

issue, when few others were raising this concern.

I thank the chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for his help on this issue and would like to work with him to make some technical and refining changes that are currently being discussed. I strongly support the solution included in this bill and look forward to it becoming law.

Mr. SHUSTER. 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. WELLER) having assumed the chair, Mr. MCINNIS, 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. 961) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, had come to no resolution thereon.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER  
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 357

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 357.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 535, THE CORNING NATIONAL FISH HATCHERY CONVEYANCE ACT

Mr. MCINNIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-116) on the resolution (H. Res. 144) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 535) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Corning National Fish Hatchery to the State of Arkansas, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 584, CONVEYANCE OF THE FAIRPORT NATIONAL FISH HATCHERY TO THE STATE OF IOWA

Mr. MCINNIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-117) on the resolution (H. Res. 145) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 584) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey a fish hatchery to the State of Iowa, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 614, THE NEW LONDON NATIONAL FISH HATCHERY CONVEYANCE ACT

Mr. MCINNIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-118) on the resolution (H.

Res. 146) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 614) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Minnesota the New London National Fish Hatchery production facility, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 2030

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER  
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1500

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1500.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WELLER). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN COMMITTEES TO SIT TOMORROW, FRIDAY, MAY 12, 1995 DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit tomorrow while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: the Committee on Banking and Financial Services; the Committee on Commerce; the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities; the Committee on International Relations; and the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

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

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am instructed by the leadership that these committees have been consulted, and it is proper for them to meet tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER  
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1143, H.R. 1144, AND H.R. 1145

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. BRYANT of Texas be removed from the list of cosponsors of the following bills introduced by myself: H.R. 1143, H.R. 1144, and H.R. 1145.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

[Mr. GRAHAM addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

NATIONAL SPACEPORT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I will formally introduce the National Spaceport Act, but today, I would like to take a few minutes to discuss why I believe this is a critical and important step forward for American space policy as we prepare for the 21st century.

America has always been a world leader in space development, exploration, technology, and most recently commercialization. Our Nation has always understand the importance of space and has exercised bipartisan cooperation when it came to advancing space issues. This bipartisan cooperation has come from every corner of the political spectrum because of a universal recognition that space is an area of national unity and importance. I recently saw this bipartisan cooperation first hand during the deliberations over the California Spaceport and its 25-year lease with the Air Force.

We are now into the next frontier of space and that is the growing commercial arena. Commercial space was once an area dominated by the United States. However, over the past few years, we have relinquished our leadership position and stood by as other nations have stepped in and vigorously embraced the vast opportunities presented by this market.

Today, a European consortium controls over 60 percent of the commercial launch market. In addition, many other nations including China, Russia, Japan, India, Canada, and Australia are becoming stronger and stronger competitors. Most have the benefit of big and seemingly unlimited government subsidies. For example, earlier this year, the Japanese government announced a 5.1-percent increase in their overall space budget. The Russians have also approved a substantial increase in 1995 funding while the Indian Government increased their funding for

1995-96 by 31 percent. There is a strong return on the investment. European industry expects to post sales of up to \$12 billion from commercial launches of Ariane rockets by the end of the decade.

Although the United States remains a strong competitor with active spaceports and a healthy booster and satellite market, we have not charted a course to regain a leading role in what has become a very large market. Moreover, this very large market promises to be an even larger international enterprise in the 21st century.

We have to take a step out of the box and employ a new approach with regard to commercial space. The first step is educating and making the case that space is more than a NASA, science, or an exploration issue. Space is a vast area of untapped economic potential for local communities, State, and most importantly our Nation.

We are not looking for government to play the leading role, but instead we are looking to the private sector. But if we are to convince the private sector that commercial space is a worthwhile and ultimately profitable undertaking we have to demonstrate Government's commitment to a comprehensive commercial space policy and the development of commercial spaceports.

A spaceport is a transportation center that moves surface infrastructure into space. I believe that we ought to look at spaceports in the same way that we look at airports and treat them just like we would airports. Rather than moving passengers from one place to another, spaceports move commerce from one place to another.

The spaceport philosophy is a commitment to use-friendly environments, integrated launch services, and low-cost access to space. In addition it is important to recognize that facility development is separate from the overall commercial space industry. In the United States, the available parts of the market are launch bases, boosters, and satellites. The missing piece of the puzzle is a facility for the launches and timing is important. It is imperative that spaceport development progress quickly in order to maintain the other elements of the market.

In America today, there are only two existing spaceports, but many more who want to become active spaceports. I would encourage all States who are interested in developing spaceports to get involved. Commercial spaceports means jobs—many jobs. Jobs in building the spaceports; manufacturing rockets and satellites; research, training, and education.

Commercial spaceports produce positive economic return. In California for example, the growth of a spaceport helps in the revitalization of the high-tech industries which have been hurt by defense cuts. This means more high paying jobs, added business for local service providers, new hotels, homes, shopping centers, education centers, and research facilities.

In America we want to do it a little differently than other nations. We want to reach a point where government acts as a facilitator not an obstacle. We want the government to be primarily a customer rather than a provider. We want to give States the flexibility necessary to develop commercial spaceports and attract private industry support. We want to encourage greater private industry support through tax-exempt bond financing. We want spaceport development to progress free of the traditional regulatory barriers imposed by Government.

Mr. Speaker, commercial spaceport development is in the national economic interest. It is an issue of transportation and it should be pursued as part of a national transportation policy. It means jobs, it means economic opportunity, and it requires American leadership.

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

[Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### A SMALLER, MORE EFFICIENT FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, for the first time today in 26 years, something very, very unusual has happened. That is, this morning at 1:05 a.m., the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives proposed a balanced budget, a balanced budget, one so that in 7 years our kids and grandkids won't be having more debt to pay off because we were not willing to face the tough task and make the tough choices now to be able to cut things back.

I think this is a grand moment that we are finally addressing this most critical of problems. This year alone the Federal debt is going to \$5 trillion. If we don't balance the budget, going on the current projection path we have, if we don't put our oar into the water to make this happen, it is going to be at \$7 trillion by the year 2002. It is time we do it.

There is only one way we are going to be able to balance the budget. That is, creating a smaller, more focused, more efficient Federal Government, one that was originally intended by the Founding Fathers, one that is not into all functions and tries to do everything for everybody but a limited government, a focused Federal Government, one I think that Thomas Jefferson would be proud of, one that I would hope that Peter Drucker, the management guru, would be proud of for its efficiency, and one most of all that I would hope the American people would be proud of for what it delivers of serv-

ices of what they call on their Government to do.

We have had a Federal Government this past quarter of a century that has grown out of control and everybody has contributed to it, everybody in this country, and in this institution here on both sides of the aisle. It is time to get it back into control. It is time to cut it back. It is time to recreate the limited Government that was always intended by our Founding Fathers.

The Federal Government was not meant to be all things to all people. James Madison wrote early on in the founding of our country this:

"The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the Federal Government are few and defined."

We must get the Federal Government back to its core functions of what it was originally intended to be and not flung out here into so many different things but focused, efficient, and smaller so that we can be able to cut back on the spending, so that we can be able to not deliver so much debt to our children, so that we can hold the dream out and push toward even paying off the debt, the nearly \$5 trillion in debt that has been accumulated.

There are a number of proposals that have been put forward. Some of them call for the elimination of whole agencies in the Federal Government, agencies such as the Department of Commerce and Energy, HUD and Education, keeping certain of the core functions that are functions of the Federal Government and should be done by the Federal Government and eliminating other portions, privatizing some functions and sending some functions back to State and local units of government so that at the end of the day we have a smaller, more focused, more efficient Federal Government.

This is an absolute need, if for no other reason than for our children and grandchildren, so that they can have a future, not saddled with this huge debt, not saddled with such an enormous mortgage on America.

#### HAITI

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I rise with great concern over the administration's action in Haiti. On March 31, 1995, President Clinton turned over control of the Multi National Force [MNF] in Haiti, to the United Nations, under the auspice of the U.N. Mission in Haiti [UNMIH]. UNMIH, although still under American command, differs from the previous U.S. operation in two respects. The net effect of these changes is a U.S. commander and U.S. forces under the control of the U.N. Special Representative, Mr. Lakhdar Brahimi and a U.N. mandate for rules of engagement [ROE] which dictate the use of force by U.S. troops.