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 Slink of Atlanta; two sisters, Kathleen 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, 6383 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 recommended 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 the 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 across-the-board, top-to-bottom cut in federal funding. 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:

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

THURSDAY, JULY 29, 1999.

NASA DESERVES BETTER

America's record budget surplus has left the nation with more 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 JPI research.

The decision of the Republican-dominated subcommittee was easy enough to understand. In that odd-ball 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 sub-committee'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 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 hurricane droughts, global warming and other climate changes.

NASA director Daniel S. Goldin turned NASA into a model for efficient, small government projects. 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's agency brings far more commensurate 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 agenda 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).

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

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

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 this 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 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 barefoot across vision: 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. A budget cut that reduced the burden on private income and reduced the burden on private income and 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.

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 method 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 ad-

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 Ken- nedy 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 is produced 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, there 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, which I believe, places trust and wisdom in the American people. Our views seem to strengthen personal freedom and reward individuals