have been launched more cheaply with disposable rockets. Indeed, if the American taxpayer had not been forced to subsidize those shuttle satellite launches (wiping out any possible competition that would have had to pay full cost), there might now be a viable private American corporation capable of launching satellites—a boon to the entrepreneurs waiting in line for years for a satellite launch.

NASA has run out of useful work for the shuttle, let alone its successor. So we are bombarded by reports of German and Russian astronauts using the Canadian robot arm to perform ecology experiments. The large P.R. efforts that form in step 5 of all government megascience endeavors have learned that spreading the pork (step 4) now must be both an international and a politically correct endeavor.

Some shuttle experiments—at a cost of about $500 million each—are simply ludicrous. Who cares or will ever care if spiders spin their webs differently in zero gravity? And technology con men are having a field day. One University of Houston professor convinced NASA to spend $2.5 billion on five shuttle flights to make space-grown gallium arsenide (GaAs) semiconductor wafers, the starting material for GaAs computer chips. The flight produced five wafers at a cost of about $100 million each. The promise is that in the near-perfect vacuum of space, the shuttle will produce GaAs semiconductor wafers nearly perfect in crystal structure. Eventually, the space-grown wafer cost is projected to drop to $10,000 per wafer.

I am a member of the board of directors of the largest GaAs chip maker in the United States. Here are the facts:

(1) Current terrestrial GaAs wafers cost $500.

(2) The hypothesized improvement in the crystal structure of space-grown wafers is irrelevant, since the GaAs chip manufacturing process destroys and rebuilds the crystal as part of the process.

(3) All GaAs companies would go out of business if their wafers cost $10,000 each.

The basic problem with megaprogram funding is that particle physicists, space scientists, and big-company technology experts can have their way with a lay Congress that barely comprehends the complex technologies it is funding. And even that minimal comprehension comes only when huge sums are expended on ever-increasing congressional staffs.

After eliminating the big-science megaprograms, Congress should attack the technology subsidies that Secretary of Labor Rober Reich reasonably calls ''corporate welfare''. The corporate subsidy most often touted as a success by the Clinton administration (yes, they speak on both sides of the issue) is Sematech, the Austin-based semiconductor research facility that has been given $1 billion in two five-year grants so far. A reasonably well-run organization, Sematech recently announced it would not seek a third $500-million grant. (Of course, the original Sematech promise was that it would not come back to Congress the second time.) The Clinton administration believes Sematech should be replicated in other industries. But its record is not one that warrants replication:

Sematech has as members only 12 of America's 200 semiconductor companies.

Two of Sematech's original 14 members quit because even with their dues halved by government subsidy they could not justify the investment.

The big companies that control Sematech's board designed the consortium's dues structure to prevent small, entrepreneurial companies from joining. A $20-million chip company that may someday be the next Intel must pay 5 percent of revenue, while Intel itself pays only 0.15 percent of its revenue—a 33-to-1 ratio, which is the primary reason so few companies joined Sematech originally. Of course, Intel, which makes over $1 billion a quarter in pre-tax profits, needs the subsidy a lot less than the small companies that were excluded. But the political system provides the opposite results: Only big companies can muster the lobbying resources to convince Congress to subsidize them. And why would they share the pork with the upstarts?

Sematech used its government subsidy to attack directly the other 100-plus American chip companies that were not Sematech members. After the checks were signed and the TV lights turned off, Sematech began granting funds to companies that make the critical equipment for the production of computer chips—in return for contracts to hold back the most advanced equipment from all but Sematech members for up to one year. (The deals, which Sematech denied repeatedly, were discovered during a lawsuit.) It is no wonder that Sematech insisted on and received antitrust immunity as part of its funding legislation.

If Sematech's silicon-chip subsidy represents the Clinton/Gore model for government subsidies, it's up to the new Republican Congress to stop its replication. Let's not copy a system that allows well-heeled corporations to use their lobbying clout to entrench themselves with taxpayer subsidies, to the detriment of new companies with new ideals.

The flow of bright, well-educated technologists into industry is much more important to American high-tech businesses than are subsidies to prop up ailing giants. And by cutting out science megaprograms and corporate technology subsidies, the new Congress can both cut the federal budget and free up funds to increase university research funding.

Many Silicon Valley venture capitalists—no friends of big government—believe that the defunct DARPA (Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency) was one of the most effective government technology programs. They credit it with funding such winning pre-venture capital investments as the UNIX computer operating system work done by Sun Microsystems founder Bill Joy.

DARPA funded my doctoral studies on transistor physics at Stanford. The high-performance chips I worked on may or may not have improved national defense, but I became one of the hundreds of DARPA-funded Ph.D.s who flooded into Silicon Valley from Stanford and Berkeley. What caused an unlikely agency like DARPA to provide decent return on government investment?

DARPA conducted classified military research, which kept Congress on a need-to-know basis. Thus DARPA projects avoided having to spread the pork or to hire a P.R. staff to maintain viability.

DARPA contracts were awarded by competent technical experts on a merit basis without much political consideration. DARPA also had a ''customer,'' the Pentagon, that had at least a long-run interest in the usefulness of what it funded.

DARPA tended to fund the large number of small programs, rather than wasteful megaprojects. The agency was on the right side of the economic tradeoff that demands the sacrifice of 1,000 chances to fund the next Bill Joy/Sun Microsystems in order to fund one superconducting supercollider.

Unfortunately, today's ARPA, the non-defense version of the old DARPA, is drifting back into politics. Members of Congress fantasize about ''dual use'' (military and commercial) technology, with the hope of picking losers and winners, the latter preferably in their districts. There are debates about where the ''retraining'' funds should be spent when military programs are shut down.

Some of this is inevitable—ARPA's mission is hazier and more politicized that DARPA's. But the agency's best chance for success is if Congress leaves it alone, allowing it to set technical priorities and give out thousands of small grants to universities based only on a peer-review meritocracy.

The new Congress has an opportunity to shrink the federal government and simultaneously help America's technology industries. It involves getting politics out of the laboratory and supporting education on a non-partisan, merit basis.

OPPOSITION TO SUMMER YOUTH PROGRAM RESCISSIONS

HON. JACK QUINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the proposed elimination of the Summer Youth Program. I fully support the program and will fight to restore its funding when the rescissions bill is sent to the conference committee later this year.

At the same time, I encourage private sector businesses to contribute to the Summer Youth Program so they may make a contribution to the communities in which they do business. In these times of tight budgetary constraints, it is my hope that local businesses can assist in ways that the Government can no longer afford.

Although I support the Summer Youth Program, I also saw the need for reducing the deficit. If we continue to spend money we don't have, we will be passing the financial burden on to our children.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues, especially the members of the Appropriations Committee, to work to restore the funds necessary to continue the summer youth program.

FAIR COMPENSATION FOR KRIS MURTY

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation which would allow for the Federal Government to right an injustice wrought upon one of its own over 8 years ago. In January 1985, the Department of the Army extended a job offer to Mr. Kris Murty, then of Houston, TX, for a position at Ft. Bliss, TX. He received orders authorizing reimbursement for miscellaneous expenses, unexpired lease expenses, and temporary quarters subsistence expense. It was with this understanding that Mr. Murty accepted the position. Upon his relocation to Ft. Bliss Mr. Murty was awarded an advance for his travel costs.

Several months later, Mr. Murty was notified that the Army had erred. At that time, Mr. Murty was instructed that he must make restitution for the Army's mistake. Without recourse, his wages were garnished.

Mr. Murty acted in good faith with the Department of Army. His acceptance of the position hinged on the Army's assurances that it

would cover these expenses. Mr. Murty has spent the last 8 years exhausting all possible avenues of redress. His last recourse is the bill of private relief which I have introduced today.

The Comptroller General of the United States has reviewed Mr. Murty's claim and agrees that his case deserves to be favorably considered by Congress. I urge the committee of jurisdiction to take up this legislation expeditiously so that this issue will be fairly and judiciously settled once and for all.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAN MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, during Rollcall Vote 265, the Roukema amendment, I was unfortunately unable to be present.

I would have voted ''yes'' on the amendment.

TRIBUTE TO MR. AND MRS. HEINDL

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. and Mrs. Heindl for the many acts of kindness they have bestowed on our community. It is an honor and a privilege to express my gratitude to this generous couple. Truly, the Heindls epitomize the type of people that make our local communities great. These are the real life heros that kindle the spirit of giving in each one of us.

When we look at role models in history, the ones who get recognized the most are sometimes the least worthy. I hope that volunteers like the Heindls continue to be recognized as they are most deserving. One of the traits that make people like the Heindls so special is that they do it out of the goodness of their heart. The only motives behind their actions is the hope that those around them will in some way be bettered by their hard work. I can speak for everyone when I say that we have all been touched by their philanthropy.

One of the most important facets in our society is the education system; it lays the foundation for future leaders. Contributions, like those of the Heindls, prove to enhance the system and benefit community members for years to come. The Ridgway residents I am speaking of today have made significant contributions to the Ridgway Area Public Schools. They have selflessly donated their time and resources to ensure that new facilities would be constructed for use by all students. By giving of themselves so freely, they set an example for all of us to follow.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to recognize Mr. and Mrs. Heindl for all of their kindness and dedicated service on behalf of the Ridgway community. I extend to them my best wishes for continued health and happiness.

WISHING ''BO'' WILBURN AND SUSIE BOWES WELL ON THEIR WEDDING DAY

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me to take a moment to wish two very special people well as they prepare to join in holy matrimony this Saturday in Texas.

Mark ''Bo'' Bryan Wilburn of Dayton, TX, will marry Kathleen Sue Bowes of Houston at the Heaven on Earth plantation in Missouri City, TX, this Saturday. ''Bo'' is a peace officer in the Houston area, while Susie is a fifth grade teacher at Timber Elementary School in Humble. Following their wedding, the couple plans to live in the Humble area.

''Bo'' is the son of Tom and Janet Wilburn of Dayton, TX, and Susie is the daughter of William and Barbara Bowes of Houston. Since I first took office in January 1981, Barbara has served as my district coordinator, while Bill has for many years served as chairman of my Service Academy Nominations Board.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me this opportunity to observe this upcoming union, and thank you for joining with me in wishing ''Bo'' and Susie much happiness on their wedding day and throughout their lives together.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF JIM GRANT

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, this week I was privileged to participate in a very special event to mark the life of Jim Grant, one of the most extraordinary public servants the world has ever seen, who died earlier this year at the age of 77.

Memorial services are often held at which the passing of a noted public figure is lamented. But, for those who gathered in the Russell caucus room to remember Jim Grant, it was in celebration of a life that was devoted with energy, enthusiasm, endless persistence and, yes, joy, to saving and improving the lives of children in the world's poorest countries.

Those who offered remembrances of Jim Grant included Congressmen DAVID OBEY and TONY HALL; Warren Unna, John Sewell, president of the Overseas Development Council; Dr. Richard Jolly of UNICEF; Mrs. Margaret Catley-Carlson of the Population Council, and two of Jim's sons, John and James D. Musical interludes were provided by the World Children's Choir.

One of Jim's greatest gifts was his ability to imbue others with that same sense of demanding dedication that motivated his own life, and that was how the speakers recalled him.

Jim Grant was one of the most remarkable men it has ever been my privilege and my pleasure to know and to work with.

Never elected to public office, he nonetheless was one of the most effective politicians and diplomats I can recall, particularly when it came to working the Halls of Congress.

His special constituents were the children in the world's poorest countries. He worked tirelessly to improve their conditions.

Jim used his role as executive director of UNICEF as a bully pulpit to prod, pull, and pummel the international community into facing the awful realities of malnourishment and disease that annually claims the lives of millions of children.

Jim Grant placed special emphasis on adapting new findings in the drug and health industries—immunization, breastfeeding, oral rehydration therapy—to low-cost applications that parents could use at home to care for their children.

He was relentless in pursuit of resources to support programs to save and improve the lives of children. Jim's motto was, the difficult gets done immediately, the impossible takes a little longer.

Jim was a leader who went out to see for himself. No project was too remote to escape his interest. Traveling with Jim in Africa meant bouncing around in Land Rovers and Jeeps to check on village health programs in the remote bush.

His flair for promotion and publicity enabled him to attract as celebrity spokesmen for UNICEF leading figures of the entertainment world such as Danny Kaye, Peter Ustinov, Harry Belafonte and Audrey Hepburn, to name just a few.

Shakespeare's Marc Antony lamented in his funeral oration for Julius Caesar that the ''good that men do is oft interred with their bones.'' In Jim Grant's case the good he has done lives on.

During his tenure as the executive director of UNICEF, immunization levels in developing countries increased from 20 percent in 1980 to nearly 80 percent today the number of polio victims fell from 500,000 a year to fewer than 100,000. More than a million lives are saved each year thanks to the oral rehydration therapy works makes Jim strongly advocated.

Jim Grant was an American hero and a world treasure. His presence is greatly missed, but his spirit and his good works continue as a legacy of his persistence, his energy and his humanity. We shall all miss him.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN BYRNE

HON. BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to salute John Byrne upon his retirement from the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, the I.B.E.W.

Mr. Byrne graduated from Storey County High School in May 1943, and completed his electrical apprenticeship in Medford, OR, in 1947. He returned to Reno in 1950 as general foreman for Landa Electric and became a member of the I.B.E.W. Local Union No. 401, in Reno, in 1951.

From 1957 to 1966 he served as financial secretary/business manager of the I.B.E.W. Local Union No. 401, until his appointment as secretary/business representative of Northern Nevada Building Trades Council. He was reelected secretary/business representative in 1967 and 1969.