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

THE INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION PROGRAM DESERVES OUR CONTINUED SUPPORT

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to come here this evening and talk to my colleagues for a few minutes about the VA–HUD bill that is going to come up tomorrow and talk specifically about potential amendments that are going to be made.

It is important for us to lend our support to the overall NASA budget and, specifically, manned space exploration and those items that center around the International Space Station.

There has been an awful lot of talk in the last several weeks about potential cuts in the International Space Station because of the overruns that had been talked about for a long period of time. We are looking at building a facility that has never been built before and doing things that are absolutely new technology. The guesses in the expenditures of what it was going to take to create this facility have not always been right; and, unfortunately, we are facing more costs than what we originally anticipated.

Something has to be done about that. We hope we will find a way in our committees to ask the tough questions of the contractors and of NASA to make sure that we get a better handle on what is going to be spent in the future with regard to any space activity, whether it is manned or robotic.

But, right now, we are making some real serious decisions and potentially bad decisions with regard to the International Space Station. We are talking about taking parts of the International Space Station, such as the crew return vehicle, which allows a full crew of seven people to do the science necessary to get a return from our exploration in space.

If we stop the construction of the crew return vehicle, then we will only be able to accommodate three to six people on the International Space Station. If we did six, a total of two Soyuz return vehicles, one commander for each vehicle, that would dramatically reduce our ability to do the science that we have built the International Space Station for in the first place.

A lot has been done, and we have succeeded in getting significant amounts of monies put into the appropriations bill, which will be considered tomorrow in the VA–HUD and Independent Agencies appropriation bill.

Some of those amendments will be Space Station-killing amendments, so I am here to ask my colleagues to give very serious consideration to anything that would stop this huge investment that we have made and the opportunity for us to get a significant return on that investment over the next many years, an investment in knowledge of what is out beyond Earth's surface; what we might be able to gain in knowledge as we explore space that could change our health, our lives, knowledge-wise as far as why human beings are here; or perhaps something as simple as a solution to or a cure for a particular illness.

Those are the things we have gotten out of our space exploration for decades, and it is interesting to note some statistics: that in the 1960s, during the Apollo period, in the 1960s and 1970s, 4 percent of our Nation's budget went to NASA, 4 percent. Today, that amount is less than six-tenths of 1 percent.

It is also interesting that some of these amendments that may be considered tomorrow that will replace money from NASA, take money away from NASA and put it either into the VA or HUD parts of that bill, let us consider what has happened to Housing and Urban Development, as an example. They have had an increase from $16 billion to $31 billion in the last several years. The Veterans Administration has had increases from $40 billion to $50 billion, a 25 percent increase only in the last 4 or 5 years.

We want to support both of those. I will be supporting them. Both have had significant increases in this year's appropriation. The NASA budget has stayed flat, at $14 billion, for the last many years. It is time for our commitment to space to be reiterated, to be spoken of again in a way that we spoke of it in the 1960s.

I remember when President Kennedy challenged our country to send a man to the moon and return him safely within a decade, and we did it. It changed the way we educated our children, it changed the way we did business. It brought huge returns to us.

So, in wrapping this up, I ask my colleagues to pay very much attention to the VA–HUD appropriation tomorrow and to support NASA in every way they can.

□ 2115

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. BROWN of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

COMPACT DIVISIVENESS COULD DAMAGE DAIRY INDUSTRY

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

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Fort Atkinson, Wisconsin-based national dairy farm magazine, Hoard's Dairyman, on its editorial page, expressed its support for the continuation of the Northeast Dairy Compact and allowing other regions of the country to form their own compacts. As a representative of a Congressional District with a large dairy producing population, and as a strong advocate of States' rights, I implore my fellow Members to keep an open mind on the complex interstate dairy compact issues.

I would like to read this thought-provoking editorial from the prestigious dairy magazine from the heart of dairy country, Wisconsin.

''Editorial comment: Compact Divisiveness Could Damage Our Industry. Hoard's Dairyman. Fort Atkinson, Wisconsin. July 2001.

''Dairy compacts, in the eyes of their proponents, help stabilize and boost dairy farmer incomes by flooring Class I prices. Opponents see compacts as an unconstitutional restraint of commerce, a rip-off of consumers and processors, and distortion of supply and demand. We see the compact ''cup'' as being half full rather than half empty. That is why we support continuation and extension of the compact concept. We do so for the same reasons we work together to improve and stabilize their incomes.

''To us, compact pricing is of little difference to the overorder Class I premiums negotiated across the country by the dozen or more groups of dairy co-ops working together. Compacts are different in that they are not voluntary. Rebel processors and producers cannot circumvent the system by undercutting established prices. And unlike marketing federation boards, compact commissions represent consumers, processors, as well as producers.

''The Northeast Dairy Compact has improved incomes for dairy farm families, without hurting milk consumption or adding to price support costs. There is even a provision for leaving food programs, such as Women, Infants, and Children programs, unaffected by higher milk prices. Nor has the Northeast Compact contributed to lower Class III prices, as many in the upper Midwest contend. We see no reason to prevent dairy farmers in the South or other regions from working together the same way.

''Our biggest fear about compacts is that the issue will further divide the industry that needs cohesion more than ever. Unless cooler heads prevail, we will shoot ourselves in the foot over compacts just as we have on many other issues.''

Mr. Speaker, it is a myth that upper Midwest farmers oppose dairy compacts. I urge my colleagues to pay attention to the growing support from across the country for dairy compacts. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle from all States to advance this important legislation.