

the commercial space business. Also in 1994, the State of California's earmarked matching funds rose to \$550,000.

What worked for us in California was removing the issue of spaceport development from the larger issue of commercial space. We made a successful argument that the narrow issue of spaceport development was largely a transportation infrastructure issue. After all, if there is no facility from which to launch, there would be no launches.

The first thing was define a spaceport? A spaceport, in its best description, is a transportation center. It should be viewed in the same way as an airport or a seaport. A spaceport puts semi-trucks—rockets—on end and drives—launches—them into space. In the current environment this is an expensive proposition because these vehicles can only be used one time. It is my belief that commercial business will drive down these high costs and encourage developments in reusable launch vehicles.

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. Currently, launch facilities are controlled by the Air Force, but California is building the first commercial facility. What makes the California Spaceport special is the fact that it will be the first one capable of launching in polar orbit. Market reports and international competitors prove that polar orbit launches are the future of commercial space.

As with most things in life, timing is a very key issue. It is imperative that spaceport development progress quickly in order to maintain the other elements of the market. In the international arena, competition is fierce. This competition is currently headed by the European Space Agency [ESA] and propelled by the French. Other strong competitors are the Russians, Japanese, Chinese, and Canadians, while still others, including the Australians, are looking to get in.

Currently, the French now launch roughly 60 percent of the world's commercial satellites. From its first launch in December 1979, the spaceport in French Guiana has progressed rapidly. They have moved from 6 launches a year to a potential for 36 launches per year by the end of the decade.

The United States has many potential launch bases and two existing ones—the California and Florida spaceports. The question we must ask is, with existing spaceport facilities—plus all of the potential launch bases—and a healthy market for boosters and satellites, why isn't the United States in a better position to compete with our international competitors for a bigger share of the commercial launch market?

Mr. Speaker, in California we are no longer in the position of encouraging commercial space activity, we are there. A limited partnership between ITT and California Commercial Spaceport, Inc. puts to work \$10 million in Federal and State grants and a \$30 million investment by ITT toward the development of commercial space launches at Vandenberg.

This limited partnership, called Spaceport Systems International [SSI], is working hard to open the spaceport launch facility by 1996. They recently announced they will launch four Taurus vehicles in 1999. They had previously projected 15 launches by the end of 1997. Those payloads will include low Earth orbit [LEO], Earth observation, research, education, and government.

These customers will use the California Spaceport to launch LEO satellites into polar orbit—a unique ability that will generate significant business and jobs—400 to 500 for the construction phase and 700 to 1,000 when operational. However, the big jib numbers, in the tens of thousands, will be in the satellite manufacturing that will be drawn to this low-cost access to space provided by the California Spaceport.

The spaceport philosophy is a commitment to user-friendly environments, integrated launch services, and low-cost access to space. The economic potential for California and, more importantly, the Nation, is unlimited. In California the growth of spaceport helps in the revitalization of high-technology industries which have been hurt by defense cuts. This means more high paying jobs and improving local economies with new hotels, homes, shopping centers, education centers, and research facilities.

It is my hope that California can be used as a model for future spaceport development. We have stepped out of the box with a fresh perspective on space. Space is no longer the jurisdiction of little men in funny suits, Star Trek movies, or the Shuttle. The international commercial space industry is our highway into the 21st century and holds the promise of enormous economic benefits to our entire Nation.

□ 1520

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2, LINE-ITEM VETO ACT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 2 pursuant to House Resolution 55 the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment, and that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by

electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall be not less than 15 minutes.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, but I want to inquire of the majority leader, it is my understanding that what we are trying to arrange here is a system for voting, in consideration of the rest of the line-item veto bill on Monday, so we can start at 2 p.m., have amendments with a 30-minute time limit for the amendments that are left, have an hour time limit on the substitutes that are left, that we would not begin the consideration of the Stenholm substitute until 5 o'clock, and that the order of voting when the voting would begin would be on the amendments first and then ending finally with the Stenholm substitute, and then on to final passage of the bill. Is that generally a correct statement?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would just like to engage the distinguished majority leader in a short colloquy about the family-friendly nature of the schedule and also the productivity and effectiveness of the congressional schedule.

Many of us, as the gentleman from Texas knows, are frustrated with the current schedule, whether we have young children, whether we are on the east coast, the west coast, or in the Midwest. We see we are starting voting at 5 o'clock and 6 o'clock at night. We are all working 70 or 80 hours a week, but we are working many of these in the middle of the night where we never see our families. We are having votes overlap between committees on floor votes. Certainly the distinguished gentleman from Texas is as frustrated as anybody with this schedule, and while a bipartisan committee was appointed to work on this for the first 100 days, I did not sign that resolution on the bipartisan committee because I was afraid this would happen. It has happened. We have got angry and angrier families.

□ 1530

I am hopeful, if the majority leader would commit to working with us as he has in the past on improving this, if not immediately, then sometime in the next 90 days.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROEMER. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. The gentleman is absolutely correct about the frustrations. Certainly I felt it, too. I stand before you as a man who is a half-hour late already with a date that I have with the most beautiful woman I have known, and we feel these frustrations every day.

But I must say that, given what I have seen today as what I believe is a real breakthrough in relations with the work and the help of the minority leader and certainly the cooperation we have gotten from the distinguished ranking member of the committee on this effort, I believe we have got an opportunity to alleviate all of this tension and frustration in the future, and I am looking forward to moving on with the completion of this week, the beginning of next week under much more favorable conditions than we anticipated just a few short hours before, and I think more smoothly throughout the rest of this Congress.

Mr. ROEMER. Further reserving the right to object, so I can ascertain from the gentleman's remarks, that after the contract and the first 100 days is over, he is going to be working on spending more time with this beautiful lady after those 100 days and we can get that as a solid commitment?

Mr. ARMEY. Yes, if the gentleman will yield, not only that, you with your beautiful children and your wife as well.

Mr. ROEMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I wanted to say I misspoke in my explanation of the arrangement in saying all the amendments would have 30 minutes. It is my understanding that we are intending to have 1 hour for the Orton amendment alone.

Mr. ARMEY. Absolutely. That is correct. And I will have this in the request I am about to make.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF OFFERING AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2 ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the Committee of the Whole House meets under the 5-minute rule next Monday to consider amendments to H.R. 2 that four amendments, if offered, will be considered, time to be divided equally between proponents and opponents of the amendment, with debate not to exceed the time allotted, in this case the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] for 1

hour, the gentleman from California [Ms. WATERS] for 30 minutes, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN] for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] for 30 minutes; furthermore, that no amendments to the amendments may be offered, that two substitutes, if offered, will also be considered, time to be equally divided between the proponents and opponents, and debate not to exceed 1 hour each.

Those substitutes would be by the gentleman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] and by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], with the proviso that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] will not begin to offer his substitute until 5 o'clock p.m.; and, finally, that no amendments to the substitutes may be offered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For clarification, the Chair will ask one question.

Is it the majority leader's request that the six named amendments, and none other, be in order for the balance of the consideration?

Mr. ARMEY. The Chair is correct in that.

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

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS ON MONDAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I hope that we have most of our Members that have now discerned from these two requests, and we will engage both majority and minority whip information system to inform all of our Members, that with these requests and with the generous cooperation of the minority, we are now able to advise Members that unless you have business on the floor that you need not anticipate a vote will be taken before 5 o'clock next Monday. Certainly those people with business on the floor and those people interested in debating the business on the floor will need to be here at 2, but Members not required to be on the floor for purposes of the debate may now be assured that votes will not occur before 5 o'clock, and very likely 5:30 on Monday next.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. It will take very little time, just to commend the gentleman and the gentleman from Missouri for working this out, and it is something I know will be beneficial to many Members, and I also think it is incumbent on staff now to notify those Members, a lot of whom are probably on their way home, and maybe it will make them feel better.

Mr. ARMEY. And again, one final point, the staff should be sure to notify the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], who is on his way to Califor-

nia to celebrate the birth of a new grandbaby.

OUR LEADERS SHOULD PUBLISH THEIR IDEAS AND WISDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is recognized for 5 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] would listen to my response to his special order a few minutes ago with respect to the Speaker of the House and the Speaker's intent to write a book.

I think the gentleman from Missouri, in continuing to raise accusations, clouds over the Speaker, because of the fact that he is preparing to write a book and publish that book, does a disservice to this House, and I think a disservice to the tradition that we want to have leaders in this Nation who not only have ideas and thoughts and wisdom and insight but also express those ideas and those thoughts and that wisdom and insight in books and make them available for the American people and for the people of the world.

I thought, as I walked down here, when I listened to the gentleman complain bitterly that the Speaker of the House might write a book, I thought about the great leaders in the West who have written books, and I thought about Winston Churchill, who wrote "The History of the English-Speaking Peoples," written when he was in office and who wrote following World War II "The History of World War II," a multivolume book, that has been the source of wisdom for many of those who came after him, and I thought of our great President, Teddy Roosevelt, who wrote many books, who wrote "The Winning of the West", "Trails of a Ranch Man", "The Naval War of 1812", "Through the Brazilian Wilderness", "The Strenuous Life", "The Rough Riders", who was a prolific writer and, you know, Teddy Roosevelt, of all of the, and I disagreed with the Speaker the other night when he said that Franklin Roosevelt may have been the biggest figure on the political stage in this century, the biggest political figure.

I think the other Roosevelt, Teddy Roosevelt, was the biggest political figure of this century, and Teddy Roosevelt left his energy and left his imprint on succeeding generations up to and including this generation of political leaders, because he wrote. He wrote, and he made his words available to the American people. He made his words available to Europeans and to Asians and to people around the world. I think in many ways Teddy Roosevelt's words and his books were such ambassadors of what this country is all about, as his speeches and his career.