

centers and specialized institutes. We applaud this effort, and will work with NASA to carry out the reforms of the zero-base review, including privatization of the Space Shuttle.

At the same time, we recognize the Administrator had two constraints placed on him that prevent a permanent solution to the underfunding problem. The zero-base review was not allowed to cancel NASA programs and was not allowed to result in the closing of any of NASA's field center installations. Those constraints were self-imposed, but as a result, the promised savings from this effort ring hollow.

In H.R. 2043, we propose the only credible, reasonable way to achieve a radical restructuring of NASA. That is, by a complete review of all NASA's capital assets: every piece of equipment, every building, every truck, every test facility, every everything. By looking at assets, we can see two costs: people who support the asset, and the mission supported by the asset. This kind of review is needed since NASA now owns more things—and has more people to use those things—than for which there is a purpose.

Up until our proposal, the conventional budget cutters would look only at the number of people or the missions. Decisions were being made on whether to cut raw numbers of people, close whole research centers, or cancel missions. These decisions can be terribly flawed and costly since missions require specialized skills and equipment that are, in fact, well distributed across the NASA system.

Our asset base review will turn the system on its head and look at the building blocks of the modern NASA budget: the maintenance and operations of capital assets. We propose to go to each such asset and ask, "What does this piece of equipment do for a mission? Who uses it? Why do they need it?" This approach will avoid the political and scientific pitfalls that have destroyed NASA's previous efforts to reform itself.

Our approach will not be vague. You won't hear us say, "Let's cut the fat." If it's not being used to perform a mission, it's fat. If it's not being used enough, or alternatives exist elsewhere in Government or through the private sector, NASA will go elsewhere, and not retain an underutilized asset. At the same time, if assets are needed, but are too old or too inefficient to do the job they are assigned, we will work to upgrade or replace essential assets on a cost-benefit basis.

Once the asset base review is completed, the President will propose to Congress, no later than September 30, 1996, legislation to implement the Administrator's recommendations based on the asset base review. In the meantime, we prohibit the Administrator from closing any of NASA's field centers. The Administrator may only close a field center if it is rendered obsolete as a result of the Administrator's recommendations, after enactment of the implementing legislation submitted by the President.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2043 is a real alternative. We navigate between the constraints NASA imposed on itself to bring fundamental change to the Nation's space agency. We navigate between the pressures facing our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee and suggest a way to set NASA's priorities on basic research. In conclusion, I urge all of my colleagues to read the bill and consider the direction H.R. 2043 takes NASA and the Nation to-

ward. We are moving forward, building great science, and appropriately right-sizing the NASA infrastructure. We commend our approach to our colleagues, and look forward to working with the Senate to enact the kind of reform-oriented NASA authorization proposed here today.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. ELIZABETH FURSE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1977) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment to transfer \$2 million from the salaries and administrative expenses of the Department of the Interior to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, which is slated for elimination under the current language of the bill. In this day and age of shifting decisionmaking power to the local level, it makes sense to keep the Advisory Council.

An independent Federal agency, the Advisory Council plays a critical role in ensuring that local residents have an opportunity to provide input on Federal projects that affect the historic and cultural resources in their community. If the Advisory Council is eliminated, citizens will not be guaranteed a voice and the process will suffer as decisionmaking becomes less participatory and, hence, less representative.

Without the Advisory Council and the accompanying section 106 process, the average person would be shut off from the consultation process. Decisionmaking will become exclusive and subject to domination by Federal officials and narrow interest groups.

It is imperative that we maintain funding for the Advisory Council to allow communities to continue to have a voice. After all, it is the people at the local level—not the Federal bureaucrats in Washington, DC—whose neighborhoods and towns will be impacted by Federal projects.

In my home State of Oregon, the section 106 process allowed public comment on the construction of the federally-assisted light rail transit project as it was being planned in the 1980's. The local landmarks commission and Portland businessowners, among others, were able to suggest ways to counteract the negative effects of the new construction on two important downtown historic areas—Skidmore Old Town and Yamhill District, both of which are recognized as national historic landmarks.

As a result of local involvement through the section 106 process, special historic-styled benches and shelters were installed and the cobblestone paving around the historic Skidmore Fountain was restored. As the inscription on the Skidmore Fountain reads, "The riches of the city are its citizens." The section 106 process carried out by the Advi-

sory Council similarly recognizes the importance of citizens.

Eliminating the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation runs counter to the very principles of citizen involvement on which our country was founded. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation deserves our support, and I urge the passage of this amendment.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 2043, THE
NASA AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR
FISCAL YEAR 1996

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1995

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, on July 17, 1995, Representative WALKER and I introduced the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 in order to continue the process of prioritizing NASA's missions and programs for the remainder of this century. The multiyear space station authorization bill, which the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics and the full Science Committee endorsed by wide margins with strong bipartisan support, placed the space station at the top of NASA's list of priorities and provided the programmatic stability NASA needs to reduce costs. The bill builds on this strategy to focus NASA on the goal of becoming the leading R&D agency it once was. By moving NASA away from operating large, expensive programs such as the space shuttle and Mission to Planet Earth, this authorization act will enable NASA to focus on those activities which the agency does best, namely space science and technological research. At the same time, the bill preserves U.S. national interests in the space shuttle and Mission to Planet Earth by laying the foundation to privatize the space shuttle and bring the emerging commercial remote sensing industry into Mission to Planet Earth.

By taking these steps, we bring new revenue streams and capital assets from the private sector into Government space missions. More importantly, we introduce market efficiencies into the large operating systems that NASA created but was never intended to run. In this manner, Congress enables NASA to leverage its resources against those space activities that the private sector cannot perform.

As needed as these measures are, this bill is also important for what it does not do. The Fiscal Year 1996 NASA Authorization Act does not force the precipitous closing of any NASA field centers. While we have encouraged NASA Administrator Daniel Goldin to more aggressively to streamline and consolidate the NASA bureaucracy, Congress must ensure that this process proceeds logically and with long-term programmatic goals in mind. NASA's ongoing zero-based review is the first attempt to restructure the agency without affecting its programs. While this is a commendable effort, congressional action to prioritize NASA programs will also have an impact on the agency's structure. The authorization bill Chairman WALKER and I introduced begins this process by focusing first on NASA's priority programs and then calling for an assessment of Government assets that match those priorities. This assessment will