

City Managers' Association, California Parks and Recreation Society, Rotary International, Lambda Alpha and Community Redevelopment Association.

I would like to take the opportunity to say thank you to Mr. Molendyk for his dedication, influence and involvement in our community. He has served as a fine representative of municipal government. It is a great pleasure for me to congratulate Mr. Ron Molendyk on his outstanding career and offer my best wishes for continued success in his future endeavors.

HAPPY 50TH ANNIVERSARY TO  
WNAM-AM

**HON. JAY W. JOHNSON**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1997*

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor broadcasting excellence and the 50th anniversary of WNAM-AM in Neenah, WI.

Friday, May 23, 1997, will mark 50 years that WNAM has provided information and entertainment to residents of the Fox Valley, an invaluable public service. WNAM Radio, whose call letters reflect Neenah and Menasha, is one of the oldest radio voices in northeast Wisconsin. As such, it has provided a continuous record of the history of radio as it emerged across the Nation. From the old days of network radio soap operas to the veteran broadcasting personality Ron Ross, who holds forth every morning on the air, WNAM has been a constant radio companion to thousands of listeners at 1280 on their AM radio dial.

Every day, listeners tune in to WNAM to hear hourly local, regional, State, and national news. And, of course, it is the place to hear Frank Sinatra, Nat King Cole, the McGuire and Andrews Sisters, and many other popular entertainers.

As a former broadcaster myself and as someone who knows the hard work and dedication it takes to operate, maintain, and continue great programming on a radio station, I want to thank WNAM for their service to Wisconsin and I wish them many more years of excellence on the radio.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to help me honor WNAM and wish them a hearty happy 50th anniversary.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MR. NATHANIEL MORRELL AND THE STUDENTS OF E.W. CLARK HIGH SCHOOL

**HON. JOHN E. ENSIGN**

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1997*

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring my colleagues' attention to the tremendous accomplishments of an outstanding teacher, Mr. Nathaniel Morrell, and group of young students from E.W. Clark High School in Las Vegas, NV.

Recently, Mr. Morrell's class won the Nevada State competition sponsored by the Center for Civic Education. The competition tested

students on their knowledge of the Constitution. For their efforts, Mr. Morrell's class represented the State of Nevada at the national finals which were held in Washington, DC. At the national finals, Mr. Morrell's class was further distinguished when they were recognized as the best nonfinalist team from the Western States region.

Through this competition, each student demonstrated his or her knowledge of the Constitution before simulated congressional committees made of constitutional scholars, lawyers, journalists, and government leaders. Unfortunately, for too many Americans understanding the Constitution and appreciating the protection of liberty it affords us is a duty left unrealized. However, with the example of young students devoting their free time to participate in a scholarly competition, I am confident that our Nation will have the leadership to take us into the 21st century and increase our collective knowledge of one of the most revolutionary documents in human history.

I would like to offer my congratulations to Mr. Morrell, Scott Bernth, William Britton, Dana Buck, Scott Collins, Marci Conant, Jill Conk, Gina Eusano, Desiree Evans, Brenna Flood, Neeloufar Gharavi, Michael Grizzaffi, April Jones, Parminder Kang, Sih Lee, Cassie Martin, Jesseca Master, Andreas Mauer, Chairat Meevsin, Nicholas North, Jennifer Patterson, Charles Posnecker, Scott Pringle, Yoan Rodriguez, Jeffrey Sherman, David Simpson, Michael Sweker, Jack Tomassian, Benjamin Tripoli, Brianna Winters, Michael Wucinich, and Kate Raby. Nevadans are very proud of their achievement.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud these young Americans and the Center for Civic Education for their months of hard work. Mr. Morrell and his class will undoubtedly treasure this experience for a lifetime.

H.R. 1702, THE COMMERCIAL SPACE  
ACT OF 1997

**HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1997*

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, the United States is a country built by the sweat, ingenuity, successes, and failure of its people, not its Government. Our history was written well outside of Washington, before the beltway was ever constructed. The American model of progress is one that draws on the skills, energy, and honest work of our citizens. It is a model in which Government ultimately plays a subordinate role.

Sometimes we forget that when it comes to outer space. Because the Government put a man on the Moon, some supporters of space development have thought that only Government was capable of developing this newest frontier. But this is the wrong mindset to have in a country that does not revolve around Washington and whose energies must not be trapped by the gravity well of Federal deficits. If we expect, or accept, that Government will do for us in space what the American people did for themselves in developing this country, then we will have lost the vision of our Founding Fathers. We will have ceased to be American.

Fortunately, the can-do attitude that built this country still exists beyond the beltway,

and even in many corners of Washington. There are legions of citizens who don't work for the Government or a government contractor, but who are opening our next frontier in outer space. They're using their own sweat, their own creativity, their own insight, and their own money to create one of the fastest growing areas of commercial activity in this country: commercial space. In 1995, the commercial space industry generated \$7.5 billion in revenue. For the last decade, it has been one of our fastest growing industries and has proven relatively recession-proof.

Today, commercial space businesses are employing thousands of people in various commercial activities, including communications, space launch, remote sensing applications, and navigation. The services are growing by leaps and bounds, as is U.S. employment in the industry. We use communication satellites launched on commercial rockets to make international calls for a fraction of the cost we paid decades ago. We have a commercial sector investing in new rockets to lower the costs of getting to space. We have companies investing in new space instruments to do the kind of research that pays immeasurable returns in the outyears. We have remote sensing applications companies using space imagery to better understand flooding and more realistically estimate damage.

Tomorrow, we can look forward to an explosion in remote sensing after the first privately financed satellites are launched this year. We can look forward to an explosion in communication services, as companies fill low- and medium-Earth orbits with constellations of communication satellites. We can look forward to cheap access to space that is an order of magnitude less costly and more reliable than today's ballistic vehicles. We may even look forward to space tourism, which NASA is already studying in a joint venture with industry.

The American people have spoken on this issue. We value commercial space. We want it to succeed. We want to participate in opening the space frontier. Over the past decade, the Science Committee had led the way under Republican and Democratic management to pass the legislation necessary to enable these industries to succeed, with bills ranging from the original Commercial Space Launch Act of 1984 to the Land Remote Sensing Policy Act of 1992. Over the past decade, the office of the President—whether it was held by Republicans or Democrats—has developed and imposed policies intended to expand the ability of the commercial sector to lead this country in space. None of these initiatives required a new government program. Instead of spending money, we've saved it by expanding the technical and industrial base for space. We've saved money by reducing the amount of overhead that Government has to pay on its own. We've saved money by creating new jobs, new technologies, new expertise, and new capabilities that tax dollars didn't have to pay for. These benefits are so simple, and so direct, that America's elected officials have supported them regardless of party, whether they are in the White House or in the Congress. We've done, in legislation, the things that the American people have asked for, we're moving Government out of the way.

But the job is not done. We've heard it from constituents and we've experienced it ourselves: The Federal bureaucracy does not always apply law or policy in the manner that

the Congress and the White House intend. Instead of serving the Nation's interest in promoting commercial space, bureaucracies serve their self-interest in expanding turf, accreting regulatory power, and stifling creativity. The bill I am introducing today reverses the increasing bureaucratization of commercial space and the tendency by the Government to grow and stifle this industry. The Commercial Space Act of 1997 levers the legislative and regulatory process for space launch, space reentry, and remote sensing back to the track it was meant to be on when Congress enacted and the White House approved commercial space legislation.

We designed this bill around the Clinton administration's space policies, in particular, as they relate to remote sensing, space transportation, and navigation from space. We designed this bill around those policies because they are good policies. They strike an appropriate balance among our Nation's interest in promoting commercial space activity, creating high-tech jobs, protecting our national security, preserving the public safety, and increasing our technical competitiveness. We've insisted that Federal agencies and departments do the things they are obligated to do. We've strengthened some of the policies and set specific limits on the power and authority of the Federal Government. By taking these steps, we're creating a stable business environment in which the commercial sector can raise capital, develop a business plan, hire employees, and offer a space good or service with the expectation that the Government won't keep changing the rules.

The bill does several things, but let me limit my comments to the highlights.

First, we direct NASA to study the prospects for commercial development, augmentation, or servicing of the international space station, including the funds that we might save through greater commercial involvement.

Second, we amend the Commercial Space Launch Act to give the commercial sector the legal ability to reenter Earth's atmosphere and return space payloads to Earth. This is a vital portion of the bill, as a handful of companies are building commercial reusable launch vehicles which will need to reenter Earth's atmosphere and land after delivering their payloads to orbit. NASA's own X-33 program is leading technology in this direction, so Congress and the White House must act soon to make commercial reentry from space legal.

Third, the bill confirms and supports the President's policies on the global positioning system [GPS]. GPS is a space-based system that people can use to determine their precise position on Earth. Although it is a military system, the Reagan administration decided a decade ago that its signal would be available to civilian users. Since then, the civil and commercial uses of GPS have exploded. According to a RAND Corp. study, the global market for nonmilitary GPS goods and services could reach \$8.47 billion by the year 2000. Other governments are considering entering this area of space activity. Because our national security and economic interests are better served if the U.S. system becomes the world standard, the bill encourages the President to enter into regional agreements with foreign governments to secure the U.S. GPS as the world's standard. This encouragement will strengthen the administration's negotiating position by presenting a united front overseas

without tying its hands to reach the best agreement.

Fourth, the bill streamlines the process of obtaining a license to operate a commercial remote sensing satellite. The Government has issued seven licenses to the industry to image the Earth from space, enabling our commercial sector to compete with a host of corporate, government, and quasi-private entities from other countries seeking to dominate global remote sensing markets. U.S. leadership of this industry is crucial if we are to ensure that its benefits accrue to Americans and that the global industry remains under the control of the United States. If we allow foreign entities to lead the industry, then we will lose insight into and control over the use of high-resolution remote sensing imagery during times of crisis. This bill lays the foundation to ensure that American industry can set the pace of technical change in the industry so that we do not cede control over it to another country.

Fifth, the bill requires the Government to procure commercial space transportation services, instead of buying rockets. When the aviation industry began in this country, the Government procured air mail services from the commercial sector, allowing the market to determine the pace of innovation in the industry. The results of this decision made America's aeronautics industry the world's leader in just a few decades. We need to do the same thing for space and bring market mechanisms into the process of launching Government payloads. The bill does make appropriate exceptions, including giving the Defense Department considerable discretion in areas of national security.

This bill is based on legislation, H.R. 3936, that the House passed under suspension last year. That bill had broad bipartisan support and we worked very closely with the administration to ensure that it was consistent with President Clinton's objectives. After all, the President's policies help achieve our goals. This is one area where there is very little political disagreement. In the end, a Republican Congress and a Democratic White House can look back on a spirit of cooperation among the Nation's elected officials last year. The bill didn't become law because it was sent to the Senate in the waning days of the 104th Congress. By sending this bill to the Senate during the first session of the 105th Congress, we will be giving the Senators enough time to review and pass the bill. I hope that we can maintain the same level of cooperation and compromise as we experienced last year. Just as we worked on a bipartisan basis in the House last year, and just as we worked with the administration to move the bill forward, I am looking forward to working with the bill's supporters in the Senate this Congress.

As important as this bill is, it is not the last and final word on commercial space development or Government's role in it. It takes several very solid, but incremental steps down the path the American people have said they want to go. The changes we are making here are vital to providing the stable business environment that any young and growing industry needs to expand. To paraphrase Neil Armstrong as he leapt to the lunar surface 28 years ago, these small steps add up to one giant leap.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON  
THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1998

SPEECH OF

**HON. WALTER H. CAPPS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 20, 1997*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 84) establishing the Congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2002.

Mr. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the budget resolution. Though I have strong doubts about some of its provisions and fully oppose others, I am confident that this budget is, on balance, in the best interest of my constituents and the country.

This budget is a victory for fiscal responsibility. It offers sensible tax relief while increasing our commitment to education, health and environmental protection—all while achieving a balanced budget by 2002.

The capital gains tax reductions will help small businesses, family farms and high-tech companies throughout this country. Lower interest rates will free up capital, allow greater expansion for growing sectors of our economy, and reward risk-taking entrepreneurs. The likely \$500,000 exemption of profits from home sales will encourage home ownership and give many taxpayers flexibility with their largest financial asset.

I am particularly pleased that the new budget proposal calls for the strongest Federal support of education in 30 years. It strengthens the Head Start program to include an additional 200,000 young children by 2002 and provides for 1 million tutors for older students who need help catching up. The expansion of the Pell Grant programs and \$35 billion in education tax credits will increase access for working families and their children to help them help themselves through the wonders of higher education.

I believe in welfare reform, but I opposed the rank unfairness in last year's bill that sought to end all benefits to legal immigrants. The provisions to restore benefits to elderly disabled legal immigrants will help impart some fairness to welfare reform. I also support the tax incentives for businesses to help increase welfare-to-work opportunities.

This budget also restores health insurance for half of our Nation's 10 million uninsured children. While this is a good start, we must do more. No child in this country should be without health insurance. We should see this provision as a start in addressing this critical need throughout our country.

As the Representatives of one of the most beautiful districts in the Nation, I am pleased that the agreement also provides funding to double the pace of cleanup at Superfund toxic waste sites; increases funding for community redevelopment of contaminated urban areas (so called "brown fields"); and increases funding for ensuring the beauty of our National Parks.

But like many of my colleagues here today, I am concerned about the amount of savings—\$155 billion—to the Medicare program. These cuts will force a rise in seniors' premiums of perhaps more than \$5 per month by