

quaint by comparison. Violence that was once unthinkable now fails to shock. In our schools, and across the nation, we have, to borrow a phrase from my colleague Senator MOYNIHAN, "defined deviancy down."

This forum seeks answers to the questions of why kids kill, why teen violence is on the rise, and what can be done about it. Of course, there are no easy answers. But there are a lot of contributing factors.

Perhaps the single most important factor is the continued breakdown of the American family. Today, almost a third of all children are born out of wedlock. Around half of all children will live in a broken home before they turn 18. Tens of millions of little boys and girls will grow up without a loving and committed father.

There are other cultural warning signs. Popular entertainment continues to glamorize violence. Movies and computer games grow ever more gory and grisly. Chart-topping songs feature lyrics celebrating torture, rape, and murder.

Glorifying violence in popular entertainment—whether it be music, or movies, or video games—is dangerous. It is dangerous because a society that glorifies violence will grow more violent.

We had a hearing recently on the issue of music lyrics. One person made the point along this line and said that if John Philip Sousa's music makes us feel patriotic, and if other music, like Frank Sinatra's, makes us feel romantic, what does music that is violent make us feel? If it is hateful, if it is anti-women, if it is oriented towards death and destruction, we think that is going to make us feel that way—that music will just wrap around your soul and cause some distortions to take place.

But most importantly, this discussion will focus on ways to prevent, curtail, and combat teen violence—whether on the Congressional, state, local, or societal level.

I hope that we will gain insight not only on the proper government policies to deter and combat crime, but also on non-governmental initiatives—including those by churches, faith-based organizations, and charities—that have reached out to troubled youth, and succeeded where government has failed.

One of the great things about our nation is that for each of our problems, there are people who are living and working the solution. In churches, youth groups, schools, charities, and families across the nation, miracles are every day taking place. These groups show what is possible by what is actual—that is, their real-life success stories should inspire us with the possibilities.

We in Congress need to enact wise and prudent crime-fighting policies. But we also need to allow these small, often faith-based groups to touch the souls and transform the lives of those in need.

Mr. President, I know that you, as the Presiding Officer and a Senator in this body, know full well the problems that we are facing in this culture and in this society, and the increase in the violent nature of what is happening here. We are all troubled and very perplexed by it.

What we are hoping with this discussion and policy forum that Senator LIEBERMAN and I have today is that we will be able to begin the national dialog—actually not only begin but continue the national dialog—about what each of us can do now to become a more civilized country to stop the violence from growing.

Abe Lincoln made a point that the United States frequently is a nation that moves to a common thought. I think today we have decided we have focused in on saying this is a major problem. Youth violence is a major problem. What can each of us in our individual capacities and our capacities in this body, or in other places—in our communities and homes, in our churches and synagogues—do to solve this problem?

That is what we are going to focus on today—some of the individual solutions that have taken place, what are appropriate governmental policies. But, more importantly, let's get to the common thought on how to start solving this growing problem in America.

I invite my colleagues to tune in to this policy forum that we will have starting today at 2:30. I hope some of them will be willing to join us and follow the subsequent proceedings as we pick up this debate and try to carry it on forward.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the session be put into recess until after the caucuses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to that request?

Mr. BROWNBACK. I object to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I withdraw the request.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is debating a motion to proceed on S. 648.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the Chair.

#### JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I noticed we were in a quorum call. I was going to mention a situation that we have today that we may want to think about as we consider moving to proceed. Tonight much of America is going to observe a midsummer tradition, the major league baseball All-Star Game.

A number of teams are having outstanding seasons, including the New York Yankees, Atlanta Braves and San Diego Padres. Adding special interest to this season is the possibility that the single-season records for home runs and runs batted in may be broken.

Now, when Roger Maris and Mickey Mantle were chasing the home run record in 1961, they finished the first half of the season at 33 and 28 homers, respectively. At this year's All-Star break, Mark McGwire already has 37 homers, Ken Griffey, Jr., 35, and Sammy Sosa 33, as they head toward Maris' record of 61.

Some may recall from baseball history what Babe Ruth said when he was asked about his \$80,000 contract for 1930—it was 10 years before I was born—and at the time it was the highest salary ever agreed to be paid to a baseball player. In a response to a reporter's comment that he was earning more money than the President of the United States, the Babe remarked, "Why not? I had a better year than he did."

So, too, when the American people consider how the Senate is meeting its responsibilities with respect to judicial vacancies, we are going to have to conclude that Mark McGwire is having a better year than the Senate. In light of the All-Star Game being played tonight, let us compare the Senate's pace in confirming much-needed Federal judges to Mark McGwire's home run pace. The Senate got off to an early lead this year. From January through the end of April, the Senate confirmed 22 judges. The Senate's pace, though, slowed in May. We have not been able to generate any real momentum through the spring and early summer. The number of Federal judges confirmed all year is only 33.

Of course, the Senate's early lead on McGwire started to vanish once the baseball season started on March 31, which happens to be my birthday. It took "Big Mac" only 10 weeks to match the Senate's total. By June 8 he had caught and passed the Senate's total and he has been looking back at us ever since. McGwire is on a pace to shatter Maris' record and total 70 home runs in a single season.

You can see on my chart: July—judges confirmed by the Senate, 33; McGwire's home runs, 37; October projections—for the Senate only 51; but for McGwire, 70.

Unfortunately, the Senate is nowhere near a record pace. As recently as 1994—coincidentally, the last year in which the Senate majority was Democrats—the Senate confirmed 101 judges. It has taken the Republican Senate three years to reach the century mark and to do what a Democratic Senate was able to achieve in a single session.

As Chief Justice Rehnquist—and I have no idea if like Justice Blackmun, he is a baseball fan or not—but he correctly observed: “The Senate confirmed only 17 judges in 1996 and 36 in 1997, well under the 101 judges it confirmed in 1994.”

This chart also shows you where the Senate is today as compared to our total of judges confirmed in 1994, when we had confirmed 44 judges in July on our way to 101 confirmations. That out paced even Mark McGwire. Here again are our October projections: Judges confirmed at the current pace, probably around 51. I think Mark McGwire is on a pace to get 70. And, of course, the Congress, when last controlled by the Democrats confirmed 101.

I hope that some think about this when we are watching the All-Star Game tonight. Would not the Senate be more productive if we could do just a little more and get a bit closer to the pace being set by some of our favorite baseball players? We are supposed to be the stars of the legislative firmament, but we certainly aren't All-Stars when it comes to this.

We began this year with the criticism of the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court ringing in our ears: “Vacancies cannot remain at such high levels indefinitely without eroding the quality of justice that traditionally has been associated with the federal judiciary.”

Both the Second Circuit and the Ninth Circuit have had to cancel hearings over the past couple of years due to judicial vacancies. Chief Judge Winter of the Second Circuit has had to declare a circuit emergency and to proceed with only one circuit judge on their three-judge panels.

In response to the criticism of the Chief Justice, the Republican leadership has argued that the Senate is on a steady course and making steady progress. So was the Titanic as it headed towards the icebergs. It was only in the last 9 weeks of the last session that the Senate achieved any real progress. In that period, in conjunction with the President's national radio address on the crisis, the Senate confirmed 27 judges in 9 weeks.

I began this year challenging the Senate to maintain that pace. Instead, we confirmed only 33 judicial nominees in 18 weeks in session instead of the 54 we would have confirmed if we had maintained last year's pace.

I have reissued my challenge for the last 10 weeks in session, which are all that remain to the Senate this entire year. We can confirm another 30 nominees by the end of the session if the Senate will work at the pace it achieved at the end of last year.

We have held only seven judicial nomination hearings all year. I recall in 1994, the most recent year in which the Democrats constituted the majority, the Judiciary Committee held 25 judicial confirmation hearings, including hearings to confirm a Supreme Court Justice, which automatically take far, far more time than others. That is 25 hearings as compared with seven.

They had no vacancy on the Supreme Court this year, but nine of the current nominees for the courts of appeals need their hearings and they need them promptly. We have 25 currently pending nominees to the district courts, and only one of those is less than 30 days old.

We should not tolerate upwards of 73 vacancies in the Federal courts, with more on the horizon. Almost one in 10 judgeships remains unfilled, and from the looks of things, they are going to remain unfilled into the future. The Judiciary Committee needs to do a better job, and the Senate needs to proceed more promptly and to consider nominees reported to it.

The nomination held the longest on the Senate calendar is Judge Sonia Sotomayor for a critical vacancy in the Second Circuit. I have already mentioned that in that circuit, which is my own, the Chief Judge has declared an emergency situation. Chief Judge Winter recently issued his annual report in which he notes that the court now has the greatest backlog it ever had.

Ironically, it was Judge Sotomayor who issued a key decision in 1995 that brought an end to the work stoppage in major league baseball. How wonderful it would be if today, at the time of this year's All-Star Game, the Senate would end its work stoppage with respect to her nomination and proceed to consider and confirm her.

This brings me back to the All-Star Game, Mr. President. We will applaud these outstanding players and we will cheer the baseball teams represented. As a New Englander, I historically applaud the Red Sox, no matter how they do—although they had a pretty good first half. Every one of us has favorite players and teams. We stick with them even when they fall behind. But none of these teams has fallen as far behind where they should be as the U.S. Senate has, none has been so disappointing.

Let us try harder. Let us try to confirm at least as many judges as Mark McGwire is going to hit home runs. If we do not want to use the Constitution as an inspiration, if we do not want to use judicial vacancies and the harm they cause as an inspiration, if we do not want to use the potential collapse of the Federal judicial system as an inspiration, maybe some can take inspiration from America's pastime and say, “If Mark McGwire can do it, so can the U.S. Senate.”

We have not yet, but hope springs eternal. Let us take his effort and commitment as inspiration. Let us not

keep hitting foul balls. Let the Senate hit a home run now and then. It would be a home run for the American people if the Senate stopped holding the Federal judiciary hostage. We should help fill these vacancies. Let's do it.

We have 45 judicial nominations pending, some of whom were first received over three years ago. There are currently nine qualified nominees on the Senate calendar who have been reported favorably by the Judiciary Committee.

In addition, there are 36 nominees pending before the Judiciary Committee and more nominees are being received from the President every week. I hope that the Committee will schedule prompt hearings for each of the judicial nominees currently pending in Committee and for the nominees we expect to be receiving over the next several weeks so that they may have an opportunity to be considered by the Committee and confirmed by the Senate.

At the conclusion of the debate on the nomination of Merrick Garland to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, as 23 Republicans were preparing to vote against that exceptionally well-qualified nominee whose confirmation had been delayed 18 months, Senator HATCH said “playing politics with judges is unfair, and I am sick of it.” I agree with him. I look forward to a return to the days when judicial nominations are treated with the respect and attention that they deserve.

I calculate that the average number of days for those few lucky nominees who are finally confirmed is continuing to escalate. In 1994 and 1995 judicial nominees took on average 86 or 87 days from nomination to confirmation. In 1996, that number rose to a record 183 days on average. Some would discount that number because it was a presidential election year, but even they cannot ignore that it shattered the previous record.

Last year, the average number of days from nomination to confirmation rose dramatically yet again, and this in the first year of a presidential term. From initial nomination to confirmation, the average time it took for Senate action on the 36 judges confirmed in 1997 broke the 200-day barrier for the first time in our history. It was 212 days. Unfortunately, that time is still growing and the average is still rising to the detriment of the administration of justice. The average time from nomination to confirmation is now over 260 days. That is three times the time it took before this partisan slowdown began in earnest.

The Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court has called the number of judicial vacancies “the most immediate problem we face in the federal judiciary.”

I have urged those who have been stalling the consideration of the President's judicial nominations to reconsider and work to fulfil this constitutional responsibility. Those who delay

or prevent the filling of these vacancies must understand that they are delaying or preventing the administration of justice. Courts cannot try cases, incarcerate the guilty or resolve civil disputes without judges.

The Republican Senate leadership seems to be operating under several false assumptions. As recently as June 22, they have stated that there is no problem with the scores of long-standing judicial vacancies because the federal judiciary has 767 active judges, which are more than the number of active judges sitting during the Reagan and Bush administrations.

Unfortunately, their statement fails to consider the enormous growth in the workload of the federal courts over the last two decades. The federal judiciary's workload was at least 60 percent lower than it is today when the Reagan-Bush administrations took office. The federal court's criminal docket alone is up from 28,921 cases in 1980 to 50,363 last year. That is an increase of over 70 percent in the criminal case filings in the federal courts.

Moreover, if the Republicans have their way, this Congress will add more and more cases to the federal courts' workload. Among their priorities are a products liability bill, a so-called "takings" bill and a version of a juvenile crime bill that each federalizes huge portions of what have traditionally been cases handled through state courts.

In recognition of the growing federal court workload, Congress authorized an additional 85 authorized judgeships back in 1984. The vacancies were then filled without delay by Congress, including the 100th Congress in which there was a Democratic majority. Indeed, in 1987 and 1988, the last two years of the Reagan administration, a Democratic Senate confirmed 96 judges, leaving only 23 vacancies at the end of that Congress.

In 1990, a Democratic Congress created 85 additional judgeships during the Bush administration. That brought an anomalous spike in the vacancy numbers. During the 102nd Congress, in 1991 and 1992, the last two years of the Bush administration, the Senate Judiciary Committee under the chairmanship of a Democrat, held 30 confirmation hearings and the Democratic Senate confirmed 124 Bush nominees to the federal bench. In fact, in 1992, during President Bush's last year in office a Democratic Senate confirmed 66 of his nominations.

Thus, during the Reagan and Bush years, both Democratic and Republican Senates not only promptly considered and confirmed judges but also authorized 167 new judgeships in response to the increasing workload of the federal judiciary. Authorized judgeships have increased in number by 25 percent since 1980 while the workload of the federal courts has grown by over 60 percent during the same period. That is why the prolonged vacancies being perpetuated by delays in the confirmation

process are creating such strains within the federal courts.

Presidents Reagan and Bush were able to appoint 579 federal judges, including 291 confirmed by a Democratic Senate from 1987 through 1992. In the last two years of the Bush administration, 1991 and 1992, a Democratic Senate held 30 hearings and confirmed 124 judges nominated by a President of the other party, with 66 coming in 1992, a presidential election year.

When Republicans note that President Clinton has appointed 273 federal judges over the past six years, they invariably fail to mention that 129 of these nominees were confirmed by a Democratic Senate in 1993 and 1994. Over the past four years, Republican have confirmed a total of fewer than 145 federal judges, during a time in which the judicial vacancy rate has continued to hover between 70 and 110 long-standing vacancies and the workload of federal courts continues to grow.

So unlike other periods in which judicial vacancies could be attributed to newly-created judgeships, during the past four years the vacancies crisis has been created by the Senate's failure to move quickly to consider nominees to long-standing vacancies.

Republicans also suggest that maintaining as many as 60 vacancies is "virtually full employment" on the federal bench. I disagree. In the early and mid-1980's, vacancies were between 25 and 34 at the beginning of each session of Congress. By the fall of 1983, the vacancies for the entire federal judiciary had been reduced to only 16.

With attrition and the 85 new judgeships created in 1984, vacancies reached 123 at the beginning of President Reagan's second term, but those vacancies were reduced to only 33 within two years, by the fall of 1986. A Democratic Senate in 1987 and 1988 reduced the vacancies still further to only 23 at the end of the 100th Congress.

It was not until the additional judges were created in 1990 that the next significant spike in vacancies occurred and then, again, the Democratic Senate responsibly set about the task of helping fill those vacancies with qualified nominees. Although President Bush was notoriously slow to nominate, the Democratic Senate confirmed 124 nominees in President Bush's last two years and cut the vacancies in half.

Republicans also contend, erroneously, that the Clinton administration has stated that 63 vacancies is acceptable and "virtually full employment." They misinterpret a press release from October 1994. That press release was pointing out that if the Senate had proceeded to confirm the 14 nominees then on the Senate calendar it would have brought the total judges confirmed during President Clinton's first two years to over 140 and would have reduced the judicial vacancy rate to 4.7 percent, which the press release then proceeded to compare to a favor-

able unemployment rate of under 5 percent.

This was not a statement of administration position or even a policy statement but a poorly designed press release that included an ill-conceived. Job vacancy rates and unemployment rates are not comparable. Judicial vacancy rates have significance beyond general unemployment statistics.

When I learned that some Republicans had for partisan purposes seized upon this press release, taken it out of context, ignored what the press release actually said and were manipulating it into a misstatement of Clinton administration policy, I asked the Attorney General, in 1997, whether there was any level or percentage of judicial vacancies that the administration considered acceptable or equal to "full employment."

The Department responded:

There is no level or percentage of vacancies that justifies a slow down in the Senate on the confirmation of nominees for judicial positions. While the Department did once, in the fall of 1994, characterize a 4.7 percent vacancy rate in the federal judiciary as the equivalent of the Department of Labor 'full employment' standard, that characterization was intended simply to emphasize the hard work and productivity of the Administration and the Senate in reducing the extraordinary number of vacancies in the federal Article III judiciary in 1993 and 1994. Of course, there is a certain small vacancy rate, due to retirements and deaths and the time required by the appointment process, that will always exist. The current vacancy rate is 11.3 percent. It did reach 12 percent this past summer. The President and the Senate should continually be working diligently to fill vacancies as they arise, and should always strive to reach 100 percent capacity for the federal bench.

At no time has the Clinton administration stated that it believes that 60 vacancies on the federal bench is acceptable or a virtually full federal bench. Only Republicans have expressed that opinion. As the Department noted last year, the Senate should be "working diligently to fill vacancies as they arise, and should always strive to reach 100 percent capacity for the federal bench."

With respect to the question of vacancies, it is also important to note that in 1997 the Judiciary Conference of the United States requested an additional 53 judgeships be created and the Republican Congress has refused to consider that workload justified request. My bill to meet that request, S.678, the Federal Judgeship Act of 1997, has received no attention since I introduced it over a year ago. Had those additional judgeships been created, as they were in 1984 and 1990 under Republican Presidents, current judicial vacancies would number 123 and total almost 14 percent of the federal judiciary.

I hope that the Judiciary Committee and the Senate will proceed to consider and confirm judicial nominees more promptly and without the months of delay that now accompany so many nominations. I hope the Committee

will not delay in scheduling the additional hearings we need to hold to consider the fine men and women whom the President has nominated to fill these important positions.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RECESS

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now stand in recess under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:29 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COATS).

Mr. LOTT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. BOND. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now resume consideration of the VA-HUD appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2168) making appropriations for the Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I think the distinguished Senator from Arkansas is ready to proceed with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 3062

(Purpose: To terminate the Space Station and provide additional funding for veterans and low-income housing)

Mr. BUMBERS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMBERS], for himself, Mr. BRYAN, Mr.

WELLSTONE, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. KOHL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. FEINGOLD and Mr. DURBIN, proposes an amendment numbered 3062.

Mr. BUMBERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike line 21 on page 76 through line 4 on page 77 and insert the following:

“For termination of the International Space Station project, \$850,000,000. In addition to the other provisions of this Act, \$1,000,000,000 shall be available for the Veterans Health Administration Medical Care account and \$450,000,000 shall be available for the Housing Certificate Fund account within the Department of Housing and Urban Development’s budget.”

Mr. BUMBERS. Mr. President, this will be the eighth year that I have stood here and debated whether or not America should go forward with a space station. I didn’t like the idea of the Space Station *Freedom*, but it was probably a bargain compared to what the International Space Station is turning out to be.

First, I would like to pose a question to my colleagues: Why is it that we continue to fund a program called the International Space Station, when every cellular biologist, every medical researcher, and every physicist in America who isn’t involved in the program itself is vehemently opposed to it? These are some of the most brilliant people in America. Before we start off spending \$100 billion, we ought to ask ourselves, Why are they opposed? Well, for very good reasons, and I will come back to those in just a minute.

It is a mystery that here in Congress we talk seriously about a program which in the last 3 years has become almost laughable. If it weren’t so serious and the amount of money so enormous, it would be almost a comedy—a comedy of errors.

The cost began to spiral in 1996—maybe before that, but that was the first time we really knew it. The Russians have had space stations up for almost 30 years. The Mir is the seventh space station that the Russians have had up since 1971. And what do they have to show for it? Absolutely nothing.

In a little while, I will come back and quote some of the top Nobel Prize winners, some of the top physicists in America, cellular biologists—you name it. I will come back and quote several of them and what they have had to say about the space station as a research vehicle.

Now, you should bear in mind throughout this debate that when you talk about research on the space station, there is only one reason—one reason—you have to believe that the kind of research we are going to do, which NASA says will cure ingrown toenails, warts, cancer, sties—it will cure everything—you have to believe that research of whatever kind—mostly medical, and some of it molecular biol-

ogy—but you have to believe that something happens in a microgravity situation that you can’t emulate on earth, and not only is something going to happen in a microgravity situation, but it is going to be good. Again, I will come back to what the top scientists in this country have to say about it. But right now I will quote Professor Bloembergen, who is a top physicist at Harvard University. When he was President of the American Physical Society, which consists of 40,000 physicists, and, he summed it up when he said, “microgravity is of micro importance.”

JOHN GLENN came to the Senate with me. We developed a warm friendship the first day we met and we have remained friends. I consider him one of my dearest friends, except when I bring this amendment up. But Senator GLENN is not going to deny that about all you get out of this is whatever you can get from microgravity research that can be emulated on earth; but there is no need to emulate it on earth. You are going to hear all this business about gallium arsenide crystals, which is “bunk.” Even if you could build crystals on the space station, nobody on earth could afford to use them.

Well, Mr. President, why are all these people opposed? Why are the top people on whom we rely for all of our medical research, cellular research—the top scientists in America—why are they outraged by spending \$100 billion on one orbiting space station with a crew of, at first three people, and subsequently six or seven people? Why are they outraged? Well, one reason might be that they come up here pleading for money for honest-to-God research every year, and we give them a few shekels and off they go to do the best they can with it.

Think about the National Institutes of Health getting about \$13 billion a year, and they do research on everything—honest research. They send out money to every university in the country that has a medical school to do research. Well, if we ever get this thing in space, just the annual operating cost will be enough to fund 6,000 researchers at NIH and universities across America for a year. We are going to have six people on the space station doing what the National Research Council estimates to be 24 hours of research each day, at a cost at which we could hire 6,000 researchers on earth.

Do you want to hear another one? Once we get it deployed, we are going to leave it in space for 10 years. You multiply the man-hours by 10 years that we are going to get in research, and if you don’t just divide the annual operating costs, which, as I said a moment ago, would produce 6,000 researchers on earth, but divide it into the entire \$100 billion cost, which is a legitimate thing to do because, after all, we are spending \$100 billion to put the space station up and do research—whether you are going to build crystals or cure ingrown toenails, it is all research. But when you do that, the cost