

the legs. Take care of your legs. Now, let me take your arm, so I don't stumble on something."

He closed with that warm twinkle in this eyes, and the gentle, upbeat, pursed smile which is the image I shall forever harbor and always cherish.

Like my own father, who lived a river's length and a culture away, Charles Denechaud saw everything, overlooked a great deal, and forgave much.

As my father did with in-laws, Charles took me in as one of his own, without reservation, and extended the greatest of all treasures: the inclusiveness of family love.

It was not my privilege to know, at its peak, his dazzling legal mind, but I shared, at its best, his unbounded love, especially for the lady he always endearingly called "my bride."

The Psalmist wrote: "I will treat him as my first-born son. I will love him forever, and be kind to him always; my covenant with him will never end."

Written of David, Psalm 89 appropriately embraces Charles I. Denechaud, Jr.

CHARLES I. DENECHAUD, JR.

EULOGY OF JEAN K. OBERSTAR

Almost three years ago, when my father was in the hospital, his doctor came into his room and asked, "Mr. Denechaud, would you like to pray?" There was silence for a while and then my father said, "My life is a prayer." And indeed it was.

As a child, his likeness was used as a model for one of the cherubs in the Edward Francis Denechaud stained glass window here at Holy Name. Perhaps his life was directed toward goodness from that time forward. After all, how many mortals are used as models for angels?

Although I don't really think Charlie Denechaud needs prayers, I ask you to pray for him anyway. I am quite certain that God will scoop up all the left-overs and give them to souls who do need them.

One of the measures of Charlie Denechaud is that each of his five children is quite sure that he or she was his favorite child. But whoever that person may have been, he or she takes a dim second place in terms of the love and devotion he had for his bride.

Mother, you must be so very proud of him and so very proud to have been his bride. I understand and have great empathy for your sadness. I share it. We all do. But never forget the love and pride you have for him—and he, absolutely, for you.

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, July 25, 1999]

CHARLES I. DENECHAUD JR., ARCHDIOCESE ATTORNEY

Charles I. Denechaud Jr., a lawyer who represent the Archdiocese of New Orleans and a number of other Catholic institutions in the city, died Saturday at his home. He was 86.

Mr. Denechaud, retired senior partner of Denechaud & Denechaud, was a lifelong resident of New Orleans.

Mr. Denechaud "was one of the leading citizens we had in this community," said G. Frank Purvis Jr., a friend for more than five decades.

"He was a very fine lawyer and a very dedicated lawyer, both to his profession and to his faith," said Purvis, the former chairman of Pan-American Life Insurance Co. in New Orleans.

The Denechaud family has represented the archdiocese since 1901, beginning with Mr. Denechaud's father, Charles Sr. The firm also has represented Loyola and Xavier universities, the Daughters of Charity, Hotel Dieu hospital and Jesuit High School.

Mr. Denechaud represented WWL television since the station's inception, and played a crucial role in Loyola University's acquisition of the station, his son, Charles III, said.

Mr. Denechaud attended Our Lady of Lourdes school, Jesuit High School and Loyola University and received an honorary L.L.D. degree from Xavier University in 1954.

He was a former member of the President's Council of Loyola University, New Orleans Hospital Council, National Association of College and University Attorneys, United Negro College Fund, American Hospital Association, New Orleans Hospital Council, Louisiana Hospital Association and Catholic Hospital Association.

He was former member of the board of advisors of WWL and First National Bank of Commerce in New Orleans and the board of directors of Chinchuba Deaf Mute Institute, New Orleans Public Library, Metropolitan Area Committee, National American Bank, Sisters of the Immaculate Conception, Eucharistic Missionaries of St. Dominic, and National Diocesan Attorneys Association.

He was former chairman of Hotel Dieu Board of Advisors, St. Vincent Infant Asylum Board of Advisors and Our Lady of Holy Cross College Board of Lay Trustees. He was past president and director of Blue Cross of Louisiana and Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, past president of the Audubon Park Commission and past director of the Marquette Association for Higher Education, St. Mary's Catholic Orphan Boys Asylum, New Orleans Chamber of Commerce and National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Mr. Denechaud was a member of the New Orleans Bar Association and served as its vice president from 1944 to 1945. He was also a member of the Louisiana, American and Federal Communications Bar Associations.

He was a member of Holy Name Society, St. Thomas More Catholic Lawyers Association, Alumni Chapter of Beggars Fraternity, President's Associates of Loyola University, New Orleans Country Club, Startford Club and Pickwick Club. He was named Layman of the Year by the Louisiana Hospital Association in 1969 and Outstanding Alumnus of the Year by Jesuit High School in 1978 and received affiliation to the Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul in 1981.

In 1947, Pope Pius XII named Mr. Denechaud a Knight of St. Gregory, one of the highest honors in the Catholic Church. He became a Knight Commander of the Order of St. Gregory the Great in 1958.

Survivors include his wife, Barbara Byrne; two sons, Charles III and Edward B. Denechaud; three daughters, Barbara Denechaud Boggs of Washington, D.C., Jean Kurth Oberstar of Washington, D.C. and Deborah Denechaud Slimp of Atlanta; two sisters, Kathleen D. Charbonnet and Margaret D. Ramsey; 13 grandchildren; and six great-grandchildren.

A Mass will be said Tuesday at 10:30 a.m. at Holy Name of Jesus Catholic Church, 6363 St. Charles Ave. Visitation will begin at 9 a.m. Burial will be in Metairie Cemetery. Lake Lawn Metairie Funeral Home is in charge of arrangements.

DO NOT CUT NASA'S BUDGET

(Mr. ROGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, the House is recommending a \$1.4 billion cut out

of NASA's budget. This is wrong. With the string of accomplishments and world firsts under its belt, NASA has exceeded its goals of both this decade, 40 years ago to send men to the moon and return them safely to earth.

Under these proposed cuts, one of NASA's primary installations, the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena, California will be the hardest hit. Their vital research leading us into the next century would be decimated by this action. The American people need to know that this is wrong, and I intend to join with my colleagues to fight these cuts.

NASA and JPL have proven that, in an era of diminishing Federal budgets, we can achieve results, in NASA Directors Dan Goldin's words, that are "faster, better and cheaper." We must not reward NASA's efficiency by further slashing their budget.

I urge my colleagues and the House leadership to reinstate full funding for NASA, JPL, and America's crucial space science programs. Those who wish to cut funds for NASA and JPL are the heirs of those who scoffed at Columbus because they thought the earth was flat.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following article for the RECORD:

THURSDAY, JULY 29, 1999.

NASA DESERVES BETTER

America's record budget surplus has left the nation more able than ever to reach for the stars, but to the astonishment of scientists a House appropriations subcommittee on Monday approved a spending bill that increases most federal agency budgets but takes a \$1.4-billion bite out of NASA's budget. That's 11%. Worse, the cut tends to target the agency's most cost-efficient and significant projects. Officials at Pasadena's Jet Propulsion Laboratory say the change would sharply set back JPL research.

The decision of the Republican-dominated subcommittee to scrap the Triana satellite was easy enough to understand. In that oddball project, a camera on the satellite would broadcast a live picture of Earth over the Internet, an idea conceived by Vice President Al Gore. Its demise wouldn't slow the forward march of science, but the subcommittee's other cuts would. They include: \$100 million for the Space Infrared Telescope, which would enable scientists to detect "brown dwarfs," substellar objects that the existing Hubble and Chandra space telescopes have trouble seeing. Their number and density must be known in order to calculate the mass of the universe and thus its age and ultimate fate. \$200 million for the Earth Observation system. This proposal for a network of satellites—conceived in the Reagan administration and officially initiated by President George Bush—would create Earth's first integrated system for understanding how clouds and other fine particles affect global temperatures and climate. The answers could help nations prepare for hurricanes, droughts, global warming and other climate changes.

NASA director Daniel S. Goldin turned NASA into a model for efficient, small government projects. In the 1960s NASA used 4% of the nation's budget to put a man on the moon—an inspiring endeavor that nonetheless yielded only marginal scientific returns. Today the agency's far more economical missions reap huge amounts of worthwhile

data while consuming less than 1% of the federal budget.

That's why members of the full House Appropriations Committee should restore NASA's funding when they take up the agency's budget on Friday. Democrats on the committee are expected to support restoration, but Republican members might need persuading. You can encourage them by calling the numbers below.

To take Action: Reps. Jerry Lewis (R-Redlands); Ron Packard (R-Oceanside); and Randy "Duke" Cunningham (R-San Diego).

□ 1500

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may give my special order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE DEBATE ON THE BUDGET SURPLUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, in the last couple of weeks we have seen a vigorous debate here in the House and in the other body. I think it is one that resonates across the country. That is, what to do with the projected \$3 trillion budget surplus.

There are those who want to argue that the path to prosperity really begins and ends here in Washington, that bigger government and higher taxes and taking away control from our everyday lives is the way to go.

There are those who feel that the path to prosperity is paved across every street across our great Nation; that rewarding people to go out and work hard, and to allow hard-working Americans to keep more of what they earn, that is the direction we believe is

the right way to go; to strengthen personal freedom, to strengthen individual liberty, and to allow economic growth to create more jobs and to put more people to work.

Mr. Speaker, this is a debate that is just beginning, but one I think every hard-working American taxpayer needs to take note of.

As a reference, I cite a statement that was given about 36 years ago from then President John Kennedy. These were his remarks.

The most direct and significant kind of Federal action in aiding economic growth is to make possible an increase in private consumption and investment demand—to cut the fetters which hold back private spending. In the past, this could be done in part by the increased use of credit and monetary tools, but our balance of payment situation today places limits on our use of those tools for expansion.

It could also be done by increasing Federal expenditures more rapidly than necessary, but such a course would soon demoralize both the government and the economy. If government is to retain the confidence of the people, it must not spend a penny more than can be justified on grounds of national need and spent with maximum efficiency.

The final and best means of strengthening demand among consumers and business is to reduce the burden on private income and the deterrents to private initiative which are imposed by our present tax system. This administration pledged itself last summer to an across-the-board, top-to-bottom cut in personal and corporate income taxes to be enacted and become effective in 1963.

Madam Speaker, President John Kennedy then, like Ronald Reagan several years ago, recognized what it meant to invest and truly believe in the spirit of the American people. This American spirit to produce, to invest, to create, and to give back is what this Nation is truly all about.

Currently we engage, as I say, in this debate, and although it is 36 years later, the core principles still remain the same. On one side are those who do not believe in the American spirit or the American people. According to this view, bigger government, higher taxes, and more government control is the answer and the salvation.

The alternative view, however, places trust and wisdom in the American people. Our views seem to strengthen personal freedom and reward individuals for the efforts they are willing to undertake. We wish to promote economic growth by reducing the tax burden on hard-working Americans and essentially telling the American people, we believe in you, we trust you, and we want you to keep more of your hard-earned money in your pockets, so you are allowed to spend that on your families, on your education, on your vacation, on your car, making that mortgage payment, buying the new washing machine.

Because ultimately it is not about, well, we are going to destroy this program or destroy that program. No, it is about reminding folks what is important: to protect and strengthen social security and Medicare, to strengthen our national defense, and so many

other vital programs that are critical to our Nation.

But when we are confronted with a projected \$3 trillion budget surplus generated by the American people, who are working hard every single day, I do not believe, nor do I think it is unfair, but in fact I think it is not right unless we give a portion of that money back to the people who earned it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. TANNER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my 5 minutes at this time.

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

There was no objection.

THE MEANING OF COMPASSIONATE CONSERVATISM: CUTTING FUNDING FOR AMERICA'S VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I believe I have discovered the meaning of compassionate conservatism, at least as defined by the congressional Republicans. It is conservative to cut funding for the critical needs of our Nation's veterans, and it is compassionate to use that money for pork projects for congressional people in exchange for their votes.

At least that is the definition implied by the VA-HUD-Independent Agencies appropriations bill which was crafted by the Republican majority in its subcommittee earlier this week.

As the Washington Post reported yesterday, this pending bill is chock full of pork, 215 provisions funding a host of projects and activities that have little or nothing to do with veterans or housing, or the other concerns that this bill is supposed to address.

Madam Speaker, the gentleman just before me spoke of returning the surplus to people. What we are doing here is returning that surplus in pork projects to the majority Congresspeople.

As one who has joined our veterans throughout the Nation in advocating for the past many months for additional funding in the veterans budget, I am frustrated, appalled, shocked, and angry at this turn of events.

Our veterans must wait for months to see a doctor, but we fund the pork project of a machine aimed at growing