

lakes and coastal areas. The Aquaculture Employment Act amends the Coastal Zone Management Act [CZMA] to authorize grants to States to formulate, administer, and implement strategic plans for marine aquaculture. This provision would enable States like Rhode Island that have no comprehensive plan for aquaculture development to get started in the process of creating jobs and economic development through aquaculture.

The legislation also creates a grant program modeled after a shellfish seeding program operating in Nantucket. Under this program, funds would be made available to States to expand ongoing projects relating to aquaculture, such as the State quahog transplant operations. By transplanting clams from high bacteria areas of Narragansett Bay to clean areas of the Bay, the clams are given the opportunity to clean themselves and eventually be ready for harvest.

This is not to say that development of a marine aquaculture industry will be easy. Difficult issues such as private use of public resources, conflicts with other coastal user groups, and the development of streamlined regulatory and permitting requirements will have to be addressed.

Other nations around the world have already recognized the potential of aquaculture and the important role that government can play in developing this industry. The governments of Japan, Norway, and Chile are supporting aquaculture development programs, and giving their citizens the opportunity to reap the accompanying economic rewards. In fact, these countries are exporting their aquaculture harvests of fish and shellfish to America.

This bill calls for a modest commitment of Federal resources, but it does not take a large Federal investment to join marine aquaculture and economic development. I urge my colleagues to join with me in support of its passage.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

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:

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 1977, the Interior appropriations bill. My amendment reduces funding for two unnecessary aircraft and some vehicles to be used by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. These savings are then made available to the Bureau of Indian Affairs for two purposes.

In 1906, Congress enacted the Alaska Native Allotment Act to allocate lands to Native Alaskans. The Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971 repealed the 1906 Allotment Act and an allottee must have filed an application with the Department of the Interior by De-

cember 18, 1971. It has been over 23 years since eligible allottees filed their applications and there still remains a need to resolve the on-going case load of Alaska Native allotment disputes at the Department of Interior. In February of 1994, the Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management, the Alaska Legal Services, and the Alaska Federation of Natives met to discuss solutions to resolve these disputes, propose to close the last of Native allotment cases and an attempt to finalize land dispute problems in this area. This amendment intends that half of these funds—\$442,000—be used for the Alaska Native allotment attorney fee program at the Bureau of Indian Affairs. This will provide funds for representatives for Native allottees with cases with pending at various stages of review within the Department of Interior and before the Interior Board of Land Appeals. The need for outside counsel in these cases is required because of the attorneys within the Department of Interior recognize a conflict of interest between the Native allottees and their institutional clients.

The remaining funds are to be added to the Bureau's Wildlife and Parks program as additional funds for monitoring and enhancement of the salmon returns within the Arctic-Yukon-Kuskokwim regions in Alaska. The Athabaskan, Yup'ik and Inupiaq Natives of western and interior Alaska live a subsistence way of life from harvests of different fish and mammals. Although these resources supply most of their food needs, they also need cash to purchase essentials such as gas, and nonperishable foodstuffs and harvesting equipment such as boats, outboard motors, nets, and rifles. Commercial fishing provides that small but necessary income since other jobs are scarce and seasonal in rural Alaska. Fishing income averages \$4,000 from about 7 weeks of fishing and the per capita income in the villages of these regions is about 60 percent of the U.S. national average. Beginning in 1990, chum salmon stocks in these regions declined significantly and spawning escapements were inadequate. For the upcoming fishing seasons, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game is predicting below average return of salmon to these regions. This program fund is intended for salmon monitoring, enhancement and restoration and research projects in these regions.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 2043, THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT

HON. ROBERT S. WALKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1995

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing H.R. 2043, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, fiscal year 1996. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Science has devised a visionary, yet prudent alternative to the two very different approaches we have seen thus far this budget year.

The first approach was contained in the President's Budget Request for NASA. It said, "don't worry, trust us, we'll cut NASA's budget by \$5 billion over the next 5 years." At the

time, the President didn't say how the budget would be cut by \$5 billion, but he said it could be cut without closing NASA field centers or cancelling programs.

To some of my colleagues, that promise sounded incredible—so much so that the Appropriations Subcommittee that pays NASA's bills, the Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development and Independent Agencies, took the exact opposite approach: it proposed closing NASA field centers and cancelling major science programs.

The role of the Science Committee is to provide guidance to the Nation's civil space program. We are operating under the fiscal imperatives that weigh upon all Members of the House. Our job is to propose a new direction for NASA that meets both the needs of the nation's space program and the budget of the nation's taxpayer. H.R. 2043 does just that.

THE PATH OF THE FUTURE

Our bill lays the groundwork for a direct path to the future by focussing NASA's energies on basic research and development. The International Space Station, which is fully authorized to completion in H.R. 1601, should be seen as the foundation on which this bill rests. H.R. 2043, builds on the commitment made to human space exploration by fully funding the Space Shuttle program and takes the first steps toward privatizing the Shuttle while maintaining safe and productive operations.

But that's not enough. H.R. 2043 also fully funds the Reusable Launch Vehicle initiative aimed at low-cost, simple, reliable space transportation systems whose operational vehicles will be entirely developed by the private sector. This basic research is fundamental to industry's being able to privately finance and profitably operate the next generation of space vehicles. With this program, Mr. Speaker, we will begin a new era in space, led not by large engineering bureaucracies, but by skillful space entrepreneurs.

We are fully funding the President's proposal to fund two reusable X-type vehicles, the X-33 and the X-34. The X-33 is intended to be the development "footprint" for a single-stage-to-orbit fully reusable launch vehicle; the actual step of capitalizing and developing this system will be the private sector's responsibility. The program is designed to make that next step technologically feasible. The X-34 is already changing the way NASA does business because it reverses the contracting relationship; reverse contracting means that industry can decide how NASA will contribute its expertise to the program, and not the other way around.

PIONEERING BASIC SCIENCE

We are committed in H.R. 2043 to complete development of the highest priority basic science missions in NASA. These programs, Gravity Probe-B, Cassini, the Advanced X-ray Astrophysics Facility [AXAF], the Mars Surveyor, the Stratospheric Observatory for Infrared Astronomy [SOFIA], represent the core science mission that NASA should be focusing on as it returns to its original mission as the Nation's leader in basic scientific, air and space research. Originally NASA had proposed terminating Gravity Probe-B, if possible, to make room for two new programs in infrared astronomy, SOFIA and the Space Infrared Telescope Facility [SIRTF]. Our bill makes the difficult choice to fund Gravity Probe-B and SOFIA, but not SIRTF.

Originally, the Appropriations Subcommittee had proposed terminating Cassini, NASA's high reward science mission to Saturn. Cassini is an extremely valuable basic science mission, as evidenced by the fact that our European partners have devoted the equivalent of an entire year's science funding to develop the Cassini Huygens probe, which is their contribution to the program. If terminated now, with less than 25 percent of its development cost remaining, Italy's bilateral contribution to the Cassini mission would also be wasted. As America seeks to do more in space with less money, Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to abandon international agreements where other nations have pledged their national treasure to work with the United States. H.R. 2043 funds the complete development and launch of Cassini.

Similarly, it would be a mistake to summarily terminate the Gravity Probe-B mission, which was first conceived of by Stanford University in 1967, to empirically prove Albert Einstein's Theory of Relativity. Less than 30 percent of the spacecraft, launch, and operations cost to complete this singularly important research remains. Rather than throw away nearly 30 years of dedicated research and development aimed at testing, at last, the most fundamental of physics assumption of our century, H.R. 2043 funds Gravity Probe-B.

SETTING FISCAL PRIORITIES

Mr. Speaker, some of our colleagues will wonder at hearing this news, how come NASA is not cutting its budget? Well, in fact, we are cutting NASA's budget by a total of \$598 million—or 4% in real terms—below the President's request. H.R. 2043 authorizes NASA at \$741 million—or 5% in real terms—below the current spending level.

How did we do it, Mr. Speaker? We decided to put our eggs in the basic science and research basket, and back away from applied research and applications. While spending more than \$1 billion in fiscal year 1996, it is hard to suggest we have abandoned the Mission to Planet Earth. We will scale it back and restructure it in order for basic science to obtain priority once again. When the Earth Observing System was started in 1989, NASA was given the job of developing spacecraft sensors and satellites for each science researchers to use. As a result, as long as the funding for this service to others continued to be provided in Presidential budget requests, NASA enjoyed a growing budget and its outreach to the earth science community.

Mr. Speaker, those days are over. The government added Mission to Planet Earth to NASA's programs at a time when NASA expected its budget to grow by some 10 percent a year to accommodate this new application of the agency's technical capabilities. If those expectations were ever realistic, they certainly are not now. This does not mean that we need to cancel Mission to Planet Earth at this time, however. Instead, two things must now happen for NASA to continue applying its capabilities to earth data collection in a fiscally sound manner.

First, we must consider the size and scope of the Earth Observing Satellite [EOS] system and its data distribution system, EOSDIS. The Mission to Planet Earth program will extend to the year 2022 and in the year 2000 the budget for this program will grow to \$1.6 billion. NASA has been reticent to provide detailed cost data beyond the year 2000. The General Account-

ing Office estimates that the EOS will cost some \$33 billion through its completion.

Mr. Speaker, we must ask ourselves if this \$33 billion dollar expenditure to collect earth environmental data is efficient, especially for the user community it will directly serve. For example, NASA estimates that EOSDIS will receive some 2,100 gigabytes of new data every day, or 766,550 gigabytes of data every year. NASA estimates that the entire earth science community has some 10,000 potential users, including graduate and undergraduate students. Mr. Speaker, that means that each user will have to analyze 76.6 gigabytes of data every year just to process the data. For comparison, a new personal computer with a Pentium processor is capable of holding .008 gigabytes of data in its RAM memory, and perhaps 0.9 gigabytes on its hard-drive. Our fear, Mr. Speaker, is that NASA is buying a present for earth watchers that is too big to fit under their tree.

Second, we must recognize that the government no longer has a monopoly on the production of earth images and scientific data sets. Several companies are in the process of selling earth-remote sensing data commercially. More are preparing to launch their own satellites to gather data. Proceeding without regard to the cost savings that will be made possible by the emergency of this industry is foolhardy. EOS could also become a competitor of this new commercial enterprise, throwing people who build satellites, and analyze and collect data for the private sector out of work.

Mr. Speaker, our bill does not end Mission to Planet Earth. It cuts the President's request by some \$324 million, or 24%, but still authorizes NASA to spend over \$1 billion dollars for this activity in fiscal year 1996. H.R. 2043 simply directs NASA to rescope the program for maximum efficiency and in the context of the private sector's growing capability to meet NASA's data requirements.

In Aeronautical research we make some hard choices, again favoring the more basic, more fundamental, and less applied research over those things that already bear communal value and in which the private sector already has sufficient incentive to pursue.

Mr. Speaker, Subcommittee Chairman Jim Sensenbrenner and I are proud of the bill we are introducing today, not only for what it does to solve the problems facing NASA this year, but because our bill takes NASA on the high road to the future.

NASA UNDERFUNDING

Looking back, my colleagues should recognize that NASA's reductions to help achieve a balanced federal budget are nothing new. Since 1992, NASA's budget has been declining each year. In all NASA has reduced its total budget by 35 percent since 1991. Using the current year as an example, NASA had planned programs in its budget for fiscal year 1991 that today would require a NASA budget of nearly \$21 billion. Instead of \$20.9 billion, NASA got \$14.4 for fiscal year 1995. The problem is not only that NASA's budget has been reduced, but the way in which it has been reduced.

Like no other, NASA is an agency that has consistently asked for less money than it needed to do the job. Since 1992, NASA's budget has been declining against looming programmatic requirements. The result has been devastating to agency morale and mis-

sions. The failure to produce realistic budget estimates to carry out the programs underway led to the cancellation of programs that had already consumed billions of taxpayer dollars. The Comet Rendezvous Asteroid Fly-by, the original Advanced X-ray Astrophysics Facility, the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor, and Space Station Freedom are among the casualties of this reckless budget strategy.

The fiscal year 1996 Request once again underfunds what is needed to do the job, based on the programs approved by Congress last year. Yet, the underfunding of \$140 million in the fiscal 1996 budget request came the closest of all years in matching program requirements with the budget requested.

Beginning in fiscal 1997, the President's budget proposes to widen the gap again, based on arbitrary budget reductions of 3 percent in 1997, 5 percent in 1998, 7 percent in 1999 and 9 percent in 2000. We believe this will lead only to repeating the mistakes of the past and the summary cancellation of important missions into which taxpayers have already invested significant amounts. The only reasonable way to reduce NASA's budget is to address program requirements, including the size the scope of missions undertaken.

NASA IN A BALANCED FEDERAL BUDGET

Breaking the pattern of underfunding mission requirements is especially challenging in the fiscal environment demanded by a balanced federal budget. We believe NASA must adhere to basic research as its principal mission in order to set a strategic direction for itself in a future of declining budgets.

Therefore, the reductions in mission content proposed by this bill are aimed not only at the current year budget resolution target, but are also chosen to reduce future years' funding requirements. Every effort is made to prevent cancellation of programs in which large investments have already been made.

The priority is given to roles and missions of NASA aimed at basic research and discovery, as opposed to applications work. The long-term goal implied by the bill is to achieve a balance among NASA's strategic enterprises that allows basic space science—astronomy, astrophysics, life and microgravity science, and planetary science—to become a full 20 percent of the NASA budget as recommended by the Augustine Committee in 1990.

In order to ultimately reduce the overhead launch cost of performing any space activities, the development of the next generation of reusable launch vehicles, is an essential investment that NASA must make to survive. Basic research in cutting-edge technologies like single stage to orbit systems will enable yet greater science and discovery at lower costs.

Other enterprises of the agency will compete for the remaining resources provided in a declining budget. The opportunity for funding of these enterprises, including the earth science applications, applied technology programs for aircraft, and various outreach and academic program efforts, will depend on the ability of NASA to right-size its base of assets to the sharper focus of its missions henceforth.

RESTRUCTURING NASA

Our bill recognizes the real necessity for NASA to restructure itself in order to meet the challenges facing space in the next century. The Administrator of NASA has worked hard to produce a zero-base review which will help him reorganize NASA's activities into lead

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