

word "formula". The second should read as follows: "Changes would continue to be subject to applicable rulemaking procedures."

P. 77—Heading should be "Extension Period for Sharing Utility Cost Savings with PHAs". Sec. 224 should have a separate heading.

Department of Justice:

The second paragraph of the Committee Recommendation says it "relocates all responsibilities for fair housing issues currently housed in the Department of Housing and Urban Development". This should be revised to "relocates all responsibilities of the Secretary under the Fair Housing Act". As written, the statement inaccurately describes the bill. The bill only pertains to Title VIII (the Fair Housing Act). The Secretary continues to have responsibility for fair housing under Title VI, the Rehab Act, etc.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, in just a few minutes, I will be proposing a unanimous-consent request setting forth the time for debate on this tomorrow. We will have an opportunity to go through some of these debates and expand upon them.

I am not going to take much time tonight other than to say the proponent of this amendment is very eloquent. He has raised quite a few concerns that he has. I believe there are good answers for all of them. I was reminded, as he spoke, about all the things that could potentially go wrong, of a cartoon character many years ago who used to walk around with a metal shield over his head so he would not be hit by a meteorite if one came from space. Some of the arguments presented against the space station seem to have about as much likelihood of occurring as being struck by a meteorite.

I do want to point out that in this bill we do not, as the proponents suggest, cut back on regulation to endanger the drinking water of this country. In fact, we believe that with restructuring and refocusing the activities of the Environmental Protection Agency, we can continue to make the progress that we have made in these fields.

But to address the particular terms of this amendment, the argument has been made that we do not really need to go to a space shuttle, because everything we can do on a space shuttle can be accomplished much more effectively on Earth. But I say the facts are that the science proposed for the station cannot be accomplished on Earth at any price.

The space station science requires sustained access to very low levels of gravitational force. It is not technically feasible to create a low-gravity environment for research without going into orbit, and I believe the speakers opposing the amendment have made that point very well.

The space shuttle program has produced a number of very important findings and helped scientists to explore the possibilities of orbital research, but the space shuttle can only stay in orbit for 16 days at a time. Dr. Michael DeBakey, chancellor and chairman of the department of surgery at Baylor College of Medicine has said:

Present technology of the shuttle allows for stays in space of only about 2 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.

I might also add that the National Research Council, an arm of the National Academy of Sciences just released a report on microresearch opportunities for 1990 which states:

The need for an extended duration orbiting platform has been identified as critical in many microgravity research experiments because of the time required for experimentation, the wide parametric ranges and the need to demonstrate the reproductibility of results.

Another quote:

The duration of experiments, the regime of parameters available to experimenters and the ability to demonstrate reproductibility of results in microgravity experiments create the need for extended duration orbiting platforms.

There are many other authorities that we could cite for this proposition, but as my colleague from Maryland has said, this is a question of setting priorities. We have a tight budget, certainly, but we ought to be in the position where we make investments that are important for the future. I believe it would be a tragedy, a tremendous tragedy, were we tomorrow to vote to kill the space station. The space station is the most ambitious and exciting space program since the Apollo program of over 25 years ago.

I think it is time that we called an end to the incessant attempts to kill the space station. Over the last 4 years, there have been 13 attempts in the House and Senate to kill the program.

And fortunately, because of the knowledge and what the space station can and will do, these amendments have failed.

Last year, a resounding 64 Senators voted against this amendment. I was proud to be among them. The arguments used by station opponents this year are the same ones. We have seen the same charts. We have gone through the drill. These tired arguments have been used in the past. The claims were not true then; they are not true now.

Let me tick off a very few. The space station is no longer a dream. It is a reality. It is working. It is providing results.

Second, the space station is perfectly on schedule and on budget. As a matter of fact, through the leadership of the administration, the White House and NASA, we are going through the entire space budget and we have made significant savings. We can spend our scarce dollars on high-priority programs and that includes the space station.

Third, a streamlined management team is in place. NASA has reduced its in-house work force by 1,000, almost one half, and the program is being better managed than ever before. They made rescissions and reforms in having a prime contractor. The system is working.

Fourth, cooperation with Russia is working as planned. We are working with our former adversary and developing some very usable scientific information, and breaking new ground working with Russia.

Fifth, the program is not a budget buster. It has been included in the budget resolution that has been adopted because it is an investment.

Finally, the space station will not undermine the balance among NASA programs in human space flight, science, technology, and aeronautics. This is a program which deserves to stand on its own.

I think the amendment to terminate the space station threatens the existence of the U.S. human space flight program, and I urge my colleagues not support the amendment when it comes up for a vote tomorrow.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent there now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPUBLICAN CUTS IN STUDENT LOANS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, we have an extremely important measure that is before the Senate at the present time where we have had discussion. I would like to take just a few moments to talk about another extremely important measure that will be and is important to the Senate tomorrow when the Labor and Human Resources Committee meets its obligations under the budget recommendations and addresses how we are going to reach the instructions by the Budget Committee. I wish to take just a few moments of the Senate's time on this issue.

Mr. President, tomorrow, the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee will be asked to take \$10 billion out of the student loan accounts to help pay for a tax cut for the wealthiest Americans. That priority is wrong, and I oppose it.

Senator KASSEBAUM's reconciliation proposal strikes at the heart of the Federal commitment to higher education. It adds to the debt burden of students, increases the costs for working families struggling to pay for college, and penalizes colleges and universities for accepting needy students.

Tomorrow's markup marks the third time in a week we have been asked to meet to consider student loan cuts, and the proposal has not improved with time. Senator KASSEBAUM's proposal retains the unprecedented student loan tax on colleges and universities, it forces schools out of the direct lending program against their will, and it triples the cut imposed directly on students.

More than two-thirds of the proposed cut—\$7.6 billion—fall on students and