have to earn their health insurance, because after all, that is one of their benefits, it is just not given as a gift but it is tied to their working, showing up for work, since they earn that they ought to be able to own it. It ought to be personal to them and portable.

It has been suggested by experts looking into this field that if businesses are not willing to provide that

kind of a personal and portable plan, then they ought not to get the tax deduction for providing that type of health insurance.

The gentleman from Illinois and others have commented upon the nature of this 37 million. I think the gentleman from Indiana referenced it. The reality is, 60 percent of this 36 or 37 million, I hear both numbers and I am not sure which one to fix on, but let us say 37 million, 60 percent of that 37 million are under the age of 30. They are the healthiest sector, really, of the job market, and the primary reason these individuals do not have health insurance is because the price is too high.

Why is the price too high? The price is too high because, in many cases, of the government's own involvement with its own regulations, which drive the price up. The irony is that one of the solutions that we hear being advanced to the health care crisis is a law passed that says employers must provide health insurance for their employees, a mandate imposed by the government.

We have heard within the last month figures as high as 12 percent, can you imagine that, a new payroll tax, 12 percent laid on the employer plus about 3 percent for the employee. People who think we do not have enough taxes already in terms of payroll taxes, wait until this hits them.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. It would drive a lot of companies out of business.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. It will drive a lot of companies out of business, and the ones who can avoid going out of business are going to seek to cut their costs. What is going to go first? Health care, that is what is going to go first. Either the deductibles are going to go up, the cover is going to be limited, or they are just not going to seek to offer it, if there is any way they can avoid it.

One other way they may seek to avoid it is dropping below the threshold, whatever the minimum number of employees is that they have before these Federal standards take effect.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Which will cost jobs.

It will cost jobs, and it is going to hurt the very people that we are seeking to help. The gentleman over here has made a very important point. I believe in that study that was done there are only about 9 million or 4 percent of this population that was being looked at that was actually long term without health insurance or, I think 28 months or more. I believe the figure that sticks in my mind was 4 percent. That does not correlate to 9 million. It would have to be more than that.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct, it is 4 percent, but it says 9 million. The gentleman is right, it does not correlate.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Fewer than 10 million, they said.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. We are going to have to address this discrepancy in our figures, because that would be about 25 percent. I think the figure from other sources I have read is 4 percent are actually without health insurance for 28 months or more.

What we have to do is reform the system so we preserve individual choice, like we have now; so that we make it more affordable. We can do that by actually getting the Government out of the system. Does the Government do anything well? Look at the different range of activities that the Government is involved in.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. The microphones work.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. The microphones work.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. The House Administration staff does a good job.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. These folks up here tirelessly toil away in service. The reality is that Government is inherently inefficient. That is why the founders believed in a limited government. That is why they gave us a written Constitution with expressly delegated powers from the people to the Government and they put it in writing so that there could be no mistake about it. At least that was the thought. It is kind of ironic to see how this has all developed over time.

Their desire was to constrain the Government. Why? Because government will sap the lifeblood of the people, if given the opportunity. It naturally tends to grow.

Big government was not invented in the 20th century. We had big government under King George in the 18th century, with hordes of tax collectors and regulators of all sorts from the British Government. They had big government then, and we finally had an American Revolution.

Unfortunately, we have big government again today. It is going to get bigger if they are allowed to seize control of one-eighth of the United States economy, which is indeed the portion that is comprised by the health care industry.

I think we need to look at reforms that broaden the opportunities to get health insurance and that preserve choice and that preserve the high quality of medical care that we actually have.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. While we are doing it, do not kill the goose that laid the golden egg.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Yes, or do not throw the baby out with the bath water.

Mr. HASTERT. I think the gentleman from California hit on some interesting philosophy points, some basic philosophical points. I think when we look back at health care, there are some problems in this country. I think we all agree there are some things we will be able to address.

How do we define those problems? We have said there are a number of people who do not have health care, whether because it is transition or whatever, but some of them do not have health care. Like the tax fairness issue, we need to find solutions to address that. I think we can target, we can pinpoint those solutions at those populations of people.

For instance, small business, and I come from a small business situation, I said the statistics of small business drive them out of business if they have to provide health care. That was the NFIB statistics, the National Federation of Independent Businesses. How do we help small businesses? We can do some reform in insurance that small businesses have to do, that they can group together, they can go together into a marketplace. Instead of taking four people to a market, if you were a small business, you can take 400 or 4,000.

The types of not only benefits but the costs you are going to have to pay are going to be a lot less with that approach, because you can purchase en masse, so that is another reform we have to look at, small group reform.

When we are doing it, one of the things that the gentleman from California talked about is the issue of portability. If we make those risk pools bigger when we do reform, then all of a sudden people can move from job to job. They do not have a job lock or the preexisting condition problem that there was before, and we can make some real headway. Those are the types of things we want to focus on.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. What we are talking about is if we are doing something like that, we immediately eliminate about 60 percent of the uninsured.

Mr. HASTERT. Absolutely. That is what we want to do, we want to take those people who are uninsured and move them into that insured market. Then we get to the next point, the next issue. That is holding down health care costs.

We said that 40 to 60 percent of our health care cost is legitimate insurance that people have today, and the average company spends \$4,700 per employee family on health insurance. A lot of that, we could start to figure that 40 to 60 percent of that is cost subsidy for people who do not have insurance and still get sick and end up in the hospital. We can start holding down health care costs.

Those are the other things we want to look at once we get people involved, how can we hold down health care costs, because that is a problem. It has gone up higher than the rate of inflation, and there are some things we can do.

Another thing we can do, for instance, is one of the huge cost drivers that we have is malpractice insurance.

It drives health care costs two ways. The first way is that the cost of insurance, for instance, Fox Valley of Illinois that I represent, if you go to an OB-GYN to deliver a baby, 25 to 30 percent of the cost of that delivery is just health care insurance. It is the malpractice insurance that that doctor has to have before he even thinks about walking into a delivery room.

Also, the hospitals have to pick up riders on top because doctors cannot buy enough. The other side of that issue is defensive medical costs. The same locality, if the doctor is going to suggest that you have a gall bladder surgery, for instance, he can give you up to \$5,000 worth of tests, not for a prognosis or not to make you get well quicker or not to do anything that really affects your health, but if he gets hauled into court he has protected himself.

□ 1910

And so those defensive medical costs have driven up health care costs so dramatically over the last few years. So malpractice reform is a common-sense thing. And I think most people agree that it has to be done. There are ways to do it.

People are going to be injured because of doctors or hospitals, and that is part of the process. But there are ways to ask, if somebody signs onto an insurance policy, for instance, you can go into mandatory arbitration and get the thing settled right away, and people are not stuck out in lawsuits for 2 years, 5 years, or 10 years before they get whatever they want to get. And I will conclude real quick on this thing, but you know, they can get their money and go ahead and live the rest of their life. And it makes sense to do things like that.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me just add one more part to the equation, and that is that one of the problems they have in metropolitan areas like the gentleman's, he is from around the Chicago area?

Mr. HASTERT. Like you are from the Indianapolis area, right.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am from the area. In urban areas you have many hospitals, and they all want state-of-the-art equipment. They all want the latest heart machines, heart-lung machines and so forth, and because of the way the antitrust laws are written, and I am sure you are looking into this, they cannot cooperate to the degree that they really would like to or ought to. As a result they are all buying these multi-hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of equipment, sometimes million-dollar pieces of equipment, and it drives up the cost of staying in the hospital. And if we could do something legislatively that would allow these antitrust laws to be changed so that they can cooperate, maybe we would only need one heart-lung kind of ma-

chine in a given area, or maybe some other kind of machine in another hospital so that they could transport people back and forth across town for specialized procedures, and it would cut down the cost of this equipment, and thus the overall cost that a person incurs in a hospital.

Mr. HASTERT. The gentleman is absolutely right. As a matter of fact, that is point 2 on my script here. Antitrust reform is something, it is the next step if you do malpractice reform, and antitrust is the thing to follow up. You hit the nail on the head.

For instance, in the area I have that encompasses probably 4 major towns and probably 200,000 people you have 6 hospitals. Every one of those hospitals has a MRI. They also have a pulmonary unit, they have a cardio unit, they have an orthopedic unit, and because of the laws that exist today, in order to draw patients to those hospitals they have to have all of the bells and whistles, and the laws says that you cannot not compete. You have to compete. So if you are going to compete you have to buy all of those things.

If you are going to change the antitrust laws, you are saying let us cooperate, let us utilize the stuff that we have. And of course they have an MRI and now, by gosh, for every person that comes through there, they say let us give them an MRI because we have to pay for this thing. And so it really is a huge cost driver, and that is a huge step in trying to get to that solution.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield, one of the points I have made in some of the meetings I have been in is that when I was a freshman in college at Michigan State University in 1973 we voted not to allow pocket calculators because the only one that was out in 1973 was \$159. By the time I was a senior you could get a better pocket calculator for \$15. The same is true with personal computers, cellular phones and everything else. But the big difference between that and an MRI is you do not have the excessive red tape, the government intervention and regulation that you do on a hospital. So we can reduce that, and this same technology that has helped so much in education and in business, then we can also have it do the same thing in medicine where it does not just improve quality, but it decreases costs.

I want to mention, if I may, I say to the gentleman from Indiana, that unfortunately I have another appointment that I have to scoot to, but I wanted to jump back to something the gentleman from California said about let us not spoil the market system. I think there is another important point, and that is that we should not spoil the territory and the jurisdiction of States, because one of the things that I hear from so many officials is do not give us more mandated, unfunded benefits and so forth.

But there are many things going on in health care right now that the States are doing. For example, South Carolina a couple of years ago passed a portability law that for groups of over 10 they wipe out the preexisting conditions. The insurance companies were against this originally, but now 2 or 3 years later they are OK with it. I think South Carolina should be commended for their action on that.

In the State of Georgia we passed a law in the legislature this year that addressed the issue of doctors having in-house referral fees, and that I think is good. We also passed a law, I say to the gentleman from Illinois, about clustering, allowing small accounting firms and small-lawyer, one- and two-man shops to combine together to purchase and form purchasing groups. This is happening now.

In one of the counties that I represent, Glenn County, we talked about the problem of immunizations. They came up with their own solution to it, because as you know, one of the biggest problems with immunization is not the availability or the affordability, it is the fact that the parents do not take the kids to get immunized under the present program offered by the county health services. And what they did was that they put in an automatic dialing machine, and any parent who had not brought their child in for a free immunization got harassed each and every night through this obnoxious automatic dialing. As a result of it, they got children immunized in Glenn County, GA. And the lady who runs the program, Carol Heisman, was saying that other counties across the Nation want to duplicate that. What was great about it was it was effective and it was inexpensive, and it did not take us, the big bad, know-it-all Federal Government in Washington, DC, to tell the people how to do it. They came up with their own solution.

So one of the things I am really worried about with a sweeping health care law is that we are going to stifle that type of initiative. And I wanted to mention that. Unfortunately I have an appointment that I need to scoot on, but I really appreciate your leadership and everything you all are doing on this.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. We appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. HASTERT. I think the gentleman brings out a very good point, that the States are the natural laboratories in the country, and there are some States doing some very good things. We need to have flexibility so that the States can do the experimentation. Also on the antitrust things that Mr. BURTON talked about, we need to pass some Federal law to make the laws so that experimentation can move forward on a nationwide basis, because sometimes there are constraints to doing that.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. If the gentleman will yield, I think the gentleman from Georgia needs to go.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Tell everybody that he is from Savannah since we have mentioned a couple of other towns.

Mr. BURTON. Near Savannah, he is from near Savannah, GA.

Mr. HASTERT. What I want to know is why a fellow from near Savannah, GA was going to school in Michigan.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. He makes a very good point, because here we are dealing with one-eighth of the U.S. economy, the health care industry, and we were about, at least if we can believe what is coming out as leaks from the secret Hillary Clinton health care meetings, we are about to rush in and radically reform this whole system without having considered all of the nuances. I think the gentleman from Georgia is saying wait a minute, this is too big without proceeding very carefully. Let us not wipe out some of the experiments going on, as the gentleman from Illinois referenced in the different States. When we are grappling with this, those are sovereign entities. And really the framers intended for domestic issues to be dealt with by the States. But because this has a Tax Code component, there is an element in the Federal law that we have to deal with, and I think antitrust has to be dealt with, as the gentleman from Illinois mentioned. We have to deal with this issue of how we are going to treat tax deductibility of insurance.

Right now it is biased against the self-employed, it is biased against those employed by small employers who do not provide health insurance, and it is biased against the unemployed. We need to change that tax law to allow health care to be personal and portable.

When I got my term life insurance, they sent out someone to do a health exam, and then as long as I pay the premium it does not matter where I work, or where I live, I get to keep that life insurance policy because it is personal to me. And it is portable because it goes anywhere that I go. That I think is what we have got to do with health insurance.

It was purely an accident of history, if you will, that it became tied to employment. It was as a direct result of another government intermeddling during World War II with wage and price controls. And all of a sudden businesses could only pay, could only charge so much for their products and services and only pay so much to employees. So the ever-flexible free enterprise system resulted in businesses thinking OK, let us see how we can attract employees without paying them more in their dollar wages. Oh, we will offer health benefits. And of course, that has really caught on, and expanded to the point where we are

today, where we have 83 percent of our people cover their employment. But we have these pockets of people who for no logical reason are really being denied opportunities to have access to health insurance.

□ 1920

So that is the responsibility at the Federal level, I think, is to change at least that part of it and change the part relating to antitrust and do what we can with malpractice to reduce the costs of so-called defensive medicine. We can do all of these things without having the Government take over the health care system which is the finest in the world as it presently exists. It just is not the fairest in the world because we have these flaws in it.

So we need to make some changes, no question about it. But the gentleman from Georgia, I thought, made a very good point respecting the rights and responsibilities of the States, and others here have made some excellent points.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. And the initiative.

Mr. HASTERT. If the gentleman will yield, he is right in those issues, and we need to look back.

And what is coming down the pike? Well, quite frankly, we do not know what is coming down the pike. But we know that 80 percent of the people in this country are insured today. Most of them have their insurance through their employer just because of the system that you talked about. It is there.

What we have to ask ourselves in any new system that comes down and any Government system, if we get it, is that there are three questions, I think, that people want to ask themselves: No. 1, what am I going to get; No. 2, what am I going to have to pay for it; and, No. 3, am I going to have any choices?

I think when you start to look at the Government system, probably those choices are not very good. And when they see what they are going to get, especially if we have caps and we have limited benefit packages that they are talking about, they are going to get less, and they are also going to find out that they are going to pay more, and those are not very good solutions at all.

So I think that one of our real challenges is to say how we start to put together a reform of the system that says, you know, we are going to pay about what we are paying now, or somebody is going to pay that, and we are going to, you know, get what we get now or maybe a little bit better, and, by gosh, we are going to have some choices.

That goes into another issue that all of the laws that you need to change in malpractice, and, as the gentleman from Indiana brought up, the ideas of antitrust.

You know, I guess when we really get down to it, we have probably the best,

and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] said this before, that it is the best health care system in the world. I mean, I will hold it up against the Canadians or the Swedes or the Japanese or the Germans or the English or anybody.

When they get sick in those countries, they want to come back to the United States and make sure they have got their doc and their hospital and their pharmaceuticals that are there. But when you look at that, what we want to do with our doctors and systems is say, "Listen, let us give the doctors the ability to go back to what they were trained to do." Right now they are so leashed down and tied down with malpractice laws and antitrust laws that, you know, before they do a decision on a person on how to treat a person if he has cancer or whatever, they know what the symptoms those people have are, they know what maladies they have, but they have to go back and do 37 different tests before they dare give a prescription or a prognosis or a cure.

We need to give docs and the people in the health care profession the ability to do what they were trained to do, and that is to give people their best judgment.

You know, we have to design a system that allows them to use their talents, not to go out and, you know, there are all kinds of stories out there, but, you know, one caution that a doctor told me, who happened to be a top surgeon in a big Chicago hospital, he said, "Every time we give a knee surgery for somebody who twisted their knee playing tennis, an arthroscopic surgery, usually for torn meniscus, we have to do an MRI." He said, "We do not have to do an MRI, and it costs \$1,500 to do an MRI, but we have to do an MRI because we may get hauled into court, and we have to have that as part of it, you know, as the service we have given."

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. So it is an additional \$1,500 that is unnecessary?

Mr. HASTERT. Absolutely, and everybody pays.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. That is terrible, terrible.

Anything else? Does anyone else have any comments they would like to make?

If not, I would just like to end by saying that the gentleman who heads the task force for the Republicans here in the House will be presenting a program that we will be looking at in the conference before too long, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] is going to be working on one from the study committee, and we will probably be collaborating on a program that we think will be something that our colleagues and the American people will embrace.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I might just jump in and say that the gentleman from

Texas and I are cochairman of the study committee task force.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am sorry. Yes, our colleague, SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is all right, I am just from Dallas.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The Big D, yes. Well, in any event, we will have a program, and it will be one that is well thought out and will not burden the American people with huge new taxes or a new bureaucracy.

You know, the S&L crisis was caused because we had a bureaucracy that was out of control. We do not want that in health care.

We think we will be able to present a program that will solve our problems without adding another \$150 billion or \$200 billion in taxes on the backs of the American people.

Mr. HASTERT, I just wanted to say that I appreciate the gentleman from Indiana scheduling this special order tonight, and I think what we need to do is to have more real thoughtful discussions about what the problem is and how we can start to look at ways to start to solve that problem, and this is a great first step.

I certainly appreciate being with you this evening.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The one thing I like about a discussion like this, with all of us participating, is it illuminates the issue not only for us and our colleagues, but there are a lot of people who watch these proceedings on C-SPAN. I know that you get calls, and I get calls, from across the country from people saying, "I did not know that," and the American people need to have more in-depth knowledge of the problems and possible solutions.

You know what Lincoln said, that if the people know the facts, the country will be saved, and I think that that is just as true with the health insurance crisis as anything else.

I thank the gentlemen.

THE NORTH AMERICAN FREE-TRADE AGREEMENT

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time this evening to discuss an issue that is very important and very close to me, the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

THE HEALTH CARE CRISIS

But before I do that, I had the occasion to listen to my friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle discuss health care, and one of the comments that was made in that discussion was that we are rushing in to do radical reform. Well, I do not know that my colleagues understand or perceive the need to do something about reform.

Some people say, "Well, we are rushing into it." We have a health care crisis in this country. Our health care system is out of control.

For a family of four in 1980, the health care cost was about \$2,500 a year. Today it is over \$6,000, and if we do nothing, nothing, by the end of the decade, it will be \$14,000 per family.

That will bankrupt not only families but businesses in this country. We have to do something, and we have to do it this Congress, and I hope this session of Congress.

A country this wealthy, this prosperous, without a national health security plan for its people is an outrage, an absolute outrage. The Germans have had it since 1870, 1870. They have a good system. The French have a good system.

I heard some comments about the Canadian system, and while I do not particularly advocate that system, my district is right across from Canada, and believe me, the vast, vast overwhelming majority of Canadians like that system. They get good service from the system.

So, you know, to do nothing as we have for all of these many years is not the answer. The answer is to engage ourselves and solve this problem to provide people with affordable health care insurance, affordable, that will not bankrupt their families.

The health care crisis is causing us, in the automobile industry in Michigan, today, it costs, for the cost of health care for an autoworker or for someone who is retired in the auto industry, it is \$1,100 a year, onto the sticker price of each new automobile, \$1,100. The cost of health care on the sticker price of a new automobile in Japan is about \$300, in Canada it is about the same, and Germany maybe a little bit more, but not much more.

We are uncompetitive in pricing because of this health care crisis that we have today, and it is going to require that we not only deal with the question of reforming malpractice, which we need to do, as my colleagues have indicated in their colloquy, and we certainly obviously need to do tort reform, and it has got to be a part of this package.

But we have to go after the industries that have helped create this crisis, in a responsible way, but nonetheless call them to task.

□ 1930

Mr. Speaker, I am talking about the insurance industry, the pharmaceutical industry.

One of my colleagues mentioned here, "Does the Government do anything well?" And then there was this kind of laughter between my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, "The Government really doesn't do anything well."

Well, you tell that to the people who serve in the U.S. Marine Corps or the

Navy or the Air Force and to our men and women who fought in Desert Storm, and you tell them they do not do anything well. You tell the people in my district, the people of the National Guard who served their country in Desert Storm, the people in the Army Tank Command that produced the vehicles that made us successful in Desert Storm, that they do not do anything well. Or tell that to the men and women across this country who carry the mail every day through rain, sleet, snow, storms, so that you can get the communications, both business and personal communications, that are important to your lives. You tell that to the park workers. We have the greatest national park system in the world in this country. You tell them that the Government does not run that well. There are fine people who work in those parks interpreting for young people and making sure people have a pleasurable experience in our national park system. You tell them that the Government does not do anything well. You tell the fine researchers we have at the CDC down in Atlanta, or the NIH here in Washington, who work tirelessly, some of them 12, 14, 15 hours a day in order to come up with the cures for diabetes, cancer, Alzheimer's, and all these other diseases that are ravaging our population. You tell them they do not do a good job. You tell the people who educate your kids. We have the finest university system in the world here. They work for the Government. You tell them they do not do a good job. Or those who work in your communities teaching your young people.

You know, the problem is that we have got a lot of good workers in this country, and I am just getting a little sick and tired of people who put in hard days' work for their Government, getting bashed around on this floor.

My staff works hard. They work tirelessly. They are in their offices right now, some of them putting in 12, 13, 14, 15 hours a day, and they do it well. And they do it so well they help me whip this side of the aisle on a constant basis.

So let's not be too negative about the people that provide these services in education and in health care and police services across the country.

You tell the men and women in blue in this country who protect people on the streets and on the highways of this country that they do not do it well.

Mr. Speaker, you will have to excuse my exuberance here tonight. I listened, and while there were some thoughtful messages from my colleagues in the last special order, there were some things that obviously annoyed me.

NORTH AMERICAN FREE-TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on to another issue, if I could, and that is the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

I am here once again this evening to talk about this thing called NAFTA. If it is ratified, it will lock in the disastrous trends already destroying thousands of jobs in my home State of Michigan and all across the country.

And don't think for a minute that the story announced yesterday, accompanied by a great deal of fanfare and hoopla, I might add, about a single plant General Motors plans to relocate from Mexico to Lansing, MI, is representative of what is going on. The real story is told by more than 200 plants that have shut down United States operation and moved to Mexico in recent years. The real story is told by the advertisements placed in American business publications by the Mexican Government that boast, they boast about Mexico's low wages and weak labor standards.

Here is the truth about NAFTA: It was negotiated purely in the interest of multimillionaire investors and multinational corporations, at the expense of working people and their families on both sides of the border.

And that is what I want to focus on this evening; the loss of American jobs alone, though reason enough, reason enough to stand firmly against this agreement that was negotiated by the last administration and by Mr. Salinas, but proponents of NAFTA are now trying to sell the myth, to sell the myth that ratification of the agreement will be good for the Mexican people.

Just as we must set the record straight on the jobs issue, we have to set it straight on this count also.

The Mexican Government has established a development strategy that revolves almost exclusively around one principle, one principle: Keep wages shamefully low.

An explicit agreement between the Mexican president, coopted labor leaders, and Mexican industrialists has kept Mexican wages at one-tenth of United States wage levels. In spite of rapidly rising productivity, this explicit agreement keeps the vast majority of the Mexican population near or below the poverty line.

Those who want to believe that NAFTA can be a tool to raise wages and living standards in Mexico are really fooling themselves. NAFTA was negotiated by the very same man who designed the wage agreement that keeps wages low, and who enforces that agreement with an iron fist.

Now, NAFTA will not reverse this system of inequity. As far as President Salinas is concerned, this system of depressed wages is dependent on NAFTA, dependent on NAFTA, and NAFTA is dependent on the system.

Last week I delivered a statement that outlined exactly how the political system in Mexico keeps workers from earning the fair wage that they deserve. To begin with, labor unions must be approved, approved by the president

and his ruling party, and any attempt to organize without official approval is seen as illegal. It is deemed illegal.

Even approved unions can get into trouble if they step out of line. In the case of Agapito Gonzalez, who brought the Union of Journeymen and Industrial Workers to the brink of a strike in 1992, is a good example. Gonzalez was arrested just days before the strike deadline and held for 6 months before the Government's charges of tax evasion were dropped. The strike, needless to say, was broken.

The Government gets away with these tactics because there is no institutional system of checks and balances in Mexico. The Mexican President and his party are all-powerful. The Congress is set up in such a way that it is nothing more than a rubber stamp of the President's wishes. And the judiciary, the judiciary at virtually every level, is in the President's pocket. The system by which judges are appointed makes sure of that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am very much impressed with what the gentleman just said about the nature of the workers in Mexico and how there is forced union organization by the Government, in fact the Government-controlled trade unions.

I am wondering if the gentleman has been as interested as I have been in provisions that might be incorporated in the treaty, since the treaty allows free investment flows, as well as corporations, to operate across borders, transnational corporations, to incorporate within the treaty transnational labor organizations if in fact you are dealing with the same companies that have left the United States.

I am curious as to whether the gentleman has thought about this and has any thoughts.

Mr. BONIOR. I have thought about it, and I could not agree more with my friend from Toledo. Where in the NAFTA text does it say American plants cannot move south to take advantage of low wages and labor standards? Where does it state in this NAFTA text that labor unions in Mexico should have the right to organize so that they toe the ruling party line or not? Where in this text of NAFTA does it say who is going to pay or clean up the environment along the border where the polluter companies have been proven clearly to dump their toxic wastes? None of that is in there on the environment, none of it is in there on labor standards, and none of it is in there on democracy and election fraud.

Election fraud is rampant in Mexico, absolutely rampant. Corruption is everywhere, in law enforcement and throughout the Government. The President and his ruling party manipulate the laws to punish their political

enemies without regard for their innocence, while Government officials remain above the law in spite of their guilt.

□ 1940

The scourge of drug trafficking in Mexico spells out just how troubled this Government really is. Law enforcement officials in Mexico are powerless to clamp down on drug traffickers for the very reason they are the same people who are involved in the trafficking themselves. In many cases the drug traffickers are the law enforcement officials.

The gentlewoman from Ohio and my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] I am sure are aware of the assassination that occurred recently. Mexican Cardinal Juan Jesus Posadas Ocampo was killed last month when he was allegedly caught in the crossfire of a gun battle between two drug gangs.

People throughout Mexico and America were deeply saddened to learn of the loss of this person whose voice of reason, of passion, of piety, of moderation, was a real important voice in Mexican life; but those who know the Mexican system know his killers really never will be brought to justice.

I think it would be appropriate at this juncture to once again read the works of the Peruvian author, Mario Vargas Llosa. He described the Mexican political system this way. He said:

The perfect dictatorship is Mexico because it is a camouflaged dictatorship. It may not seem to be a dictatorship, but it has all the characteristics of a dictatorship. The perpetuation, not of one person, but of an irremovable party, a party that allows sufficient space for criticism provided such criticism serves to maintain the appearance of democracy, but which suppresses by all means, including the worst, whatever criticism may threaten its perpetuation in power.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman again yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. I think the American people would be very surprised in view of what the gentleman has said. Mexico is the major drug route to the United States. If this treaty has been negotiated, the issue of drug interdiction has not even been addressed in a 2,000-page document, and with the recent death of the Cardinal, with our own Drug Enforcement agents having been killed down there, with all the corruption that we know exists in the judiciary, I find it inconceivable that this country could negotiate an agreement with a country that has not taken sufficient action to stem that drug trade, and I commend the gentleman for incorporating that in his remarks this evening.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

You know, if this NAFTA thing goes through, if we ratify this, it will be an

endorsement, it will be the endorsement that Salinas and his cronies have been looking for in the political system in Mexico that they have created. It will be an endorsement of a political system that represses its own people. It will be an endorsement of a political system badly in need of reform. It will be an endorsement of a free-trade agreement with a society, as the gentlewoman points out, that is not even free, and it will be an endorsement of a system of gross social and economic inequality.

Listen to this. Twenty-one financial groups controlled by 25 families own over 60 percent of Mexico's gross domestic product. Twenty-five families own the vast bulk of Mexico's wealth, while the rest of the country remains impoverished.

The privatization of banks, of airlines, of telecommunications and other sectors of the Mexican economy has only enhanced the power of the wealthy and the elite, and these are the people who are trying to jam this treaty down the throats of the Mexican workers and down the throats of the American workers.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield once again?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Again, I am glad the gentleman raised that point as well. I represent a community that has been titled for years the Glass Center of the World, and one of the most threatened industries, the loss of jobs in the U.S. glass industry will be immediate upon the signing of that treaty. Thousands more workers in my district will lose their jobs.

I have been studying the ownership structure of these Mexican business families in the weeks that the gentleman is talking about.

What is very interesting if one looks at Vitro Glass, a multi-billion-dollar corporation in Mexico and one looks at its ownership structure, about 35 percent of it is owned by the Ford Motor Co. and another 15 percent by Pilkington Glass out of England. Pilkington Glass owns the major flat glass production facility in my district. If that agreement goes through as negotiated, what is going to happen is that company will close down production in my area and merely expand production in Mexico, because they are already positioned to do that by the agreements they have reached with the Vitro Glass family.

So, I really thank the gentleman for bringing that up tonight. It has been a hidden part of the discussion. It is not incorporated in the document of the treaty itself.

The whole issue of how Mexican business operates, how that society is structured, is not even addressed.

And how do you have free enterprise compete with a nation whose business

structure is in fact oligopolistic? There is no way for us to take it to antitrust. There is no way for us to address this House of Horrors, and it is going to hurt the people in my area.

Mr. BONIOR. Exactly. And another hidden fact in all this, it is no wonder that the Mexican Government and the corporate elite supports this, because they have spent upward of \$50 million in lobbying efforts designed to sway the American public's opinion in favor of this agreement, \$50 million.

Every high-priced law firm in this town lobbying is on the payroll. Maybe not everyone, but boy, they have got a heck of a lot of them downtown on K Street working for this agreement, a lot of them, because there are big bucks at stake here.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I find it curious that the gentleman talks about the \$50 million that the pro-NAFTA people and the Mexican Government is spending lobbying us in Congress and lobbying our constituents with the television ads and all that kind of thing that they do to try to put the pressure on us to go with them on NAFTA.

The reason they have that kind of money to do it is obviously the corrupt system that they have been running. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has talked before several times about the \$25 million contributions that President Salinas has gone to all his business friends, his major business friends in Mexico and asked them for \$25 million each to his political party.

The supporters of NAFTA like to tell us that Mexico will get more democratic if NAFTA passes. There is clearly no evidence for that.

The Salinas election itself was fraudulent, most observers say. They have had a one-party system for years and years.

The \$50 million they are spending to lobby us in Congress, the \$25 million contributions they have basically extorted from their business friends, and there is simply nothing in this agreement, absolutely nothing in this agreement, either that the Bush administration negotiated with Carla Hills last year or the talk of the side agreements, the discussion of the side agreements, there is nothing in there at all in this agreement to push the Mexicans towards any kind of really democratic system.

You simply cannot have free trade without free elections. Mexico has never had free elections. Mexico under this agreement is not in any way pushed to have free elections.

We have no business signing a free-trade agreement until and unless there are free elections and until and unless there are free trade unions, free trade

unionism, and all those other things that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] has talked about and that the gentleman from Michigan has talked about.

Mr. BONIOR. One of the things that amazes me about this issue, and I would like to get the gentleman's reaction if he has one to my comment, is the speed at which this is being perpetrated on the American people, the American worker.

I mean, there are tremendous disparities between the Mexican economy and the American economy, tremendous inequalities built into this system that really does not work in Mexico, and yet here we are over a year-and-a-half or two-year period rushing into this incredible trade agreement.

The Europeans recognized that simple fact when they built their economic development and regional parity measures right into their Common Market Agreement. The European communities worked for decades to address disparities in wages, infrastructure between the wealthiest and poorest nations in that agreement, and the Europeans recognized the importance of regional parity even though their wage differential between the wealthiest and the poorest countries is four to one. It is about 10 to 1, 12 to 1 in the United States and Mexico, and that is being generous.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The timing of it is absolutely amazing. Something curious happened on the way to these NAFTA negotiations.

Last year Carla Hills worked quickly under a deadline, under a self-imposed announced deadline to negotiate this agreement prior to the 1992 elections, knowing and thinking that President Bush needed that for this reelection; more importantly, sending the message to Mexico and to Canada that we are working under a deadline.

You do not negotiate, whether it is a labor-management agreement and I am negotiating with you and I am labor and you are management, I do not say to you, "Well, I got to finish this by midnight tomorrow night," because if I do, then time is on your side. You simply wait it out.

Mickey Kantor is doing the same thing. He is announcing that we want an agreement passed, completed, ready to go into effect by December 31 of this year, and he is saying that by mid-July he wants the side agreements negotiated.

□ 1950

And the old Rolling Stone song, "Time is on Your Side," time is on the side of Salinas, time is on the side of the Prime Minister of Canada, Kim Campbell. All they have got to do is

wait, and wait, and wait. We will not get good environmental side agreements because Salinas and Campbell can wait, and wait, and wait. We will not get good truck safety agreements because Salinas and Campbell can wait, and wait, and wait. We will not get good peso devaluation side agreements, we will not have good worker safety, or wages, or child labor laws. All the time is on the side of the Mexicans and the Canadians simply because we are working under a self-imposed deadline, something we would never do in any other kinds of negotiations. It simply does not make sense.

The administration and the former administration want an agreement. They want an agreement regardless of what the side agreements are, and we cannot operate that way. We cannot negotiate that way because we are playing right into their hands.

Mr. BONIOR. I can see a scenario developing in the country if this happens, if this, unfortunately, goes through, in which there will be really a mass exodus out of our area of corporations. I mean the logic of it is too obvious not to happen.

What will keep, especially with the productivity of the Mexican worker increasing, and it is increasing—what will keep them there? Why will keep these companies there if you can forgo paying \$10, \$12, \$14 an hour, and go to Mexico, and pay \$1 an hour, and not have to worry about pollution or toxic waste pollution because the Mexican Government does not enforce that, and not have to worry about health standards, not have to worry about environmental standards? Why would they stay? Why would they stay when they could get the same price for their products and a conscionable reduced financial input into the product? There is no incentive for them to save, and what will happen in this country is this:

In negotiations between workers, and industrialists, and companies all over America, those at the table will say, "Well, if you don't agree to giving up this health care benefit, if you don't agree to scaling back wages from \$12 an hour to \$8 an hour, we're going south."

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, that has already happened many times in my own district where workers have been told, "Cut your health benefits, take a \$3 an hour cut in pay." Let us say they are earning \$10 an hour, \$9 an hour—"or else we'll move to Mexico," and in one particular company that is, in fact, in the neighborhood I live in they shut their doors and left because the workers refused to go down to \$6 an hour and take a cut in their own health benefits that had been a benefit that had been agreed on between the company and the workers.

Mr. BONIOR. But right now there is a penalty for bringing that product back into the country, what is called a

tariff. With this treaty the tariff comes off. There is no penalty at all. You are rewarding, you are providing, the incentive for this to happen, and the theory goes, free trade theory, is that, of course, this is going to increase the standards of wage increases for Mexican workers, and their standard of living will increase, and they will be purchasing products here in the United States.

Well, I tried to address that in the beginning of my remarks. The whole system in Mexico is built upon keeping wages low. It is the whole idea of the Mexican system, and until that basic ingredient is addressed none of the theory works.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield further, I do not think that the average Member of Congress or the ordinary citizens of our country realize, as a result of the Mexican Government's free-trade zone, the northern border of Mexico, the maquiladora program, that in fact over 2,000 United States companies have already relocated down there under this very narrow program.

Mr. BONIOR. Would the gentleman talk a little bit about the program and what is this maquiladora thing we keep hearing about?

Ms. KAPTUR. Well, it is interesting. The name, as translated, means "in bond." I always say "in bondage." It reminds me of the reason we fought the War against the States, the Civil War, here in our country.

There is a very difficult economic system that is operating south of our border in Mexico, and essentially in those maquiladora plants the Government of Mexico has said to a United States company, "Look, if you relocate here, and you send materials down here for assembly or processing, you can then under the law here and under a tariff-forgiveness provision in U.S. law send the completed products back to the United States," and so automobiles, textiles, electric wiring materials, automotive parts go down there for such type of value-added production, and then they come back here.

So, they are not really developing a new export market for the United States. What they are actually doing is creating little colonies down there where people do work for very low wages, and they send it back here.

Mr. BONIOR. What kind of wages? What kind of low wages? I ask the gentleman, "What are you talking about?"

Ms. KAPTUR. I will say to the gentleman, "Every Member of Congress before voting on this treaty should go and walk on the streets of the villages where I walked and go through those companies. We went to Zenith television which moved out of Springfield, MO, and Chicago, IL, putting thousands of workers out of work in our country. Zenith now employs in

Reynosa, Mexico, 12,000 workers. We talked to one woman who cannot afford to buy what she makes, even those little black and white TVs."

Mr. BONIOR. What does she make?

Ms. KAPTUR. After 48 hours of work on a given week, after 10 years of seniority in that plant, she takes home \$15.75 a week. Out of her check is deducted money that goes to the Government of Mexico to build housing for which she gets no benefit. They deduct money to clean her street, and with all due respect I must say she does not have an asphalt road. They have a dirt road that is never swept.

I said, "Ma'am, have you ever seen anybody from the Government of Mexico come here to fix your road?"

She said, "No."

They live in little—one cannot call them homes. They are huts made out of tin and cardboard, no running water, no electricity, dirt floors that the people have scooped out with tin cans. When you walk into these little homes that have no door, you just go through the opening. You step down into their home, and they try to keep them as clean as they can, but they spray them down during the day so it is muddy in the house and they do not get the dust on their little tables. There are 12 people living in one room, working in U.S. companies.

I was so hurt when I saw what I saw down there. I thought our companies paid people a living wage that they could afford to buy the television set that they were making, that maybe they would have the hope of buying one of those little automobiles. They absolutely cannot on \$15.75 a week, cannot support a family of 5 or 10 people. They have to pay \$3 for a little box of rice.

Mr. BONIOR. So this differential and tremendous profit that was gained by leaving 2,000 Americans workless in the United States to employ people in Mexico at below \$1 an hour wage level, and to skim from even that buck an hour money so that they could have, quote, unquote, housing and good street cleaning, which basically went into the pockets of the Mexican officials—

Ms. KAPTUR. Right.

Mr. BONIOR. And where did all this profit go? Did Zenith, did they lower their prices of their television sets?

Ms. KAPTUR. No, they sure did not, and we visited one automotive company that in 1 year on wage savings alone this particular company, they saved in wages by going down there, \$131 million, and of all the U.S. auto companies located in that band at the northern part of the border, only one, because the community forced them, has built a treatment plant, a \$2 million sewage treatment plant, for the sewage and the toxics that they are generating, and that was General Motors only after considerable community pressure. All of the rest of them are down there disgorging their waste

into the ditches in northern Mexico. There is a multibillion dollar cleanup problem that our companies have left this continent. I was ashamed to see what I saw down there and the heritage that our companies have left.

Mr. BONIOR. If I could just switch subjects for just a second here, it relates to all of this, but, as my colleagues know, the things that really just burn me, just gets me livid, is the way that much of our academic community and the press has bought into this.

I have been in public service for most of my adult life, elected public service now, going on 22 years. I have never seen a bigger boondoggle than this NAFTA, never, and I have never seen a bigger ripoff, and I cannot for the life of me understand how the academic and journalistic community in this country has bought into this, and, believe me, they have bought into this.

Now one explanation is that the control of many of our institutions, in academia as well as in the press, is run by corporate elites, and they are told to buy into this, and another explanation is that a lot of these people have never worked in a factory, never have gotten their hands dirty, are divorced of reality of what happens in Toledo, and Detroit, and Warren, and Fort Huron, and Lorain, OH. They have no concept of the pain that is going on in these facilities, in these communities, because of plant close-downs so that corporations can go down and rake off these profits in a corrupt political system that Mexico provides.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I have been so disappointed that there has been so little investigative journalism on the part of our newspapers.

□ 2000

I wonder if they sold out to some of their advertisers here in this country. I wonder the same about our television and our news media. I wonder if they are living up to the high principles that they once espoused when they graduated from journalism school.

I also think there are just some folks that are plain lazy. They do not want to take the time to go down there. I remember a wonderful U.S. ambassador from our country, Sargent Shriver, who represented us in Europe. I asked him once what it was like to be an ambassador. He said, "I'll tell you what. If you can manage to get the ambassador out of the cocktail lounge in the Hilton Hotels and get him out into the countryside, you will have a great ambassador."

I wonder sometimes if our university professors and some of our media leaders have managed to walk down the street that we walked down when we were there a month ago.

Mr. BONIOR. How some of these paragons of journalism, who purport to

be the conscience of human rights and human work for dignity and decency, can support this, is beyond me, absolutely beyond me.

I guess Salinas has done an incredible job of selling this thing to these people. I mean, he is a nice looking guy. He went to Harvard and is educated. He controls this thing with an iron fist. He controls a corrupt system, and he is a part of it. He is a big part of it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield, interestingly, a newspaper editor in a Ohio newspaper told me last week that although he himself understands the human rights violations, he understands that wages in Mexico, even with the maquiladoras and all the American business down there and the American manufacturing, that wages have not gone up in Mexico in the last few years. That even though the proponents say that the wages will go up, they will be able to buy the televisions, and the people that the gentlewoman of Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is talking about will be able to buy those televisions and be able to buy those cars, that is clearly not true.

This editor understood all of that. He told me the other day, even though he is an opponent of NAFTA, that his publisher is down the road going to endorse the NAFTA because it is business.

Mr. BONIOR. It is business. It is big, big business. It is elitism. It is big business.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The only people in Mexico that really support NAFTA, the only people that really support it are the elitists, the Salinas people, the people that control the government, the people that control the businesses.

Those businesses have that \$50 million that those businesses spend. If the elite in this country, if the newspaper publishers, if most of them had not already been captured by this, they have been well organized. They sent out people to talk to newspaper editors.

People tend to agree that free trade in theory is a wonderful thing. Free trade, like free enterprise, is almost an article of faith in this country. Free enterprise absolutely works in this country. We need governmental involvement on environmental issues and free enterprise. We need government involvement on minimum wages and worker safety and all that.

With free trade, these economists and these people that take it as an article of faith just believe that pure free trade is a wonderful thing.

We do not have pure free trade anywhere. And never, as the gentleman knows, never has there been an agreement ever in history between two countries that are economically so far apart. Never has there been that kind of agreement.

The proponents will say, well, they had that in Europe with Portugal and Spain on the one hand and Britain and Sweden and Germany on the other.

The wage differentials were not nearly as high. And as the gentleman pointed out, it was a years and years and years long negotiating process, with free elections, kind of free election side agreements, free trade unionism side agreements, side agreements on wages, side agreements on salary, side agreements on all of that.

Mr. BONIOR. They spent decades doing that. They spent tens of millions of dollars putting it all together. And here we want to spend virtually nothing and do it overnight.

There is an old Abbott and Costello routine that you may have seen growing up, where Bud Abbott says to Lou Costello, "Lou, if you had 50 bucks in one pocket, and 100 in the other, what would you have?" And Lou says, "Somebody else's pants."

Basically that is what we are dealing with here in terms of the American worker.

There is a report floating around that says in the auto industry, the textile industry, the steel industry, we will lose in the United States 40 percent of our workers if this thing goes through. Now, that is going to devastate our region.

Ms. KAPTUR. If the gentleman would yield, the people who will be the most affected by that job loss will be women, women who work in industries like textile industries, where the wages are some of the lowest, even in our country. People who work in manufacturing, at jobs that are very repetitive. And we are told we should accept this, because the United States has to become a high wage society and a high tech society.

Well, I think every society should have a range of jobs, and we should try to strike to uplift everyone in this society.

But women will be the most hurt, and those who have gone into the work force most recently. So women and minorities will be the two groups in our society hurt.

Mr. BONIOR. They have always been expendable in our society. And the newspaper editors and the academicians, I mean, they do not deal with that on a daily basis. I mean, why should they worry about those people in our society who are struggling? They are expendable.

What do they say? How do they answer the question that 40 percent of these people are going to be put out of work. What is their answer to that, that we are going to retrain them? What are we going to retrain them to do? Where are we going to get the money to retrain them?

Ms. KAPTUR. If the gentleman will yield again, in the agreement that has been negotiated for the people of our country, the proposal does not even have extended unemployment benefits for the people here that will lose their jobs. It does not have job retraining.

And, quite frankly, the people in my district do not want retraining; they want jobs, period.

They are tired of hearing about retraining. Some of them have been retrained two and three times for jobs that are not there.

Last year these big companies created more jobs in Mexico than they did here in the United States of America. So our people really understand what is going on.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentlewoman will yield, earlier this week I was in a job retraining center in Elyria, the second largest city in my district. It was a group of about 30 people that were some of the most committed people you ever saw.

Back in February when they started these classes there was a really bad snowstorm, and everything in Elyria was shut down, except about half the people that were at this job retraining center came in that day. It showed the kind of dedication they have.

These people do not want welfare, they want work. They want jobs. They want the kind of jobs that they had in Toledo, Ohio, and in Michigan and in Lorain, OH, and in Elyria, and all over, the kind of jobs that gave them the self-worth that they deserve, that gave them the chance to send their kids to college, that gave them a decent retirement, that gave them nice homes.

Sending our jobs to Mexico is clearly in the wrong direction. But, as you say, there just does not seem to be much interest among newspaper publishers and among academicians and within large corporate America.

Ms. KAPTUR. If the gentleman will yield again, one of the disappointing features that I have learned in the last year has been that the American Newspaper Publishers had President Salinas before them about a year ago.

Mr. BONIOR. Isn't that a great, progressive organization, the American Newspaper Publishers.

Ms. KAPTUR. What was interesting was they did not allow for those who had a different point of view to also come before them. And one of the people I think they should have allowed to come before them is a woman whose remarks I would like to insert in the RECORD tonight. I would like to call her one of the silent voices of Mexico, Luz Rosales Esteva, who speaks very eloquently on democracy and human rights in Mexico. If you would permit, I would like to read a few paragraphs from material she has given me. She wanted us to tell her story to the American people. She has helped found an organization dedicated to human rights and democracy.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Esteva asked me to read this into the RECORD for the American people to hear. She says:

Human Rights and Democracy are inextricably intertwined: where there is no democracy, human rights are not respected and

vice versa. If we are talking about a trade agreement, we need to ask ourselves to what extent it respects the rights of man and our peoples' democracy. I believe that this agreement, the North American Free Trade Agreement, should be ratified provided it helps improve the living conditions of our respective peoples. Up to now in my country this agreement has not been discussed with the majority of the social sectors and an agreement such as this one should have the consensus of a large majority of the citizens.

While I am unable to speak in detail about the problems in the United States and Canada, I can tell you that the reality in my country is that we do not have democracy, and virtually every aspect of human rights is violated: economic, social, cultural and environmental rights, and to an even greater degree political and labor rights.

Due to the economic model currently being implemented—from which NAFTA originates—the living conditions of more than 80% of the population have deteriorated. For example, 50% of all children under 5 years of age are malnourished, workers' salaries have lost 40% of their buying power in the past ten years, and the policy of streamlining the government has resulted in the reduction of public spending in education, health and social security. The International Labor Organization (ILO) states that in Mexico we designate 2.4% of our gross domestic product (GDP) to social welfare costs, while the United States designates 12.3%, and Canada 18%.

The impunity of public officials, accused of corruption, who do not respect people's individual rights of Mexican citizens are violated and there is clear opposition to democratic transformation, denying the people's right to elect its representatives; thus generating a climate of social tension. To give an objective example of this, I can tell you that since August of 1991, 6 governors have been forced to step down because of citizen pressure objecting to the electoral processes which brought them to their posts.

Civil observations of the electoral processes in eight of the ten states observed between August of 1991 and February of 1993 show grave irregularities, which we have documented extensively, for example:

In the zones where the opposition is strong, the electoral authorities erase thousands of names from the election register of people who are not members of the official party, denying them their political rights.

Government funds are used indiscriminately to support official party candidates, especially through the National Solidarity Program—which is used more as a political arm than as a means to eradicate poverty. For example, public works are conditioned on election results in areas where potable water or a certain bridge that needs building are extremely important to the inhabitants. Between 1990 and 1992, Solidarity spent the same amount in the state of Michoacan as it did in its annual budget for the entire country, with the objective of weakening the opposition in the townships where it was strongest.

Excessively high cost political campaigns are carried out in a country where 17 million of the citizens live in extreme poverty.

The communication media is almost totally inclined toward the official candidate.

The electoral process is controlled at every level by the government party, which decides the laws and the electoral officials and declares the results of the voting.

One of the most alarming statistics is the fact that electoral conflicts have cost more than 200 lives in the last 4 years; the huge

majority of who were opposed to the official party.

This impunity and the unjust electoral process have generated a lack of confidence and discredited the government, which lacks the backing of the people.

The Free Trade Agreement has been negotiated in this climate of no-confidence and lacking the participation and representation of a large majority of the population. You thus can understand that it does not have a confirmed backing of the Mexican people.

In light of all this, I want to show you the other side of this society—a people struggling in many different ways to conquer a harsh reality. I have been a witness to the wide spread participation of citizens fighting for change. The formation of 60 civic organizations for human rights, citizens' environmental groups, the Mexican Action Network on Free Trade (RMALC), and citizens' movements to defend democracy demonstrate this.

In practically every election since 1992, an average of 400 citizens from all different social classes have come together to observe the development of the elections, with the interest of defending the right to vote. Currently, civil institutions and citizens all over the country are united in the citizens' movement for democracy, and we are proposing reforms in the national electoral law, which defines five points of change necessary to achieve a peaceful transition to democracy. This is what we as Mexicans want:

Impartial Electoral Commissions that are independent of the government and made up of citizens and political parties—an electoral branch of government separate from the executive, legislative and judicial branches. Legitimate election registers and voter identification controlled and monitored by citizens and political parties. Prohibition of the use of public funds to benefit candidates. Limits in the expenses of political campaigns. An impartial media.

To summarize, in Mexico there exists a strong citizens' movement to defend democracy and human rights. There are viable proposals being put forth and Mexican citizens are demonstrating the ability to be critical and proactive in all of these issues. Proof of this is the Plebiscite held in Mexico City on the 21st of March, organized by 10,000 city residents, to determine the kind of government people want in the capital. Eight-four percent of the 331,000 who voted in the plebiscite said they want their own government and not one imposed by the President.

The government doesn't want to recognize the plebiscite, but meanwhile in the state of Guerrero, it wants to impose a governor who obtained little more than 200,000 votes (11% of that state's voting age population) via a campaign and elections that were obviously fraudulent.

To know Mexico, it is essential that one listen to the Civil Society, understand it and support it. There is a lot to be done in the field of Democracy and Human Rights, by both our peoples, respecting our own processes and sovereignty.

In the Tri-national relationship between Canada, the United States and Mexico, the Mexican Action Network on Free Trade and its northern counterparts have made proposals that should be analyzed closely in order to improve the social conditions of the three countries. In this respect, we should in our relations: (1) abide by the Multinational Covenants developed by the UN and the OAS to protect and promote human rights; (2) ratify the UN convention for the rights of immigrant workers and their families; (3) consider

free transit of peoples; and (4) the creation of bilateral organisms which include the participation of non-governmental human rights organizations to eradicate violence in the U.S./Mexico border region.

I believe these agreements are fundamental and before thinking about ratifying NAFTA, the autonomous human rights organizations should be consulted and these proposals studied carefully. This would help to advance democracy, and hence be a responsible approach toward the future of our peoples, in spite of the months or years of work it may require.

I hope that I have helped you better understand Mexico and the struggle of its people to advance and conquer these problems.

Thank you very much.

□ 2010

I appreciate the opportunity to speak out on behalf of that silent voice from Mexico that needs to be heard.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her leadership on this issue. She has been such a stalwart to me in providing leadership for the rest of us.

We thank you for all you have given on this issue.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I think the people in this country pretty clearly are ready, and in Canada, have begun to speak out on NAFTA. While the elite in Mexico surely support it, are spending \$50 million to pass it in the American Government, in the Halls of the American Congress, and while people raise voices, people in Mexico are raising voices like the woman that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] mentioned, there are the few trade unions in Mexico that are not government operated, that are not owned by the Government or operated in some way by the Government. Those trade unions, I believe, unanimously oppose NAFTA.

Of the three people that negotiated NAFTA, President Bush, Prime Minister Mulroney of Canada and President Salinas, President Bush is out of office, partly because of opposition to NAFTA. Prime Minister Mulroney is out of office in large part because of the Canadian people's opposition to NAFTA. And President Salinas will soon be out of office.

I think people in our countries are speaking on NAFTA while the \$50 million is being spent by the Mexican Government to lobby it here, while U.S.A. NAFTA, a corporate group in America, funded by American corporations, is spending tens of millions of dollars in addition to lobbying Congress. I think that the people in this country, the numbers are with us.

The people that feel they are going to lose their jobs to Mexico, as they will, people that are afraid of the environment along the Mexican border, people that do not want to see children exploited on this side of the border and the south side of the border, I think people in large numbers are going to begin to lobby their Members of Congress.

It is important that we get that kind of grassroots input to fight off the kind of corporate big money involvement and corporate big money influence peddling that these law firms in Washington are doing, paid for by large American companies and paid for by the Mexican Government.

Mr. BONIOR. They are trying to buy the jobs of the American worker, this lobbying campaign. They are trying to steal the jobs of the American worker. It would be a tragedy, indeed, if we allowed them to do this in this body.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding to me.

Before I engage in this colloquy, I would like to say that at some point in the future we will have a chance to discuss the health care issues, including the gentleman from Michigan in the discussion, because we had a little difference tonight.

Let me just say that I just got back from Mexico. I went down to Miami, FL, to meet with Customs people and DEA agents to talk about the immigration problems and the drug problems that were bad down there and the refugee problem from Haiti and elsewhere. Then we flew to Mexico City, because we wanted to check on three things: the drug problem, the Mexican-American North American Free-Trade Agreement, NAFTA, and also to see what kind of a problem it would create on both sides of the border as far as jobs were concerned.

We found that there are 2,100 companies down there that have gone down there because of the maquiladora program. We found that some of those companies have been infiltrated by the drug cartel people. They have bought into those companies, because they find a conduit to getting drugs into the United States that they did not have before. And I talked to some of our Customs people.

Some of those convoys of trucks bringing supplies in, products in from Mexico, from the maquiladora companies, are miles long. And our Customs people and DEA people at the border are simply overwhelmed by the number of trucks that are coming in, and drugs are coming in through that method, because you simply cannot check all of the cargoes of all of those trucks.

So from the standpoint of drugs, this is going to be an additional problem, if we approve the NAFTA agreement, because there are going to be other companies going down there, probably several thousand.

And when you add to the 2,100 maquiladora companies, these other thousands of companies that will go down there or at least hundreds, it is going to compound the problem. We are going to have convoys of trucks coming up here, many with drugs and other

contraband in them that we simply will not be able to catch.

I asked one of the DEA officials down there about how they are going to deal with that. He said that they will catch a number of those people but they will not be able to stop the tidal wave of drugs. I said, "Then what do we need the DEA down there for, if you are not going to be able to stop this tidal wave of drugs?"

He said, simply, that is not their charge. Their charge is to try to enforce the law as much as possible and catch the drug dealers. But this is going to add to the problem.

In addition to that, we went to two companies down there to talk to them about what this would do to their companies. These are American companies. One was Eli Lilly, which has a major company in Indianapolis. That is their major plant. They had a subsidiary down there, because of the import tariffs on American products, drugs coming into that country. So about 40-some years ago, Lilly put a plant down there.

They told me that some companies that they knew of might very well close their doors down there because the import tariffs that are now erected against some of our products going into Mexico would be removed. And as a result, there would be no necessity to keep some American plants down there that are currently there because those protective barriers will not be there.

I said, "What will happen to the employees of many of those companies, including farmers, small campsinos that have farms down there, small truck farms that produce products there in Mexico?" And they said that what many of them would do would be to come to the United States, and they think that this would enhance the illegal immigration problem.

As a matter of fact, they told me that we could expect an increase in illegal immigration into the United States averaging from 6 to 8 percent a year for the next 8 to 15 years. So the illegal immigration problem that we have could be and probably will be compounded, if NAFTA is approved. This is another problem.

I am pointing out the problems with the NAFTA agreement that some people do not see that is really apparent.

Ms. KAPTUR. Do you not find it incredible that in this 2,000-page proposed treaty that the issue of immigration, drug interdiction, is not addressed at all? The border crossing issue? How do we inspect, and also the agricultural migration, where because of changes in Mexico, over 10 million people are being taken off their farms down there?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Of course, I would like to say, if the gentleman will continue to yield me just a couple more seconds, you have been covering this very well. I think that this is an

issue. I hope the gentleman in the well and others from our side of the aisle will involve ourselves in a bipartisan colloquy, maybe over the next few weeks, about this issue. Not necessarily because everybody will oppose NAFTA, but I think the American people who pay attention to C-SPAN and the news media and others that watch this will find some of these issues that you are raising tonight and that we have just raised now very interesting and illuminating. Because a lot of people are getting one-sided information, as I think you just mentioned a few minutes ago. And we need to make sure that the American people are well aware of all the ramifications of this, not just Mr. Perot's great sucking sound of companies going down there, but the drug problem, the illegal alien problem, job loss on both sides of the border. I think these things ought to be discussed in depth. So I hope that the gentleman from Michigan, with whom I somewhat agree on this issue, and others will take the time to have a bipartisan discussion on this in the weeks to come.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman from Indiana raises the specter of a long line of trucks coming across the Mexican border into Texas and Arizona and New Mexico and into California and then fanning across this country.

One of the issues that is not often raised is not just the drug issue, which is discussed, although not addressed in the agreement, but the issue of these trucks, these by-and-large unregulated trucks with less than well-trained Mexican drivers driving into the United States.

In this country, in every State in the Union, there are regulations on truck length. There are regulations on truck weights. There are regulations saying that no driver may drive more than 10 hours any day. There is random drug testing in most places in this country for truck drivers.

In Mexico, there are no enforced truck weights. There are no enforced truck lengths. There are older trucks in Mexico, not in as good a shape, not in as good a mechanical condition.

The drivers in Mexico only need to be 18 rather than 21 to get a license. Those drivers do not have the testing, can drive as many hours a day as they want. We raise that specter of these trucks coming into the country, when Americans are pretty concerned about truck safety anyway, with some of the triples on the road and some of the longer, bigger trucks.

□ 2020

I think if we seek trucks from Mexico that are not as well maintained, with drivers that are not as sharp because they have been driving more hours, probably not as well trained and more likely to be substance abusers, because there is not training and testing and

all of that, it raises the specter of even an additional problem with NAFTA that again we have not addressed in the side agreements, and we are not going to address in the side agreements, because the administration, as did the previous administration, set an artificial deadline on negotiations.

There is no reason that President Salinas or Prime Minister Campbell would feel like they need to negotiate this, need to give in on anything, because of this self-imposed American deadline.

Ms. KAPTUR. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Speaker, in closing for myself this evening I just wanted to thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], who has been a leader on this whole drug interdiction issue, not just as concerns Mexico but many of the other supplier countries. We certainly appreciate his being part of this special order tonight.

I also wanted to thank my very talented colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. There are some fights that are really worth fighting, and this is one of them. I am really glad to have him.

Mr. BONIOR. You bet it is.

Ms. KAPTUR. To you, I would say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], who is helping us reveal to the American people the true dimensions of this agreement, we thank you for your leadership, your persistence, and your intelligence all along.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MEEK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

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

There was no objection.

EQUAL JUSTICE UNDER THE LAW FOR HAITIANS

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

Mrs. MEEK. Mr. Speaker, I have called this special order today to bring attention to the plight of 142 Haitians, who have suffered enormously over the past several months. They risked their lives in Haiti to support democracy. They were detained and interviewed at Guantanamo Bay Naval Base, Cuba, by Immigration and Naturalization Service officials.

I implore our President to stand firm and to prevent our refugee laws from being exploited by fear. Please do not appeal Judge Johnson's order.

I would now like to thank my colleagues, who have joined with me

today to support the Guantanamo Haitians.

It is heartening how many people have come forward to help with the resettlement of these Haitians. I especially appreciate the letter I received from the associate dean of the University of Miami School of Medicine offering to coordinate any necessary health services with Jackson Memorial Hospital to provide services to the Haitians from Guantanamo.

Indeed, not all of the 142 Haitians have tested positive for this virus, as the 142 includes children and HIV-negative spouses. Those who are HIV-positive do not require hospitalization at this time, and are able to work. The Haitians will receive 12-month parole and work authorization papers, allowing them to obtain employment through family contacts and placement programs available to them.

Concern that letting these Haitians enter the United States sets a dangerous precedent, opening the floodgates for those with AIDS to come to the United States is baseless. Public health officials have stated that they present no serious health risk. The Haitians affected by the judge's order do not have AIDS. They have tested positive for the HIV virus.

I would inform my colleagues from Florida that less than half of this number will reside in Florida, and most of them will be provided housing and living expenses by immediate family, friends, and charitable organizations.

They will be eligible for already existing refugee resettlement programs and will not require additional assistance. In fact, the cost of operating the Guantanamo camp was estimated between \$7-\$8 million a year, far exceeding any cost associated with resettling 142 people.

On June 8, Judge Sterling Johnson of the United States District Court in New York issued an order initiating the immediate closure of the Haitian processing camp at Guantanamo Bay Naval Base, Cuba. On June 9, the Justice Department announced it does not intend to seek a stay pending an appeal. However, the Justice Department has reserved the right to appeal at a later date. The judge's decision was consistent with our current immigration policies and requires our Government to apply those policies uniformly in accordance with U.S. law.

They were found to have a credible fear of persecution in Haiti. They were justified in their flight from military authorities who ousted President Aristide in October 1991. INS officials found that all of these Haitians met the standard of persecution that should have allowed them to come to the United States following their interviews.

But instead of bringing them here, they were incarcerated at Guantanamo because many tested HIV-positive.

Our refugee laws are based on establishing a well-founded fear of persecution, not on the politics of race.

The impact of Judge Johnson's order has been blown out of proportion by some. It only affects 142 people. Concerns raised by some that the Guantanamo Haitians have no financial resources and will strain our economy to the breaking point are unfounded.

□ 2030

In recent days many have expressed concern about the potential impact of Judge Johnson's ruling ordering the release of the Haitians held at Guantanamo Bay. This concern has been portrayed as a financial and medical threat to U.S. citizens, mainly because of perceived medical costs and a perception that public health would be threatened because the HIV virus would be further spread. Many of my constituents have expressed fear, but most are outraged and incensed at the double standard to which Haitians have been subjected.

Concern that letting these Haitians in sets a dangerous precedent, opening the floodgates for those with AIDS to enter the United States, is baseless. Contrary to what others have suggested, Judge Johnson's decision is not inconsistent with current immigration policy; rather it requires our Government to apply these policies uniformly and to abide by our laws. Our refugee laws are not based on economics or on race, but on the need to protect those who could be subjected to political persecution.

To my knowledge, no other group of asylum seekers have been required to take the HIV test at this stage of the asylum process. Until last year, the United States had never excluded anyone from the asylum program on the basis that they were HIV positive. Indeed, Cubans who have made it to the Guantanamo Naval Base are being brought to the United States and allowed to enter the asylum program without any medical testing at all.

The impact of Judge Johnson's order is being blown way out of proportion. His order only affects 142 people, which public health experts agree will have no significant impact on our economic or public health systems.

Concern that the Guantanamo Haitians will strain our economy to the breaking point is simply unfounded. Closing the camp immediately will result in saving our Government more than \$15,000 a day; more than half a million dollars per month; \$7 to \$8 million a year. Most of the Haitians upon arrival in the United States will be supported by family members, friends, and charitable institutions. Those without families will be resettled initially from exclusively private funding sources; all perhaps will be assisted by Federal moneys in which all refugees are entitled. Eligibility for the Federal

refugee benefits will end if political asylum is denied.

The Haitians will be entitled to the same refugee assistance that is available to Cuban and others who wish to begin a new life in the United States. Any incidental cost incurred will be exceedingly smaller than the costs of operating the Guantanamo camp. And, certainly any cost incurred by the State of Florida as a result of the Guantanamo Haitians should be reimbursed out of the savings realized by the Federal Government.

While the Haitians were detained at Guantanamo, the Federal Government paid 100 percent of their housing, food, medical care, and other living expenses. Once the refugees arrive in the United States, they will earn their own wages, and to the extent that they require support, the burden of providing for their living expenses will be shared by their families, churches, community groups, and voluntary agencies.

The American people are certainly entitled to know and to have a say regarding the economic impact of our immigration policies. But the sudden focus on costs in this case is clearly a way of justifying our prejudices against these particular asylum seekers. Those voicing their concern over the cost of caring for the Haitians in the United States have said nothing about the cost over the past 20 months of running the Guantanamo camp.

Not all of the Haitians affected by Judge Johnson's order have tested positive for HIV. Indeed the 142 Haitians currently at Guantanamo Bay include the HIV-negative spouses and children of HIV positive Haitians.

The notion that these Haitians pose a public health threat is a scare tactic that plays to the worst prejudices in our society, directed at people of color and against HIV positive people. HIV and AIDS are not airborne diseases. Nor are they transmitted by casual contact. Officials at the Center for Disease Control have said repeatedly that there is no reason to keep HIV positive people out of the country. These HIV positive Haitians pose less of a public health threat than the millions of untested Americans who unknowingly infect others through high risk practices.

None of the affected Haitians has AIDS. A few of them have tested positive for the HIV virus. None are expected to require immediate hospitalization. If they develop AIDS they will need medical treatment—but that is also true of the 1.5 million people in the United States who already have HIV or AIDS. Even if we kept the Haitians at Guantanamo Bay, we would be obliged to provide them with some level of medical care if their condition worsened.

The Haitians at Guantanamo have suffered enormously over the past several months. They have risked their

lives in Haiti, fighting for democracy, only to learn in many cases, while at Guantanamo, of the loss of loved ones they were forced to leave behind. All have met the Immigration and Naturalization Services' standard of having a credible fear of persecution, a standard which should have allowed them to be admitted to the United States to pursue their asylum claims. But instead of bringing them here the INS subjected many of them to an even higher standard, which they virtually all passed. Judge Johnson's fair and just decision recognizes the extent to which we have discriminated against the Haitians.

From a humanitarian standpoint and as an act of compassion we must now look ourselves in the mirror and acknowledge what is right and what is just. What is right is to allow bona fide refugees to live in freedom and with dignity. What is just is to treat refugees fairly no matter how loud the voices of prejudice. We should use the same standards for Haitians as we do for other refugees. Our current treatment of the Haitians refugees can—at best—be characterized as discriminatory and un-American. We must move now to end such treatment and end the 20 months of suffering the Haitians have experienced.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of the members of the Congressional Black Caucus that have gone on record with some of the members appealing and asking the President and Mrs. Reno to not pull back on the decision of Judge Johnson. He did what was right, and sometimes we have very tough decisions to make in this country. But if they are based on the law and they are legal, then we can stand by them.

It is to be understood then that if we work very hard we know that the people who are detained and were detained at Guantanamo are political refugees, and they have already been interviewed.

On the health status, I repeat from before, public health officials estimate that 1.5 million people in the United States already have HIV or AIDS. Public health officials agree that the entry of a minimal number of HIV positive Haitians will have no significant economic or public health consequences.

Family unification. Most of the Guantanamo Haitians have immediate family members living lawfully in the United States, many of them living in Florida. These families are eager to provide affection and care and all necessary living expenses to their spouses, siblings, children and parents. Refugees will rejoin their families in Florida, New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Maryland.

Employment. The Haitians will receive a 12-month parole and work authorization paper upon arrival, hopefully allowing them to obtain employment through their family contacts.

The cost of resettlement will be done at negligible public expense. Refugees who adopt families are being resettled initially from exclusively private funding sources, exclusively private funding sources. Refugees with families will be assisted by a one-time Federal grant of \$2,000 per person to their sponsoring agency. This is no more than other refugees who have come to this country.

I have the greatest respect for my colleagues who have expressed concerns of their constituents over the impact of the judge's ruling. However, my phones have also been ringing with calls from my constituents who are outraged and incensed at some of the things they have heard on the floor of this House and the double standard to which Haitian refugees have been subjected. Many of the people who are voicing these concerns know very little about the Haitian input in this country, and I do not think they could care less. No group of asylum seekers, as I said, is required to do what the poor Haitians have done.

I stand here today, Mr. Speaker, asking for some justice and some mercy in this country.

I have a letter here from the Catholic Commission, the Ministry of Christian Service to Attorney General Janet Reno which reads as follows:

CATHOLIC COMMISSION FOR CHRISTIAN MINISTRY OF CHRISTIAN SERVICE,

Miami Shores, FL, June 17, 1993.

Attorney General JANET RENO,
U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. RENO: We are disturbed by reports that the Clinton Administration is being pressured to halt the closure of the HIV+ Haitian refugee camp at Guantanamo. The order by Judge Sterling Johnson allowing these Haitians to be brought to the United States is a just and humane one.

Working through the Migration and Refugee Services of the United States Catholic Conference, we have already assisted some 5,500 Haitians admitted from Guantanamo since last year with resettlement and legal services. Our offices are currently handling the arrival of these last few HIV+ detainees at no additional cost to the taxpayers.

At the time that I write, most of the 150 adults and 19 children affected by Judge Sterling's order are already here. Any move to halt arrivals now will only create confusion and subject the few remaining detainees to a cruel hoax of American justice.

Sincerely,

Msgr. BRYAN O. WALSH,
Executive Director.

This is signed by Monsignor Bryan O. Walsh, the executive director of the United States Catholic Conference.

I have other letters and also include for the RECORD a press release from the United States Catholic Conference, which I include as follows:

[Press Release]

MIGRATION AND REFUGEE SERVICES,
Washington, DC, June 8, 1993.

CHURCH AGENCY WELCOMES COURT ORDER REQUIRING ALL REMAINING GUANTANAMO HAITIANS BE BROUGHT TO UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON.—In a statement released today, Fr. Richard Ryscavage, S.J. Execu-

tive Director of the Catholic Bishops' Office of Migration and Refugee Services, applauded and welcomed the decision of United States District Court Judge Sterling Johnson, Jr. ordering that the remainder of all Haitians still detained at Guantanamo Bay be brought into the United States. The decision affects some 169 Haitians including 150 adults and 19 children. (data as of 6/1/93)

Fr. Ryscavage said "this decision of the court should be applauded and welcomed as a long overdue measure of justice and a humanitarian act of compassion for those who have suffered twice—first in fleeing Haiti where they were subject to human rights abuse and second in being subject to very difficult physical and physiological conditions in the refugee camp at Guantanamo Bay." Fr. Ryscavage had visited the section of Guantanamo reserved for HIV+ Haitians and was "shocked by the camp conditions . . . and deeply moved by the psychological pain of the detainees."

Those affected by the decision have now been in Guantanamo for over a year surrounded by barbed wire and housed in makeshift shelters, which often leak in the rain. All of these Haitians have met the condition of being allowed into the United States—namely, "a credible fear of persecution" if forced to return to Haiti.

Fr. Ryscavage "strongly urges the Administration not to appeal the court order and to allow the remaining Guantanamo Haitians to come into the United States either as refugees or with an indefinite status." The Catholic Bishops' Office of Migration and Refugee Services has already resettled 24 HIV+ Guantanamo Haitians and their family members since April 5, 1993. "Our agency is prepared to help provide the services needed to adequately care for and resettle these Haitians." These services include family counseling, structured orientation, case management, housing and food, employment where applicable, and coordination of medical services. Fr. Ryscavage "hopes that the political will and the necessary leadership will prevail in cooperating with the court decision."

The Office of Migration and Refugee Services has provided resettlement and legal services to some 5,500 Haitians admitted from Guantanamo since last year.

I have many letters from people supporting the fact that we should give some kind of justice and humanitarian care to these Haitians.

It is so important that we use the same yardstick, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to yield the rest of my time to the chairman of our Haitian Task Force, our honorable colleague from New York, MAJOR OWENS, who has fought this fight for so many years, and it has given me inspiration to do my very best. Thank you, MAJOR OWENS.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I want to congratulate her for sponsoring this special order and for beginning with a set of facts that I think are very important.

The problem is not a legal problem. The problem is not a financial problem. The presentation of the gentlewoman from Florida has made it quite clear that those problems are being taken care of. There are families, there are organizations assuming responsibility for the Haitians who have returned as a

result of Judge Johnson's order. It ought to be quite clear now.

The problem is a moral one, the fact that at this point when the court has ruled there are people who are trying to pressure the White House to appeal the ruling of the judge in order to force these people back into a situation where they cannot get the proper health care.

□ 2040

It is an example of the expression of the worst strains in the American character to have people demanding that the President appeal this ruling.

I would like to see us remain true to the expression of the best that is in the American character, the kind of noble sentiments that are indicated in the way we have treated other refugees in the past.

We not only allowed the Hungarian refugees into this country at the time of the revolution in Hungary when Soviet tanks were used to crush the Hungarian uprising, we not only allowed them in, we sent planes to get them. We paid for their transportation. We allowed them in in large numbers. Nobody was tested for any kind of disease, no restrictions were placed in any way against those people, and we allowed large numbers of Cubans in unrestricted, and no special set of rules were ever generated, no special set of rules were even made.

We have behaved nobly in many ways, and our great Nation is to be congratulated for extending itself for humanitarian reasons, often when we have nothing else to gain. There are people who said we went into Kuwait, and we spent billions of dollars, and we placed American lives in jeopardy because Kuwait was a situation where our interests were very much on the bottom line, that we were concerned about oil, and that may or may not be, but I am glad we extended ourselves.

Definitely there is nothing on the bottom line in the case of Somalia. Somalia is a situation where, for humanitarian reasons, our troops are there strictly for humanitarian reasons, and there are many other examples where the Nation has behaved in a very noble way, and we have demonstrated why we are such a great country.

In the case of the Haitians, it is just the opposite. One incident after another, one example after another have demonstrated the worst in the American character. We have made those double standards which the gentlewoman enumerated before, and those double standards that apply only to Haitians, and we can only conclude that it is racism, that it is because of the color of their skin.

Why are they suddenly subjected to tests? If we are serious about HIV-positive persons and wanted to keep them out of the country, that means we would have a program to test all of the

tourists coming into the country. We do not do that. We do not even test immigrants who come in under very strange conditions.

I think that "60 Minutes" exposed the fact that our Immigration Department allows people coming through the airports to come into the airports, especially the one in New York at Kennedy Airport, and if they say they are seeking asylum, political asylum, they are sent out for a few hours, they are questioned, and usually let go, because they only have detention space for about 20 or 30 people. So they have let people by the thousands come into the country, pretend they have lost their passport, say they are seeking political asylum, and in 3 hours they are told to show up at a hearing, and they are allowed to go into the streets of New York. Two-thirds of them they never see again.

We are that careless with our immigration policies. If you are concerned about immigration and if you are concerned about who comes into the country, then let the Immigration Department tighten up those kinds of policies.

Here we have a situation that is a matter related to political asylum. If ever there was a nation that was the subject of terrorism, oppression, abuse, it has been Haiti. If ever there was a group of people who almost automatically qualified without any further questioning, it was the Haitians, and then we have erected this setup of double standards in the case of the Haitians. It can only be attributed to racism.

I think that as soon as possible we should move on to try to get the Haitian problem solved. I would like to see our Nation not set any more precedents of the kind that we have set in the case of the HIV-positive Haitians; we have set a precedent in the case of the Coast Guard boats being used to keep people into the country. We have set that precedent. Nowhere else in the world have people been kept into their country because they were felt that they might try to get out to seek asylum and they might create problems for a nation. That is brand new.

The recent Supreme Court ruling upheld that action by our Government. It is most unfortunate. I do not criticize the Supreme Court. I cannot go into the legalities of it. I am not a lawyer.

I think the Supreme Court should never have been presented with the case. I criticize very much our administration, the present administration, which never should have appealed the case, never should have taken it to the Supreme Court.

There are arguments that are being made among lawyers about the fact that the ruling of the Supreme Court is not correct, but the Supreme Court has the final word. But it is all over with respect to this particular incident.

Justice Blackmun was the only Justice who dissented, and I think it is important to get on the record that fact that here is a Justice of the Supreme Court who really agreed with the Court that preceded him; the Federal court that had ruled before agreed with Justice Blackmun. The numerous lawyers who brought the case, of course, argued, and agreed with Justice Blackmun.

I just wanted to quote a little bit from Justice Blackmun's dissent on this case where Haitian people are being kept into their country by United States forces, and I quote from Justice Blackmun's dissent:

When in 1968, the United States acceded to the United Nations protocol relating to the status of refugees, it pledged not to "return a refugee in any manner whatsoever" to a place where he would face political persecution. In 1980, Congress amended our immigration law to reflect the protocol's directives, the Refugee Act of 1980. Today's majority nevertheless decides that the forced repatriation of the Haitian refugees is perfectly legal, because the word "return" does not mean return, because the opposite of "within the United States" is not outside the United States. * * *

I believe that the duty of nonreturn expressed in both the Protocol and the statute is clear. The majority finds it "extraordinary" that Congress would have intended the ban on returning "any alien" to apply to aliens at sea. That Congress would have meant what it said is not remarkable. What is extraordinary in this case is that the Executive, in disregard of the law, would take to the seas to intercept fleeing refugees and force them back to their persecutors and that the Court would strain to sanction that conduct. * * *

The refugees attempting to escape from Haiti do not claim a right of admission to this country. They do not even argue that the Government has no right to intercept their boats. They demand only that the United States, land of refugees and guardian of freedom, cease forcibly driving them back to detention, abuse and death. That is a modest plea, vindicated by the Treaty of the statute. We should not close our ears to it.

That is the end of the quote of Justice Blackmun's dissent.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close by just saying that a series of terrible things have been done to the Haitians, unfortunately, by our Government.

Some good things have been done recently. The present administration, listening to the voice of the Congressional Black Caucus, and we met with the President, where we presented him with a six-point program. He did respond on some of those points.

On step 1, he did respond and take steps to freeze the assets of the supporters of the coup and the members of the military. He did say that the passports would be restricted, and they did go to the United Nations and ask for the strongest possible sanctions and an embargo to be placed on the shipment of certain goods and materials to Haiti, especially the all-important commodity of oil and of arms. They took those steps.

It is true it is 21 months late. We do not know why our Government did not go to the United Nations 21 months ago, but the steps have been taken recently and we applaud the President.

We think that there is a window of opportunity to solve the problem, to get on with having the United States Government relieved of the burden of having to make day-to-day decisions about the Haitians who are fleeing the country because of the oppression there.

If the situation in Haiti is corrected, if democracy is allowed to function, if the legally elected President, Jean-Bertrand Aristide, elected by 70 percent of the voters, if he is allowed to return and assume his rightful place, then many of these decisions that we are making which are setting unfortunate precedents and are presenting our country in an unfortunate light, many of these decisions revealing a latent racism in our country that we do not want to have come out, they will not have to be made. Let us do the right thing by Haiti. Let us do the right thing in terms of President Aristide, and we will return the situation to a state where the Haitians have control of their own lives.

It is important to note that during the 7 months that President Aristide was President and left alone by the army, the number of Haitians trying to get out of Haiti to seek refuge somewhere else went down almost to zero.

Let us bring the situation back to that point. There is a window of opportunity here. As of this morning, the U.S. embargo, the sanctions, began. The process is started.

General Cedras, the person who has led the oppression and the terror, who led the assault against Aristide, has agreed for the first time to hold meetings.

I, frankly, think it is an insult to have the legally elected President sit down with a renegade and thug that used force to throw him out of office after he was elected to that position.

□ 2050

But the compromise is that President Aristide has agreed to sit down with General Cedras. For the first time General Cedras is taking the United States seriously; for the first time the world community is being respected. They are really fearful that one step will lead to another.

We hope that the President is prepared to go beyond the U.N. sanctions and embargo; we hope the President is prepared to take the other steps that the caucus has recommended. We hope that we are moving to a point where a date certain for the return of President Aristide will be established.

The international community, the United States, the Organization of American States, and the United Nations, in combination, will say that

President Aristide should be returned by a certain date and they will make it quite clear to the military gang in command of Haiti that we are coming.

I hope that they will take the further step of guaranteeing the safety of President Aristide with a corps of bodyguards, not an invading force, but enough people to guarantee the safety of President Aristide, and enough people to guarantee law and order, enough people to guarantee any of Aristide's opponents' safety, people who say they fear the return of Aristide.

All of these things are doable. We do not need to mount an invasion. We do not need to bomb anybody. We do not need to spend millions of dollars. The cheapest thing for the American Government to do now is the right thing. Let us do the right thing by Haiti. Let us get out of the situation where we had been forced by our own political expedience. Certain people have felt they have been forced to do outrageous things to Haiti.

Let us do the right thing: Let us return democracy to Haiti; let us return Jean Bertrand Aristide to this rightful place as the legally elected ruler of Haiti, and let us do it soon.

I thank the gentlewoman for this opportunity.

Mrs. MEEK. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York for his remarks and for sharing with this country the historical memory of what has happened and transpired with the Haitians.

Mr. Speaker, I want to end my special order with one special appeal to the American public. I want the American public to understand or to see the scenario that refugees from Cuba, from Nicaragua, from El Salvador, from many, many other countries have been allowed into this United States without the kind of hysteria, harassment, demagoguery and seeming racism that has faced the Haitians.

I appeal to my colleagues, in this special order, to do it fairly, take one measure and that be a measure of justice, that be a measure of law and of truth.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker. I want to thank Representative OWENS for his tireless work on behalf of democracy in Haiti, and for inviting me to participate in this important special order.

I attended the inauguration of President Aristide in April 1991. His election was evidence of the dedication of the Haitian people to live in liberty and democracy, despite decades of foreign occupation and military-backed dictatorship.

For too long after the bloody coup that drove President Aristide from power in 1991, the international community refused to use the resources available to us to remove the illegitimate regime.

Negotiators from the United Nations and OAS have gone the extra mile to offer the illegitimate government and the Haitian military a negotiated way out of the current crisis. Those

authorities, time and time again, refused to negotiate in good faith. They rebuffed the international community.

So I am pleased that the United Nations Security Council set a date—certain, midnight tonight, for comprehensive sanctions, covering oil and arms, unless the illegitimate authorities in Haiti agree to reinstate President Aristide.

The Clinton administration deserves praise for backing the U.N. sanctions.

But we must continue to apply pressure.

I have joined with my colleagues, Representatives OWENS, CONYERS, and SERRANO, in calling on the administration to work through the Security Council to use every available measure, including an international blockade if necessary, to ensure compliance. I hope that other Members will join us in sending this message of support to the Clinton administration.

As a first step in this direction we call on the administration to issue regulations to prohibit any land or air vessel that violates the embargo from entrance to any place in the United States, its territories, or commonwealth.

Tough sanctions alone will not return President Aristide to power. An embargo must be combined with negotiations.

In those negotiations, the United States must insist to the Haitian military and coup leaders that they agree on a date certain for the unconditional return of President Aristide. The heroic people of Haiti deserve no less from us.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I rise to join my honorable colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS], to address the Supreme Court decision upholding the administration's policy regarding the return of Haitians fleeing the military rulers of present Haiti. It is my hope that this body will recognize, consider, and support, the lone, dissenting, and honorable, position of Justice Harry Blackmun, and the earlier ruling of the Federal appeal court in New York, which decision was overturned today.

The President had previously denounced the Bush administration's interdiction against the boat people as cruel and illegal. I believe that this humane response was deeply appreciated by many here and abroad, especially people of color, who view our current policy as cruel and racist, and only possible because these desperate refugees are not Western Europeans.

I am deeply disappointed by the Supreme Court decision and ask my colleagues, as well as the President to exercise their power, their responsibility, in saving the lives of people who would rather face a hostile body of water than the soldiers and police of the military regime.

In the past 21 months, too many of us choose to forget that the military is in power by virtue of an illegal coup, and that we are on record as opposing military takeovers, as we opposed Iraq when they invaded Kuwait.

I have been encouraged to see the President working to strengthen the U.N. Security Council resolution to impose an embargo on shipments of oil and arms to Haiti, and consider sanctions. However, I believe that sanctions are only one response to the present situation in Haiti.

President Aristide and Haitians who are deeply committed to a democratic form of gov-

ernment have repeatedly asked the United States, and the international community to support them in taking these basic steps as a means of building the foundation for a nonmilitaristic, democratic form of government in Haiti.

They ask that these five steps be taken:

First, the military regime remove itself in favor of President Aristide. Please remember that the de facto government is responsible for torturing and killing massive numbers of opponents of their rule.

Second, the United States Government end the flow of cocaine and other drugs from Haiti into the United States.

Third, establish specific sanctions, backed by monitors, for any violations of the United Nations embargo; with special attention to the land boundary shared by Haiti and the Dominican Republic.

Fourth, the United States Government provide the necessary resources to the U.N. and Organization of American States for an international protective force to insure the safe return of President Aristide and the members of his government, and that provisions be made to prosecute the military personnel who participated in the coup as well as to disarm them to prevent an immediate repetition of another coup.

Fifth, the United States, the United Nations, and the Organization of American States announce a date for President Aristide's return to Haiti as mandated by the election 21 months ago.

I stand willing to join with my colleagues and others to assist in addressing this issue and formulating solutions. Our policy in Haiti fails to the degree that we fail to recognize the profound passion that the majority of Haitians have for an independent Haiti. Their history is one of struggle against slave masters, and imposition by dictators by the French and then the United States. Our new world 3 years beyond the end of the cold war, should be committed to the principles of the Declaration of Independence and guided by its wisdom: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all [Men] are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. * * *

We have a new opportunity to take the right steps and I join you in that effort.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. McKEON (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of attending graduation ceremonies for his daughter;

Mr. SKEEN (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today and the balance of the week, on account of surgery.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PASTOR) to revise and ex-

tend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. STARK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONDIT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DURBIN, for 60 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. BEREUTER, in support of H.R. 2446, immediately preceding the vote on final passage.

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

Mr. SCHAEFER.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas.

Mr. GUNDERSON in two instances.

Mr. PACKARD.

Mr. OXLEY.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

Mr. CRANE.

Mr. SUNDQUIST.

Ms. DUNN.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. STUMP.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio.

Mr. HOYER.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI.

Mr. RAHALL.

Mrs. KENNELLY.

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

Mr. COOPER.

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas.

Mr. KENNEDY.

Mr. LLOYD.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

Mr. FORD of Michigan in two instances.

Mr. STARK in five instances.

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

Mr. SLATTERY.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 24, 1993, at 9:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1476. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the annual report on conditional registration of pesticides during fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 136w-4; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1477. A letter from the Chairman, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, transmitting certified materials supplied to the Commission, pursuant to Public Law 101-510, section 2903(d)(3) (104 Stat. 1812); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1478. A letter from the Commissioner, National Center for Education Statistics, transmitting the annual statistical report of the National Center for Educational Statistics [NCES], "The Condition of Education," pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1221e-1(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1479. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 13th annual report on the implementation of the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 by departments and agencies which administer programs for Federal financial assistance, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 6106a(b); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1480. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment and services sold commercially to Japan (Transmittal No. DTC-32-93), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1481. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on missile proliferation, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2797b(a)(1); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1482. A letter from the Department of the Interior, transmitting the annual report on royalty management and collection activities for Federal and Indian mineral leases in 1991 and 1992, pursuant to 30 U.S.C. 237; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1483. A letter from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting the Conference's determination that U.S. District Judge Robert F. Collins of the Eastern District of Louisiana has engaged in conduct which might constitute grounds for impeachment, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 372(c)(8)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1484. A letter from the Deputy Executive Director, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, transmitting the Association's financial audit for the period ending March 31, 1993, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(41), 1103; to the committee on the Judiciary.

1485. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the 11th Annual Report of Accomplishments Under the Airport Improvement Program for the fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. app. 2203(b)(2); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1486. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting informational copies of various lease prospectuses, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

Mr. DIXON: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2492. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-152). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURBIN: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2493. A bill making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-153). 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. DIXON:

H.R. 2492. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DURBIN:

H.R. 2493. A bill making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. DE LUCA, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MORAN, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. CLAYTON, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, and Mr. SCOTT):

H.R. 2494. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a program of assistance for essential community providers of health care services, to establish a program to update and maintain the infrastructure requirements of safety net hospitals, and to require States to develop plans for the allocation and review of expenditures for the capital-related costs of health care services; to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. APPELEGATE:

H.R. 2495. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Ohio, the Seneca National Fish Hatchery; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DURBIN:

H.R. 2496. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish an Abraham Lincoln Research and Interpretive Center; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2497. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the deduction for the health insurance costs of self-employed individuals and to increase the deduction to 100 percent of such costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 2498. A bill to assist community, business, and worker readjustment required as a result of the closure of military installations and reductions in defense spending, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services, Education and Labor, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Public Works and Transportation, and Small Business.

By Mr. GOODLING (for himself, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. HYDE, Mr. PETRI, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, and Mr. HOEKSTRA):

H.R. 2499. A bill to make the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 applicable to the House of Representatives and the instrumentalities of the Congress and to allow House employees and employees of the instrumentalities to bring a civil action in Federal court to vindicate their rights under such act and under the Americans With Disabilities Act, title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and the Family and Medical Leave Act; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration, Education and Labor, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUNDERSON (for himself, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SABO, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. TAUZIN, and Mr. BARLOW):

H.R. 2500. A bill to establish a Council on Interjurisdictional Rivers Fisheries and to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a pilot test of the Mississippi Interstate Cooperative Resource Agreement; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALL of Ohio (for himself, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. COYNE, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. BEILSON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. PASTOR):

H.R. 2501. A bill to assist in implementing the plan of action adopted by the World Summit for Children; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor, Foreign Affairs, and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. KENNELLY:

H.R. 2502. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 with regard to pension integration, participation, and vesting requirements, to provide for division of pension benefits upon divorce unless otherwise provided in qualified domestic relations orders, to provide for studies relating to cost-of-living adjustments and pension portability, and to clarify the continued availability, under provisions governing domestic relations orders, of remedies relating to matters treated in such orders entered before 1985; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Education and Labor.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 2503. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require that in any case in which military law enforcement officials are called to a scene of domestic violence at which a weapon is present or there has been obvious physical violence that the officials shall arrest the individual who appears to have committed the offense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KYL (for himself and Mr. SKELTON):

H.R. 2504. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to adopt centralized procedures for providing notice to victims and witnesses of the status of prisoners in military correctional facilities; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MACHTLEY:

H.R. 2505. A bill to extend until January 1, 1998, the existing suspension of duty on stuffed dolls, certain toy figures, and the

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. MOAKLEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 206. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2150) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1994 for the U.S. Coast Guard, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-151). Referred to the House Calendar.

skins thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 2506. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on photographic gelatin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2507. A bill to continue until the close of December 31, 1994, the existing suspension of duties on color couplers and coupler intermediates used in the manufacture of photographic sensitized material; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2508. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on benzoxazol; to the Committee as Ways and Means.

H.R. 2509. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on ortho aminophenol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAMSTAD:

H.R. 2510. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on certain machinery used to recycle mercury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLATTERY:

H.R. 2511. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to allow an adult in a family or household to attest to the citizenship status of any member of the family or household as part of the process for verifying the eligibility of the family member for certain public assistance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H.R. 2512. A bill to amend title II and XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure the integrity of the Social Security trust funds by reconstituting the Board of Trustees of such trust funds and the Managing Trustee of such trust funds to increase their independence, by providing for annual investment plans to guide investment of amounts in such trust funds, and by removing unnecessary restrictions on investment and disinvestment of amounts in such trust funds; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STARK (for himself and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H.R. 2513. A bill to repeal the Military Selective Service Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STUMP:

H.R. 2514. A bill to provide for the settlement of the water rights claims of the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe in Yavapai County, AZ, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. YATES:

H.J. Res. 217. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim September 1993 as "Classical Music Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Res. 205. Resolution designating majority membership on certain standing committees of the House; considered and agreed to.

MEMORIALS

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

211. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, relative to the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act of 1974; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

212. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, relative to the Medicaid Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

213. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to the

Republic of Armenia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 18: Mr. RIDGE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. BATEMAN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. KLEIN.

H.R. 163: Mr. SCHAEFER.
H.R. 287: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
H.R. 410: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 437: Mrs. MORELLA.
H.R. 462: Mr. TUCKER and Mr. QUINN.
H.R. 476: Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY.
H.R. 561: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. KIM, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DEAL, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. TANNER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BAESLER, and Mr. PAYNE of Virginia.

H.R. 672: Mr. NADLER and Mr. MINETA.
H.R. 715: Mr. SHAW.
H.R. 727: Miss COLLINS of Michigan and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 728: Mr. MENENDEZ.
H.R. 786: Mr. CAMP.
H.R. 881: Mr. CASTLE.
H.R. 882: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 899: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 911: Mr. GORDON, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WALKER, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Ms. MOLINARI.

H.R. 1029: Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. DIXON.
H.R. 1036: Mr. WYNN, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. DEFALZO.

H.R. 1048: Mr. WYDEN and Mr. SCOTT.
H.R. 1078: Mrs. ROUKEMA.
H.R. 1079: Mrs. ROUKEMA.
H.R. 1080: Mrs. ROUKEMA.
H.R. 1081: Mrs. ROUKEMA.
H.R. 1082: Mrs. ROUKEMA.
H.R. 1141: Mr. WYNN, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. DARDEN.

H.R. 1152: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SANGMEISTER, and Mr. LEVY.
H.R. 1153: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1229: Mr. GLICKMAN.
H.R. 1231: Mr. VENTO, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 1276: Mr. HANCOCK and Mr. BARCIA of Michigan.

H.R. 1332: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 1354: Mr. FOGLIETTA and Miss COLLINS of Michigan.

H.R. 1406: Mrs. VUCANOVICH and Mr. BAESLER.

H.R. 1489: Mr. STUPAK and Ms. BYRNE.
H.R. 1492: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1538: Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 1596: Mr. BUNNING.
H.R. 1609: Miss COLLINS of Michigan.

H.R. 1627: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. ARMEY, and Mr. BREWSTER.

H.R. 1630: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1645: Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, and Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 1670: Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1697: Mr. POSHARD, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. WYNN, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HENRY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. BLUTE.

H.R. 1897: Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. WELDON.

H.R. 1901: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1917: Mr. FINGERHUT.

H.R. 1924: Mr. CLAY, Mr. DELLUMS, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1994: Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 1999: Mr. MANZULLO, Ms. LAMBERT, Mr. SUNDQUIST, and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 2062: Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 2095: Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. WISE, and Mr. MANN.

H.R. 2119: Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 2130: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BOEHNER, and Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 2134: Mrs. MALONEY and Mr. RAVENEL.

H.R. 2154: Mr. DARDEN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Ms. BYRNE, Ms. LAMBERT, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 2276: Mr. TUCKER.

H.R. 2346: Mr. OWENS, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. HORN, and Mr. DICKEY.

H.R. 2438: Mr. GORDON, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

H.R. 2449: Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.J. Res. 112: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PARKER, and Ms. MOLINARI.

H.J. Res. 148: Mr. SCOTT, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LEVY, Mr. SABO, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. WELDON.

H.J. Res. 166: Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. BECERRA.

H.J. Res. 190: Mr. COBLE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. DREIER, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ROSE, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Mr. WYNN.

H.J. Res. 194: Mr. THORNTON, Mr. WILSON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.J. Res. 196: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. DREIER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. BAKER of California, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BROWDER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARR, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COLEMAN, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. DIXON, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. EWING, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Ms. FURSE, Mr. GEJENDSON, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr.

HASTINGS, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KING, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LaROCCO, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McCRERY, Mr. McDADE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MACHTLEY, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PAXON, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. PORTER, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. QUINN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROWLAND, Ms. ROYBAL-AL-

LARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHAW, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SLATTERY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SWETT, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. TANNER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. VENTO, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WASHINGTON, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WATT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WISE, Mr. YATES, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H. J. Res. 204: Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. SAXTON, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. COOPER, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. CRANE, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. HYDE, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. GORDON, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. WILSON, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. DANNER, and Mr. CALVERT.

H. Con. Res. 47: Mr. WAXMAN.

H. Con. Res. 100: Mr. CLAY, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. STOKES, Mr. OLVER, Mr. WISE, Mr. QUINN, Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. PARKER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. VENTO, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Res. 38: Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY.

H. Res. 53: Mr. SHAW and Mr. PAXON.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

49. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Fourth Olbil Era Kelulau, Republic of Palau, relative to congratulating and commending Ms. Leslis Turner for confirmed as Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Territorial and International Affairs; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

50. Also, petition of the Fourth Olbil Era Kelulau, Republic of Palau, relative to congratulating and commending Mr. Allen P. Stayman on his appointment to become Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Territorial and International Affairs; to the Committee on Natural Resources.