1995–96 by 31 percent.There is a strong return on the investment. European industry expects to post sales of up to $12 billion from commercial launches of Ariane rockets by the end of the decade.

Although the United States remains a strong competitor with active spaceports and a healthy booster and satellite market, we have not charted a course to regain a leading role in what has become a very large market. Moreover, this very large market promises to be an even larger international enterprise in the 21st century.

We have to take a step out of the box and employ a new approach with regard to commercial space. The first step is educating and making the case that space is more than a NASA, science, or an exploration issue. Space is a vast area of untapped economic potential for local communities, State, and most importantly our Nation.

We are not looking for government to play the leading role, but instead we are looking to the private sector. But if we are to convince the private sector that commercial space is a worthwhile and ultimately profitable undertaking we have to demonstrate Government's commitment to a comprehensive commercial space policy and the development of commercial spaceports.

A spaceport is a transportation center that moves surface infrastructure into space. I believe that we ought to look at spaceports in the same way that we look at airports and treat them just like we would airports. Rather than moving passengers from one place to another, spaceports move commerce from one place to another.

The spaceport philosophy is a commitment to use-friendly environments, integrated launch services, and low-cost access to space. In addition 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 and timing is important. It is imperative that spaceport development progress quickly in order to maintain the other elements of the market.

In America today, there are only two existing spaceports, but many more who want to become active spaceports. I would encourage all States who are interested in developing spaceports to get involved. Commercial spaceports means jobs—many jobs. Jobs in building the spaceports; manufacturing rockets and satellites; research, training, and education.

Commercial spaceports produce positive economic return. In California for example, the growth of a spaceport helps in the revitalization of the high-tech industries which have been hurt by defense cuts. This means more high paying jobs, added business for local service providers, new hotels, homes, shopping centers, education centers, and research facilities.

In America we want to do it a little differently than other nations. We want to reach a point where government acts as a facilitator not an obstacle. We want the government to be primarily a customer rather than a provider. We want to give States the flexibility necessary to develop commercial spaceports and attract private industry support. We want to encourage greater private industry support through tax-exempt bond financing. We want spaceport development to progress free of the traditional regulatory barriers imposed by Government.

Mr. Speaker, commercial spaceport development is in the national economic interest. It is an issue of transportation and it should be pursued as part of a national transportation policy. It means jobs, it means economic opportunity, and it requires American leadership.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

A SMALLER, MORE EFFICIENT FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, for the first time today in 26 years, something very, very unusual has happened. That is, this morning at 1:05 a.m., the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives proposed a balanced budget, a balanced budget, one so that in 7 years our kids and grandkids won't be having more debt to pay off because we were not willing to face the tough task and make the tough choices now to be able to cut things back.

I think this is a grand moment that we are finally addressing this most critical of problems. This year alone the Federal debt is going to $5 trillion. If we don't balance the budget, going on the current projection path we have, if we don't put our oar into the water to make this happen, it is going to be at $7 trillion by the year 2002. It is time we do it.

There is only one way we are going to be able to balance the budget. That is, creating a smaller, more focused, more efficient Federal Government, one that was originally intended by the Founding Fathers, one that is not into all functions and tries to do everything for everybody but a limited government, a focused Federal Government, one I think that Thomas Jefferson would be proud of, one that I would hope that Peter Drucker, the management guru, would be proud of for its efficiency, and one most of all that I would hope the American people would be proud of for what it delivers of services of what they call on their Government to do.

We have had a Federal Government this past quarter of a century that has grown out of control and everybody has contributed to it, everybody in this country, and in this institution here on both sides of the aisle. It is time to get it back into control. It is time to cut it back. It is time to recreate the limited Government that was always intended by our Founding Fathers.

The Federal Government was not meant to be all things to all people. James Madison wrote early on in the founding of our country this:

''The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the Federal Government are few and defined.''

We must get the Federal Government back to its core functions of what it was originally intended to be and not flung out here into so many different things but focused, efficient, and smaller so that we can be able to cut back on the spending, so that we can be able to not deliver so much debt to our children, so that we can hold the dream out and push toward even paying off the debt, the nearly $5 trillion in debt that has been accumulated.

There are a number of proposals that have been put forward. Some of them call for the elimination of whole agencies in the Federal Government, agencies such as the Department of Commerce and Energy, HUD and Education, keeping certain of the core functions that are functions of the Federal Government and should be done by the Federal Government and eliminating other portions, privatizing some functions and sending some functions back to State and local units of government so that at the end of the day we have a smaller, more focused, more efficient Federal Government.

This is an absolute need, if for no other reason than for our children and grandchildren, so that they can have a future, not saddled with this huge debt, not saddled with such an enormous mortgage on America.

HAITI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I rise with great concern over the administration's action in Haiti. On March 31, 1995, President Clinton turned over control of the Multi National Force [MNF] in Haiti, to the United Nations, under the auspice of the U.N. Mission in Haiti [UNMIH]. UNMIH, although still under American command, differs from the previous U.S. operation in two respects. The net effect of these changes is a U.S. commander and U.S. forces under the control of the U.N. Special Representative, Mr. Lakhdar Brahimi and a U.N. mandate for rules of engagement [ROE] which dictate the use of force by U.S. troops.