

current agreements not be opened for renegotiation until such meetings are held.

Your consideration and cooperation in this matter is much appreciated.

Sincerely,

BOB GRAHAM,
U.S. Senator.
CONNIE MACK,
U.S. Senator.

SPACEPORT FLORIDA AUTHORITY,
COCOA BEACH, FL.
November 9, 1995.

Ambassador MICKAEK KANTOR,
U.S. Trade Representative,
Washington, DC.

DEAR AMBASSADOR KANTOR: I am profoundly concerned that consideration is being given to authorizing the use of excess Ukrainian ballistic missiles for sale to commercial United States payloads. As you know, the American launch industry is attempting to establish a strong commercial launch sector. This is especially critical to the economy of Florida in light of continuing reductions in civil and military launch missions.

It is in America's vital national security and economic interests that a healthy commercial launch industry be developed. Recognizing this, the Department of Defense, NASA, the State of Florida and several other state governments have undertaken an ambitious and expensive program of infrastructure modernization. The major aerospace companies no longer develop launch vehicles in response to federal contracts. A fleet of new vehicles is being developed at great expense to meet the requirements of commercial payload customers over the next twenty years. We believe that in the future, space transportation can be as economically significant as aviation.

Unfortunately, this climate of investment would be seriously disrupted if the assumptions of the market and projected demand are rendered useless by allowing the dumping into the market place artificially priced, non-market, heavily subsidized launch assets. U.S. policy wisely prohibits its surplus military launch vehicles to compete for commercial payloads, in order to prevent just such disruptions and distortions to the market.

The mastery of emerging transportation technology has been the root of national prominence and security throughout history. Surely you will agree that the United States should not cut the development of its commercial launch industry off at the knees in order to accomplish foreign aid objectives through alternative means. The price is simply too high.

Sincerely,

EDWARD A. O'CONNOR, Jr.,
Executive Director.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 8, 1995.
Ambassador MICKAY KANTOR,
U.S. Trade Representative,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: Last year, the Administration issued its National Space Transportation Policy. In the policy, a commitment was made to negotiate and to enforce international commercial space launch services agreements with relevant non-market economy countries (NMEs). Your office is currently negotiating such an agreement with the Government of Ukraine.

In making a recent key business decision, my constituent McDonnell Douglas, relied on the Administration's commitment to negotiate agreements that prevent the disruption of the market and avoid seriously jeopardizing a key part of our space infrastructure. In the spring, McDonnell Douglas an-

nounced the planned investment of hundreds of millions of dollars in the development of the Delta III launch vehicle. We believe that this private sector investment in upgrading the nation's launch capability is wholly consistent with, and supportive of, the Administration's goals.

Any change in the Administration's policy, or any weakening of the existing space launch services agreements before their expiration dates, would impede McDonnell Douglas' ability to meet required launch rates and put the Delta III program at risk. These capricious changes in policy also serve to discourage private investment in our launch infrastructure.

Offering the Ukraine 22 potential launches of satellites and reopening the Russian trade agreement to raise their limit to 20 satellite launches, would more than double the limit currently agreed to for the NMEs. This is unfair to our domestic industry and the thousand of high tech jobs at risk.

I urge you to postpone the negotiations with the Ukraine until a more thorough assessment of the impact to our domestic industry can be made and to not reopen the Russian agreement signed only a year ago.

Sincerely,

SCOTT MCINNIS,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
Washington, DC, November 1, 1995.

Hon. MICKEY KANTOR,
U.S. Trade Representative,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MICKEY: I understand that serious consideration is being given to revising this country's space launch services trade agreement program in a manner that will severely jeopardize McDonnell Douglas' ability to continue in the commercial launch vehicle business. The change may be recommended in relation to the U.S.-Ukraine Space Launch Services Agreement which your office is currently negotiating.

Specifically, an Interagency Working Group is expected to recommend to you and the White House a substantial change in policy regarding such trade agreements. My constituent, McDonnell Douglas, relied upon the 1994 National Space Transportation Policy when it announced in May, 1995, its decision to invest hundreds of millions of dollars to build a new vehicle—the Delta III. Its existing Delta II vehicle currently has the best reliability record in the increasingly competitive international market. The Delta III will be virtually 100% American in terms of components, technology, and labor. This is significant at a time when other U.S. manufacturers of these strategic assets are purchasing foreign components or buying foreign vehicles off the shelf in lieu of domestic production.

For instance, the Boeing "Sea Launch" proposal would utilize Ukrainian-built vehicles at "dumped" prices. They would be launched from a platform in the Pacific Ocean—not from the States of Florida and California. Similarly, the Lockheed Martin Corporation has joined forces with a Russian entity to offer below market pricing for flights on the Russian Proton vehicle. On the other hand, the McDonnell Douglas commercial space operations are located primarily in California, Colorado, and Florida. They employ approximately 6,000 people in high-technology jobs in those states. We cannot afford to export these jobs which are so important to our national security infrastructure.

If the recommendations are accepted and implemented, 70-90% of commercial launches will occur outside the United States, using foreign assets. This policy shift will signifi-

cantly affect the viability of McDonnell Douglas' investment to develop the Delta III and any future investments.

I thank you for your thoughtful consideration in this very important matter.

Yours very truly,

RICHARD A. GEPHARDT.

THE GOVERNOR OF THE
STATE OF FLORIDA,
July 12, 1995.

Hon. BILL CLINTON,
President of the United States,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I appreciate the ongoing efforts of your administration to develop a National Space Policy that recognizes the concerns of Florida and other states that are investing in commercial space launch capabilities. At the invitation of the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), representatives from Florida, California, Alaska, New Mexico, and Virginia gathered in Washington recently to discuss launch policy issues common to our states. We presented a broad range of issues which are critical to the development of state-sponsored spaceports.

Of particular concern to Florida is the challenge to United States competitiveness for commercial satellite launches. This challenge is due in part to existing bilateral agreements between the U.S. and countries with non-market economies, such as China and Russia, which permit those countries to launch significant numbers of U.S. satellites. We certainly recognize the importance of these agreements and the strategic alliances they represent. In looking at the establishment of new bilateral agreements, such as the one we believe is proposed between the U.S. and the Ukraine, we wish to encourage that careful consideration be given to domestic economic needs; effective enforcement of agreed upon launch quotas and a monitoring program to assure that Florida and other states are able to complete equally with foreign countries.

The State of Florida is committed to building our space industry's competitiveness and we believe strongly that the commercial launch marketplace offers an exciting transition for companies who are experiencing diminishing defense contracts.

Your leadership role on this vital issue will assist the U.S. commercial launch industry in receiving the domestic policy support that is required to increase our international competitiveness. I appreciate your continued attention to space industry issues and look forward to the release of the National Space Policy.

With kind regards, I am
Sincerely,

LAWTON CHILES.

□ 1315

BUDGET ROBS STRUGGLING FAMILIES TO PAY THE RICH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, in last month's continuing resolution agreement, Republicans and the President committed to a balanced budget which would include, and I quote, "tax policies to help working families." However, by cutting the earned-income tax credit, the Republicans' balanced budget plan raises taxes on over 12 million

working families whose income is less than \$30,000 per year.

Now, the Republicans like to give the impression that all earned-income tax credit recipients are so poor that they do not pay income taxes, and therefore, do not deserve a tax credit, however much such people in such low-income working categories need it. Mr. Speaker, that is simply not true.

The Republican budget actually targets tax increases to millions of working families who do pay income taxes, taxes that are withheld from their hard-earned paychecks.

Now, the Republicans also claim that their \$500-per-child tax credit makes up for their cuts to the earned-income tax credit, but that is not true either. Even with the child credit, the Republican plan leaves over 7 million families poorer.

Now, that is not a tax policy that helps families; it is one that drives them toward poverty. It does not protect children; it threatens them. And it does not live up to the continuing resolution agreement; it violates that agreement.

The Republicans even had to violate their own House rule requiring a three-fifths majority to raise taxes in order to pass these tax increases.

It was all to give \$245 billion in tax breaks that go mostly to the fewer than 10 percent of the wealthiest Americans who make more than \$100,000 a year, tax breaks so large that they actually cause the deficit to go up in the first 2 years of the Republican plan, and then, after 7 years, the tax break explodes as far as the eye can see.

So do not believe the Republican plan when they say they have to raise taxes on working families to balance the budget. It is unnecessary. It is unfair. It is wrong, so we should not do it.

The Republicans should live up to their agreement to support a budget that does not rob struggling families to pay the rich.

H.R. 1020 WILL BUST THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ENSIGN] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about H.R. 1020, which has to do with nuclear waste storage. It is also called the "budget buster," because this bill will indeed bust the budget. It will bust the budget by over \$4 billion in the next 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, not only is there a problem with this bill as far as the budget is concerned; there is also a problem with this bill as far as safety and as far as States' rights are concerned. Let me address just a few of the points that this bill fails to address.

First of all, the nuclear waste repository was originally put forth in 1982 to be in the State of Nevada or two other sites. In 1987, the famous bill that we in Nevada obviously are very much op-

posed to eliminated the other two sites from being studied and put it only at Yucca Mountain. This deep geological storage area has been being developed for the last several years.

No good science is being used out there; this is purely a political process. But in the process of developing Yucca Mountain, transportation of the waste to Yucca Mountain has been studied. It had to be made safe.

Well, in the process of developing a safe, reliable way of transporting the nuclear waste to Nevada, lo and behold, it was discovered dry cast storage would also store nuclear waste for the next 100 years in a very safe, reliable manner.

We can actually leave this nuclear waste on site in dry casts for the next 100 years, and if we want to retrieve it, if we develop technology that allows us to use this spent nuclear waste, then we will have it at the sites and be able to retrieve it very easily. If we bury it into the ground, we will not be able to retrieve this waste. Therefore, from an economic standpoint, it is much cheaper to have on-site dry-cast storage.

Yucca Mountain was originally supposed to be \$200 to \$400 million total. In recent years now, new studies have come out where Yucca Mountain will cost over \$30 billion to develop. That is one of the reasons it is a budget-buster, \$30 billion versus \$200 million, and that is just current estimates. We all know, 10 to 15 years from now, what happens to government estimates; they always go up. So how big will this bill be for the U.S. taxpayer?

Some people say that this is a national security issue. I want to raise that point. Some people say that it is not safe to keep this nuclear waste at all of these storage facilities around the country. Well, if that were the case, why do we not have U.S. troops guarding these places currently?

This is not a national security issue, and therefore, it becomes a States' rights issue. All of these States that have enjoyed nuclear power over the years, Nevada not being one of those States, should have to deal with the waste, because it is not a national security issue. Those States that have benefited from the power and the low-cost power over the years should pay and should have that stuff in their backyard, this nuclear waste Nevada has never had the benefit of; and therefore, it should not be dumped on a small State just because that small State only has two Representatives in the House.

Mr. Speaker, this whole process has never been based on sound science, has never been based on economics, but has been based purely on politics. We in Nevada understand that everybody wants to get nuclear waste out of their backyard and into Nevada's backyard. However, we oppose this measure, because not only will it bust the budget by over \$4 billion, and when we are looking at potentially \$30 billion total money spent on this deal, the \$4 billion

actually becomes a very small number, but we also oppose this on States' rights issues.

The 10th amendment clearly states that those powers not given to the Federal Government are reserved for the States and/or the people. Where in the Constitution does it give, when it is not dealing with a national security issue, this Congress the power to ship nuclear waste to a State that does not want it? This is a clear violation of the 10th amendment.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by saying that political expediency is not what this new Congress is about. That is not what we were elected to do. We were elected to respect the Constitution, and we were also elected to balance the budget. H.R. 1020 is a violation of everything that we were elected to do.

AMERICANS NEED MEDICAID WORKING FOR THEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, the assumptions by the Congressional Budget Office give us greater flexibility in reaching a budget agreement, and that is indeed great news. However, we know we will not be able to use all of that \$135 billion that the Republicans have found, but one of the places where in the budget we ought to at least begin to think about investing those moneys would be Medicaid. Medicaid needs those funds for a variety of reasons, because this is the Federal program that is indeed provided to provide health care for the most vulnerable of our society.

The Republican plan that was rejected and vetoed by the President really ignores the past and hurts senior citizens; it disregards the present and neglects the future. It hurts children, as well as women who suffer under this program.

If the Republicans have their way, you must remember that they would give 245 billion dollars' worth of tax cuts, but at the same time, they would have 163 billion dollars' worth of cuts in Medicaid.

Now, those are not really cuts; to use their words, this is just slowing the growth. Nevertheless, you would have \$163 billion less resources to provide health care for the elderly, for children, for mothers and the disabled who need those programs and who are currently using those programs now.

We should be reminded that some 36 million Americans use Medicaid, and that is the only health program that they have available to them; 26 million of those 36 million people are the very poor. Of that 36 million, 26 million of those persons are very poor. They are children, they are elderly and, again, they are the disabled.

Again, if the Republican cuts stand, that would mean that they will