

Space Station Alpha, as well as advances across a spectrum of emerging technologies.

The money we spend on space station finds practical applications for daily life on Earth, and it is money well spent. Unlike other Government programs, every dollar spent on space programs returns at least \$2 in direct and indirect benefits.

Why is it important for us to pass a multiyear authorization? In order to achieve the best, most cost-effective space station to meet the operating goal of 1998, the program requires stability. Yearly budget balances just serve to distract NASA from its mission. Space Station Alpha is already under construction at Marshall Space Flight Center and other centers around the country. In order to meet the scheduled launch of the first module in December 1997, NASA is committed to delivering the space station on time and on budget. H.R. 1601 ensures this by requiring the administrator to certify these conditions are met.

In addition, this bill sets up an annual authorizing cap through 2002, thus steering clear of cost overruns that have plagued the program in the past. We are taking responsibility by providing the proper level of oversight to avoid budgetary problems down the line. Our support is vital for the success of this program. The space shuttle will at last fulfill its envisioned mission as a primary vehicle for space station assembly, and a link between Earth and Alpha. We can only imagine the scientific advances developed on Alpha that will be an integral part of human life in the next century.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1601, the International Space Station Authorization Act of 1995.

The American people are tired of Washington wasting their money on frivolous projects. Projects that begin with good intentions. Projects that grow in size and price and begin to take on a life of their own because no one has the courage to stop them.

Proponents of this bill state that we must authorize the space station for the next 7 years to demonstrate a commitment to our international partners. Meanwhile, we leave ourselves no way out should any of our partners decide to end or decrease their participation. And if they do drop out, we will be forced to increase our spending to pick up the slack, or publicly admit that we have spent billions on a failed program.

Full program authorization is premature and ill-advised. Boeing has still not signed contracts with major subcontractors. International agreements have not been reached.

Space station supporters recognize that the program may not have the financial reserves to cover overruns. They acknowledge that our international partners are facing budget constraints and may not be able to fully participate. What they refuse to admit is that we do not need to spend \$94 billion to construct and maintain the space station until 2012 in order to demonstrate a cooperative international effort in space.

I have too many questions and far too many doubts about the space station to support a 1-

year, let alone a 7-year, \$13 billion authorization. We cannot afford the space station and we cannot afford to make the space station NASA's top priority at the expense of other worthwhile programs.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill which authorizes the international space station through completion in 2002. This House, during consideration of the VA/HUD appropriations bill, and the Senate, just yesterday, made very clear America's commitment to our international space station program.

Efforts to kill this very important program have been soundly defeated because the American people understand the significance of our manned space program to our nation's future. They share the excitement of the exploration of space because it touches the core of our American identity as pioneering adventurers.

And the success of the space station bears directly on how our future here on Earth, in the United States, in our schools, and hospitals, offices and factories will be shaped.

The opponents of the space station program have fought their hardest and they have lost. It's time for them to accept the will of the country.

This doesn't mean they shouldn't be watchdogs of the program—this bill requires certification that the program be on schedule and on budget each year in order for the authorization to remain in effect. But let me be clear, the debate over the existence of the program should end.

Mr. Chairman, just a few months ago, many around the world shared the excitement of the successful Shuttle-Mir docking. It was a nail-biting effort that required precision within thousandths-of-an-inch.

There can be no doubt that this was a significant achievement, but I wish it wasn't. At one point, watching the shuttle take off became commonplace. At one point, even the act of landing on the Moon became just another landing.

I'm looking forward to the day when the shuttle docking with the space station miles above the Earth no longer attracts attention because it's routine. This bill is an important step toward that day.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill—it gives stability to the station program, certainty to our international partners and it represents America's long-term commitment to our manned space program and the international space station.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman. This Congress has made budget cutting a priority. We have cut housing programs by \$4.9 billion, directly effecting the poor and elderly. We have cut the EPA by \$2.3 billion, threatening our water, air, and food safety. We have cut student loan programs by \$918 million. We have eliminated summer youth programs to save \$871 million. These budget cuts will affect every American, and come out of every pocket. Well, almost every pocket. The Science Committee has recommended that NASA should receive \$2.1 billion next year to build a space station. NASA's space station budget went untouched in this appropriations cycle, and received the same amount it got last year. However, all of NASA's non-space station programs were cut by 6 percent. We will gouge our seniors, our children, and our environment, but not the space station.

This authorization bill would give NASA \$13.1 billion over the next 7 years, to conduct experiments in a permanent space station. The Republican budget requires us to cut \$10.1 billion from student loans over the same period.

Budgeting priorities aside, this program is a bad idea. In 1984, the space station was originally budgeted at \$8 billion over the 40-year life of the project. We've already spent \$11 billion. According to a recent GAO estimate, the figure for completion has risen to \$93 billion. Perhaps we should spend our money improving this planet before we start wasting money on outer space.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Members for the debate, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SALMON) having assumed the chair, Mr. HOBSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, (H.R. 1601) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to develop, assemble, and operate the International Space Station, had come to no resolution thereon.

POLITICAL SUPPRESSION HEARINGS

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, political suppression hearings in the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight begin tomorrow and its first victim, if Members can believe it, is the YMCA.

In today's New York Times, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH], the subcommittee chairman, makes it clear these hearings will be used to investigate groups who have opposed the Republican agenda.

First, the majority attached the Istook political suppression amendment to the Labor-HHS appropriations bill. Next they poisoned the conference on the Treasury Postal bill by insisting on it there. Now the cancer has spread to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

The Istook amendment restricting so-called political advocacy might have been written as satire by George Orwell, or, in all seriousness, by Joe McCarthy. It is an intrusive regulatory scheme designed to gag groups who wish to participate in the political life of America.

If you have any doubt, Mr. Speaker, just look at this demand for the production of documents issued by the subcommittee chairman to witnesses at the hearing, requiring them to

produce exhaustive reports on their participation for 5 years in public affairs. All freedom-loving Americans should oppose this attack on the core principal of our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I include the document for the RECORD.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT,

Washington, DC.

Memo to: Executive Director.

From: Chairman David McIntosh.

Date: September 20, 1995.

Re: Oversight Questions Concerning Political Activity of Federal Grantees.

The Subcommittee on National Economic Growth, Natural Resources, and Regulatory Affairs will conduct a series of oversight hearings regarding Federal grantees' use of Federal funds for political activity. Thank you for agreeing to testify at the first such hearing.

Pursuant your conversation yesterday with Mildred Webber, Staff Director for the Subcommittee, attached are several questions and requests for documents that are relevant to our oversight investigation. In addition, Subcommittee counsel may contact you prior to the hearing to set up a meeting to ask any follow up questions we may have concerning your responses.

Please respond to each of the attached questions in writing by 5:00 p.m. Monday, September 25. Deliver your responses to Room B377 Rayburn H.O.B. If you have any questions regarding the scope or meaning of any of the questions, please contact Jon Praed, counsel to the Subcommittee, at 202-225-4407.

Thank you for your cooperation. I look forward to your testimony next week.

REQUESTS FOR DOCUMENTS

1. Please produce complete copies of your organization's publicity available Form 990 tax forms for the past two years.

2. Please produce a copy of the founding documents and/or charter for your organization that sets forward its founding or guiding principles.

3. Please produce a copy of your organization's annual report for the past two years.

4. Please produce all independent audits conducted of your organization in the past two years.

GENERAL BACKGROUND QUESTIONS

1. What is the tax status of your organization under Internal Revenue Code (IRC) section 501(c)?

2. If your organization is a section 501(c)(3) tax exempt organization, has it made the 501(h) election for purposes of political advocacy? If not, why not?

3. Identify each organization affiliated with your organization (by stating the affiliate's name, tax-status, tax identification number, place of incorporation, principal business address, telephone and facsimile number). For each affiliate that is a section 501(c)(3) tax-exempt organization, state whether it has made the 501(h) election for purposes of political advocacy. If not, explain why not.

4. Identify all transfers of monetary or non-monetary assets from your organization to any affiliated organizations, and from any affiliated organizations to your organization for the past 12 months.

5. How much federal taxes would your organization have owed last year had your organization not been tax-exempt? In the past 5 years? During the existence of your organization?

6. In addition to the tax windfall enjoyed by your organization, identify all other benefits your organization gains from its tax-ex-

empt status, including mail postage rate discounts (by describing the benefits and estimating the annual value of this benefit).

7. What is your understanding of the justification for your organization's tax-exempt status?

8. Does your organization believe that the current IRC limitations on the amount of non-Federal funds that can be spent by tax-exempt organizations on political advocacy, lobbying, and electioneering violate the First Amendment, or are otherwise unconstitutional? If so, please identify the limitations that are unconstitutional and explain the basis for your organization's belief. Is it your organization's belief that any of the limitations contained in the attached legislation violate the First Amendment or are otherwise unconstitutional? If so, please identify the limitations, explain the basis for your organization's belief, and distinguish this belief from its belief on the constitutionality of the current IRC limitations.

9. Does your organization engage in any non-tax-exempt business activities? If so, please describe those activities, and estimate the amount of revenue earned from those activities?

10. In the past five years, has your organization endorsed any products, goods or services? If so, identify the endorsements, and state the amount of any compensation your organization received for these endorsements.

11. How would your organization spend an extra \$1,000 this year? \$100,000? \$1,000,000?

12. For each of the past five years: state your organization's expenditures on salaries (including wages, bonuses, expense accounts and all other forms of compensation); itemize the salaries (including wages, bonuses, expense accounts and all other forms of compensation) paid to your top five officers and directors for the past five years.

13. What percentage of your organization's annual revenues are spent on fund raising?

14. If your organization is a coalition or association of organizations, please identify the member organizations by stating their full names, tax status, principal business address, telephone and facsimile numbers, and chief executive officer, and please state the amount of annual dues or membership fees paid to your organization by each member organization.

POLITICAL ADVOCACY INFORMATION

1. In the past five years, has your organization engaged in political advocacy as defined in the attached legislation? If so, please provide a brief description of the type of political advocacy engaged in, and a good faith estimate of the expenditures on each activity. Please answer for each affiliated organization.

2. Does your organization devote more than an insubstantial part of its activities to attempting to influence legislation by propaganda or otherwise, as that term is used in the Internal Revenue Code? What safeguards has your organization created, if any, to ensure that this limitation is not exceeded?

3. What percentage of your non-federal budget do you spend on political advocacy (as defined in the attached legislation), and what is the total amount?

4. Does your organization directly or indirectly participate in, or intervene in (including the publishing or distributing of statements), any political campaign on behalf of or in opposition to any candidate for public office? If so, please describe your organization's activities.

5. Does your organization disclose its political advocacy activities to its donors and potential donors? If so, please produce copies of all documents containing such disclosures. If not, please explain why not. Also, please

produce copies of all promotional and fund-raising materials distributed to potential donors.

GRANT INFORMATION

1. Has your organization received any federal grant funds since 1990? If so, please itemize for each grant received: the grant identification number; the amount or value of the grant (including all administrative and overhead costs awarded); a brief description of the purpose or purposes for which the grant was awarded; the identity of each Federal, State, local and tribal government entity awarding or administering the grant, and program thereunder; the name and tax identification number of each individual, entity or organization to whom your organization made a grant. Please answer this question with respect to each affiliate organization.

2. Does your organization receive donations, membership fees or dues from any other organizations that receive federal grant funds? If so, please identify the organizations and the amount(s) each of them have transferred to your organizations for the past two years. Were these organizations' contributions made possible by their receipt of federal grant funds? If not, how do you know? If so, justify your organization's decision to accept these contributions.

3. How does your organization separate federal grant funds from its non-federal funding? Is this record-keeping available to the public for inspection? Will you please make it available to the subcommittee for our review?

QUESTIONS REGARDING ABILITY TO COMPLY WITH THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION

1. Does your organization maintain accounting books and records relating to its activities? Are these books and records based on Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP)? If not, why are they not based on GAAP?

2. Does your organization allocate, disburse, or contribute any monetary or in-kind support to any individual, entity, or organization whose expenditures for political advocacy in any of the past five years exceeded 15 percent of its total expenditures for that year? 25%? 50%? 75%? 95%? For each of these thresholds, please identify each individual, entity or organization receiving the support, and the amount of support provided. If you are unable to answer this question for any of these thresholds, please explain why you are unable to answer.

3. Does your organization make available the results of nonpartisan analysis, study, research, or debate? If so, please identify the types of work made available by your organization in the past year.

4. Does your organization provide technical advice or assistance to a governmental body or to a committee or other subdivision thereof in response to a written request by such body or subdivision? If so, please identify the type of technical advice or assistance provided and the governmental body receiving it.

DROP SUNSET PROVISION FOR LOW INCOME HOUSING TAX CREDIT

(Mr. ORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to the Ways and Means Committee proposal to sunset the low-income housing tax credit, which is to be included in the House reconciliation bill.