

have made our space program the subject of movies like "Apollo 13" and inspired thousands of scientists, engineers, and schoolchildren across our country.

It is time for the bloodletting to stop and to give NASA the support it needs to face the challenges of the future. This NASA authorization bill is designed to do just that.

The bill provides the full \$2.1 billion requested level for space station. This program is NASA's most costly, complex, and controversial activity and we are all aware of the many criticisms leveled against it. However, space station is precisely the kind of bold vision that NASA was created to pursue. Space station will enable the United States and the international science community to conduct unique microgravity research and expand our knowledge about humans' ability to live and work in space. If past missions are any indication, the space station will undoubtedly yield breakthroughs in biomedicine and advanced materials. We can probably also expect exciting spinoffs just as past space missions have spawned microelectronics, pacemakers, advance water filtration systems, communications, and many other products and services we now take for granted.

I must admit concern about the heavy reliance of the current station plan on the Russians. I remain troubled by the possibility that the program might collapse if the Russians were to withdraw for any reason. However, I am still a strong Station supporter and the full funding provided in the bill will keep the program on track for a first element launch in 1997.

The bill also provides full funding for Mission to Planet Earth. Mission to Planet Earth is NASA's \$7 billion satellite program aimed at studying how the oceans, land, and atmosphere work as a system in order to understand and predict global climate change. For those of us representing farm States, weather and water are our lifeblood. Mission to Planet Earth promises dramatic improvements in our ability to predict climate change and manage our scarce water resources. If those expectations are met, the program will easily pay for itself in lives and property saved and improved water management.

Mr. President, in my view, one of the most important areas within NASA is aeronautics—the first A in NASA. For many years, aeronautics seemed to be reduced to a small A status. It always seemed to take a back seat to the higher-profile space missions. However, under Dan Goldin's leadership, that is beginning to change and NASA is giving aeronautics the backing it deserves.

To me, the aeronautics research is critical to maintaining U.S. technological leadership and aerospace competitiveness. For instance, the high speed research program is developing pre-competitive technologies in sup-

port of supersonic aircraft. It is estimated that the first country to market such an aircraft stands to gain \$200 billion in sales and 140,000 new jobs. Similarly, the advanced subsonic technology program funds research in support of subsonic airplanes—a market that generates one million jobs and contributes over \$25 billion annually to the U.S. trade balance. These programs are money-makers and it is in the national interest to give them whatever support they need. Accordingly, our NASA bill authorizes aeronautics research at the requested level of \$891 million for fiscal year 1996.

As a final point, Mr. President, I note that the bill also authorizes a collection of activities and initiatives designed to extend NASA's vision to include our rural States. Our rural States can make an enormous contribution to the civilian space program if only given the chance. For example, in May, Prof. Steve Running of the University of Montana testified before the Science Subcommittee about his efforts to use remote sensing satellite data in forest and crop management. To embrace our rural States in our space program, the bill contains a \$2 million increase for the EPSCoR program, which funds important research in our rural States. It also funds another Rural Teacher Resource Center to the existing nine Centers, as well as an additional rural technology transfer and commercialization center, to fill in coverage gaps in those two programs. Further, it provides funding for an Upper Missouri River Basin hydrology project. This project should help the Nation develop better strategies for predicting, and responding to, the flooding and other water management problems that have plagued the Missouri River region in recent years.

Mr. President, I believe that this bill provides NASA with the support it requires to continue and build on its important work in space and aeronautics and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation when it reaches the floor later this year. Thank you, Mr. President.●

COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH CARE

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, the need for comprehensive health care is apparent in the numbers. We have 41 million Americans without health care coverage.

But these are not just numbers.

We are talking about real people and real problems.

When you look at the individual cases, you see the tragedy of our present policy.

At the end of my remarks, I am inserting into the RECORD a letter from Mrs. Mary Davis that is largely self-explanatory.

It tells what is happening in one family.

Why we cannot respond, I do not know.

As some of my colleagues know, I have introduced a bill calling for

health care coverage for pregnant women and children six and under.

I am pleased that Senator CHAFFEE of Rhode Island has expressed an interest in the legislation.

I hope we can emerge with a bipartisan consensus to at least cover pregnant women and children six and under. That would take care of the needs of this one family, at least for a short time, and protect a great many others.

It is not a substitute for universal coverage, but it is a step in the right direction.

I ask that Mrs. Davis' letter be printed in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

JUNE 19, 1995.

Hon. PAUL SIMON,
U.S. Senator, United States Congress, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SIMON: I am writing to you with a very distressing problem.

Our granddaughter was born May 2, 1994 16 weeks premature. At the time of her birth, her mother had been unemployed because of medical problems; her father was laid off in April of that year from his job. They applied for assistance and received care for mother and baby. Bethany was in the hospital for 4 months, and although doing well, she has lost her eye sight. She is in therapy for work on her hip joints and she had allergies and has a history of respiratory problems. They moved in with us shortly after Jennifer was dismissed from the hospital, because they had no income. We are in the ministry and live in a parsonage.

In November of last year, Andy went back to work and they were able to secure a house for \$150.00 per month. Andy brings home about \$150 after taxes. As it should be, Jennifer was picked up by Andy's insurance, however, Bethany remained on a medical card because her dad's insurance, Blue Cross and Blue Shield, refused to cover her. Bethany is in therapy for her legs, regular doctor visits, and she has had two surgeries on her eyes last October in Detroit. She is scheduled to have more surgeries. However, it is understood that she will probably only have light vision.

Cost of living became so that Jennifer was forced to return to work just to keep rent and utilities paid. This past week, Jennifer and Andy were notified that Bethany would be losing her medical card and all coverage as of July 1, just because her mother had gone back to work. Jennifer works for Kentucky Fried Chicken and brings home about \$150 per week. Beth does receive SSI of about \$401 per month. By losing these medical benefits, she will not be able to keep regular office visits, because the clinic requires payment each and every time, she can no longer go to Detroit for eye surgery because the doctor won't take her without coverage, and she probably will have to give up the therapy on her legs, because they cannot afford the costs.

Tell me what they are suppose to do. Both insurance coverage that their jobs provide, refuse to insure Bethany and now she is losing her assistance. These two young kids and Bethany have been through a lot this last year. Now they have a blind child who cannot get assistance. Can something be done?

I wouldn't have your job for nothing. Being in the ministry, we realize just how difficult it is to please everyone, but I don't care if you are Democrat or Republican, I am neither, but someone has to do something about medical coverage.

I believe you are trying. But tell me where do you go to get help for the innocent children. She cannot go on Medicaid or Medicare, because she has not worked and not put anything into the system. She will never be able to read, drive or get around on her own. I realize that technology may be available in years to come that will be beneficial to her, but what is going to happen to her now.

I hope that you will be able to read this. I know that we are just a small amount of the millions you must hear from daily, but I just couldn't sit and do nothing with my distress and care for this beautiful little girl who is struggling to live.

God bless you and your family. May you gain the wisdom and the ability to lead us to a better way of life for everyone.

Respectfully yours,

MARY F. DAVIS.●

BILL SMULLIN HONORED

● Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, the broadcasting and cable industry will honor an Oregon legend this fall, when television pioneer Bill Smullin will be inducted into the Broadcasting and Cable Hall of Fame.

Bill's life is remembered for his contributions and achievements, including the establishment of broadcast and cable television in southern Oregon and northern California. In 1930, Bill Smullin founded Oregon-California Broadcasting, Inc., and later began the first VHF television station in Oregon. His company provided cable television in the region by transmitting signals via microwave from Portland and San Francisco to southern Oregon.

Those of us who had the honor of knowing Bill have fond personal memories. He was as giving to the community as to his friends. I know his family is pleased that he is being afforded this prestigious professional honor and send my congratulations to them.●

A TRIBUTE TO RALPH O. BRENNAN

● Mr. BREAU. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a fellow Louisianian, Mr. Ralph O. Brennan, who will be honored August 4 by the Louisiana Restaurant Association for his distinguished career in the food service industry. A member of the world-famous Brennan restaurant family of New Orleans, Mr. Brennan has long exemplified a commitment to community service, participatory democracy and creating opportunities for all Americans.

He has diligently served, and continues to serve, the \$290 billion food service industry and its 9.4 million employees. A past president of the Louisiana Restaurant Association, he currently is chairman of the board and president of the National Restaurant Association, a major trade group here in Washington. He is also a trustee of the Association's educational foundation, and will be an industry delegate to the first White House Conference on Travel and Tourism in October 1995. In all of these capacities he urges independent restaurateurs from around the country to participate fully in the democratic process by getting to know

their elected representatives at every level of government and then making it their responsibility to keep those officials informed. He facilitates their involvement through a toll-free hotline, numerous personal appearances and—perhaps most important—leading by example, through frequent visits to his Members of Congress and, on occasion, delivering testimony before congressional committees.

With his sister, Cindy, Mr. Brennan owns and operates two award-winning restaurants in the New Orleans French Quarter, thereby helping to preserve the rich culinary heritage of that great city which his family has successfully endeavored to do for three generations. But, as an industry leader, he is determined to preserve far more than just a great family tradition. Mr. Brennan has dedicated his life to preserving the boundless opportunities that food service affords individuals the rest of society could ignore, like recent immigrants, those without education or professional skills, and those on public assistance. Entry-level restaurant positions—washing dishes, bussing tables, assisting with food preparation—are a proven first step up a viable career ladder for millions of Americans; in fact, 60 percent of today's restaurant owners and managers started out in what some unknowing and insensitive people might refer to as dead-end restaurant jobs. In the restaurant business, upward mobility is the rule rather than the exception.

Mr. President, as this Congress continues its debate on welfare reform, I salute Mr. Brennan for working to ensure that the unmatched employment and training opportunities afforded by the food service industry will be something all Americans can be proud of in the future.●

CALIFORNIA: A SOCIETY THAT CUTS CHILD WELFARE BUT BOOSTS JAILS

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I do not believe I have ever met Prof. Robert C. Fellmeth of the University of San Diego, but I read what he had to say in the Los Angeles Times about cutting back on assistance to the poor while, at the same time, we hand largess to the wealthy.

Statistics differ somewhat, but the California situation mirrors the national situation.

If we are doing what is politically popular, I do not know, but what we are doing is certainly wrong.

What we need is not Senators and House Members who follow the latest public opinion poll on tax cuts or anything else, but people who try to lead, and sometimes do the unpopular, in order to reduce poverty in our country, to improve education and to do the things that are needed for a better future.

The incredible increase in prison construction and incarceration has done nothing to decrease the crime rate in

our country. If putting people in prison reduced the crime rate, we would have the lowest crime rate in the world, with the possible exception of Russia.

While Professor Fellmeth zeroes in on the California situation, it is worthwhile for my House and Senate colleagues to read what he has to say because they will find a striking similarity between the California action and the Federal action.

I ask that his statement be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, July 5, 1995]

CALIFORNIA: A SOCIETY THAT CUTS CHILD WELFARE BUT BOOSTS JAILS

(By Robert C. Fellmeth)

Despite what we often hear from the governor and the Legislature, spending for the welfare of our children has been in steady decline.

An example: The governor claims to have given politically popular K-12 public education "high priority" and "saved it from cuts" for the last several years. But figures from the second annual Children's Budget, completed by the Children's Advocacy Institute, show a steady decline each year, including proposed spending for 1995-96.

At the federal level, Congress proposes to change child spending from "entitlements" based on how many children qualify for assistance to "block grants," set at a static figure for five years. The Republican leadership contends that such a policy will curb what it calls "runaway spending." In contrast, the Children's Budget reveals that such a freeze means substantial reductions year to year, imposed without consideration of need or consequences.

Budgets based on raw numbers, or numbers with only inflation or only population changes considered—but not adjusted by both—slowly but inexorably squeeze out infrastructure investment. In California this failure has allowed a largely undiscussed disinvestment in children to accumulate over the past six years.

From 1989-90 to the current year, Aid to Families With Dependent Children has been cut 20%, the three child-related Medi-Cal accounts an average of 23% and public education 7.5%.

The consequences in terms of flesh and blood are momentous: The Children's Budget reveals that AFDC for 1.8 million children in California has been cut from close to the federal poverty line to only 75% of that wholly inadequate amount. The governor now proposes to reduce AFDC to just 64% of the poverty-line figure, posing a clear danger of malnutrition and permanent health damage. Wilson also proposes further cuts in AFDC assistance after six months of help; the Republican House would cut children off altogether after two years if Mom does not have a job.

Ironically, the same gradual suffocation has been applied to GAIN, the major program providing child care and job training for AFDC mothers. Here there is a 9% decline from 1989 and a proposed further cut of 12%.

The typical AFDC recipient—contrary to public perception—is 29, white, recently divorced, with two children and no child support. Her problem is not a desire for welfare dependency but the far more prevalent dilemma of paternal abandonment. Is it relevant that childcare help and job training, without which she does not have a chance, have been cut? Less than 10% of AFDC parents get child-care help.