

cab business after his retirement from the telephone company and successfully ran the operation there until his health failed him in 1992. Since that time, he was fortunate to spend his remaining days with his family and friends in Chicago, IL.

Mr. Harris leaves behind a large family of sons, daughters, grandchildren, and great grandchildren. I ask my colleagues, then, to join with me in expressing our deep condolences to the extended Harris family. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I yield back my time.

HONORING OLYMPIC DIVING  
CHAMPION PAT MCCORMICK

**HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 23, 1995*

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Olympic Diving Champion Pat McCormick. Pat is America's most successful female Olympic diver, having won two Gold medals at the 1952 Melbourne Games and two more at the 1956 Helsinki Games.

At Melbourne, Pat won both the 10 meter platform and 3 meter springboard competition. She repeated her Gold Medal performance in both events at Helsinki. She is the only woman to have ever won four Gold Medals in these events. Adding to her Olympic Golds, Pat also garnered 27 National Diving Titles during her illustrious career. She received additional recognition in 1956 when she was awarded the coveted Sports Illustrated Sullivan Award as the Nation's most outstanding amateur athlete of the year.

Pat, a long-time resident of Seal Beach, CA, will be inducted into the Orange County Sports Hall of Fame, on March 25, 1995. On display at the Hall of Fame in the "Pat McCormick Exhibit," will be her four Olympic Gold Medals.

Following her retirement from competition, Pat established the Pat McCormick Education Foundation to provide at-risk students an opportunity to graduate from high school and pursue a college education. The Education Foundation provides motivation, counseling, tutoring, and funding all the way through college for participating students. As told by Pat on numerous occasions, the foundation has helped high school students destined for academic failure to become honor students at many of our Nation's top universities.

Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I rise to recognize Pat McCormick on the occasion of her Gold Medal Retirement Celebration, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending best wishes and congratulations to Pat, our Gold Medal champion.

BART CHARLOW HONORED FOR  
LEADERSHIP IN MENTAL  
HEALTH CARE

**HON. ZOE LOFGREN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 23, 1995*

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and commend Mr. Bart Charlow for his uncompromising advocacy on behalf of mental health care in Santa Clara County, CA,

which includes the 16th Congressional District that I represent in this 104th Congress.

For 15 years, Mr. Charlow has actively helped families—and particularly children—touched by mental illness to overcome disability and lead rich and productive lives. As president and CEO of the Adult and Child Guidance Center in San Jose, CA, he fashioned mental health services specially designed to address the needs of many of the community's most neglected populations. As a result, the Adult and Child Guidance Center offers one-of-a-kind programs for adolescents, the hearing impaired, and Southeast Asian immigrants, among others. True to its charitable nature, the center strives to provide a treatment alternative for those who fall short of public-sector assistance.

Those who know Mr. Charlow know that his efforts carry far beyond his own organization. During my tenure as a local government official, I worked closely with Mr. Charlow and others to build a comprehensive system of mental health care for the needy and to preserve those vital health services as local government budgets for such services shrank. As president of the local contract agencies association and delegate to the countywide mental health board budget committee, he was key to these efforts.

Mr. Charlow has participated on too many community boards to mention at this time, yet it is worth noting that he has placed a particular emphasis—importantly—on efforts helping children.

Mr. Speaker, on March 27, 1995, Mr. Charlow will be honored by colleagues and friends for his intelligent and passionate leadership in the field of mental health. I would like to express my own gratitude to Mr. Charlow on behalf of my constituents in the 16th district and the U.S. House of Representatives.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM O. HIATT

**HON. IKE SKELTON**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 23, 1995*

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to honor an outstanding Missourian, William O. Hiatt, Jr., of Sedalia, who was recently the recipient of the Center for Human Services' Life Achievement Award. This lifetime achievement award is a tribute for his many years of service to the Children's Therapy Center located in Sedalia, MO.

Hiatt has been involved with the center since 1967. During those years he has been a member of the board and served as president from 1982 until 1992. Hiatt worked for Missouri Public Service, until his retirement 8 years ago. He is also actively involved with other community organizations, such as the United Way, Lions Club, and the Boy Scouts.

The Center for Human Services has benefited from the countless contributions by William Hiatt. I urge my colleagues to join me in commending him for his dedication and perseverance on all his achievements through the years.

CUT THE TECHNO-PORK

**HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 23, 1995*

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, Mr. T.J. Rodgers, the CEO of Cypress Semiconductor located in San Jose, CA, wrote the following memo for the Red Herring magazine, January 1995 issue.

He makes some excellent points: Government megascience programs all too often become the grossest of pork projects. Keep it small, keep it simple, keep it seed money for merit-based research is his message. It is a message worth heeding.

The article follows:

CYPRESS SEMICONDUCTOR

*January 9, 1994.*

To: The Congress of the United States of America.

From: T.J. Rodgers, CEO of Cypress Semiconductor.

Re: Cut the Techno-Pork!

My advice to the new Congress on technology policy is to kill government science megaprograms, get out of the technology-subsidy business, and double science and technology funding for universities through thousands of small grants. These priorities are particularly important for Republicans who find big-science wonders hard to resist.

With the possible exception of the Manhattan Project, government science megaprograms have a terrible record of return on the taxpayers' investment. Remember synfuels? This scheme to create gasoline from coal followed the classic, eight-step scenario for wasteful government megaprograms:

(1) Scare the hell out of them. (What happens when the oil cartel shuts off the gasoline?)

(2) Declare that the program is so big, only the government can pull it off. (Translation: No other sucker could be convinced to invest in this loser.)

(3) Get expert advice. (Translation: Listen to oil industry lobbyists who are paid to know that what is good for the oil industry is good for America.)

(4) Create a consensus. (Translation: Spread the pork out to enough states to get the bill passed.)

(5) Execute. (Translation: Use government funds to hire a large P.R. staff.)

(6) Fail.

(7) Lose \$88 billion.

(8) Blame the Republicans for underfunding the project.

Remember the superconducting supercollider (SSC)? I debated a particle physicist from the University of Texas-Arlington on National Public Radio on its merits. He claimed that \$12 billion was a cheap price to discover the sixth and elusive "top quark" subatomic particle. I argued that the genius of the physics community would find a cheaper way to float the top quark in electric and magnetic fields long enough to take its picture. A few weeks later, Congress canceled the SSC. A few weeks after that, the top quark had its first snapshot taken at Chicago's Fermi labs. Then, a Texas entrepreneur proclaimed the \$4 billion 10-mile hole in the ground created for the SSC an ideal spot for growing mushrooms.

Boeing and Lockheed have just teamed up to work on Space Shuttle II. What did Space Shuttle I accomplish to justify the next multibillion dollar investment? Certainly, it launched many satellites, but they could

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 it-

self 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 ideas.

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 than 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