

□ 1300

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. EWING) at 1 p.m.

MORNING BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of May 12, 1995, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority leader and minority leader for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes and each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders, limited to 5 minutes.

THE TRAGEDY OF JIMMY RYCE

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, a child is always special. Children are the hope of the world, and every child is blessed with the love of God and the goodness of heaven.

In south Florida we have all, our entire community, has been deeply wounded by the tragedy suffered by one very special child—Jimmy Ryce. And by the suffering, the incalculable suffering, of his wonderful family.

As our prayers go out for Jimmy's family so that God may give them the strength to endure, we also pray for Jimmy in Heaven, with full confidence that he is now at peace in the presence of the Lord.

No one in south Florida will ever forget Jimmy Ryce and we join together as a community to grieve for him.

Jimmy's family—his mom and dad, Claudine and Don, his sister Martha—have shown us all an example of extraordinary strength and of the will to somehow permit this tragedy to shield other children from similar future nightmares on Earth. Even before we all received the ultimately tragic news of the last few days, Don and Claudine Ryce had commenced a petition campaign to the President, a noble campaign that they, and now many in south Florida are continuing, urging him to require agencies in the executive branch to post in public places pictures of endangered children, so that the American people can help in the search for these children, while there is still time to save their lives.

Don and Claudine Ryce have also urged that the media run public service announcements publicizing the photographs and the peril of endangered children.

Together we will remember Jimmy Ryce as we strive to bring down the full weight of justice on monstrous beings who commit crimes against children, and as we work to protect children against such unspeakable crimes in the future.

THE NIGHTMARE OF THE TRAGEDY OF JIMMY RYCE

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

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART], and all the Members from south Florida to rise today with great sadness to share with you the news that my constituent, 9-year-old Jimmy Ryce, was abducted, sexually assaulted, shot, and finally found dead just a few short miles from his Miami home.

What happened to Jimmy Ryce is really the worst imaginable thing anyone could possibly imagine in their wildest nightmares, and all of our community in south Florida, unfortunately, share the hopes and the fears and, to an infinitesimal degree, some of the suffering that the Ryce family is feeling today and will always feel.

One of the things that has happened during this period of time is, unfortunately, I have educated myself a little bit about what is going on in child abductions in this country. On several occasions during the last several months I spoke with the FBI and people involved in the investigation, people involved in the investigation of missing children. Over a thousand a year in this country fall into that category, and, again, unfortunately, there have been strides in what we have done as a society and what we have done as a country to try to help this insufferable tragedy.

In fact, south Florida, unfortunately, was an impetus to this several years ago when Adam Walsh was abducted and killed in south Florida and from the time that Adam Walsh was killed to today, and really through his family's work, there have been changes. There is now, in fact, a missing persons center clearinghouse the Federal Government operates for missing children, abused and abducted children, that has been helpful in solving many cases and actually having children returned to their families.

But, unfortunately, what the Ryce family found is there is still a lot more that we can do operationally as a country and as a government both on the Federal level, but on State and local levels as well, but on the Federal level. Some of the frustration dealing with the Federal Government during this ordeal really is worth hearing and talking about and changing. As the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] pointed out and the Ryce family obviously knows, when they tried to spread the news of Jimmy's abduction, and they did an amazing job, the community did an amazing job, and we also on the floor of this Congress were talking about it and sending photos ourselves, but when they tried to do that through a network that exists in this country of post offices, Federal buildings that are everywhere in this

country, they found they could not do it, which really makes no sense at all. And what will happen by the end of this week is that all of us in the south Florida delegation will be introducing legislation to correct that so that we can send out that information.

If I have learned anything about child abductions, it is that the more information that is out there, the more people see a child's face, the more chances that something will be solved, and even in this case, the lead was because of that.

There are other instances where the Ryce family actually had operational problems dealing with the Federal Government in terms of coordination. They found themselves there is no coordinated effort for missing children. There is for criminal fugitives, but there is not for missing children. The family was actually calling law enforcement throughout the State who had not even heard or were aware of what was going on.

I am committed, and I know my colleagues from south Florida, I believe, my colleagues throughout this country are committed to doing everything that we possibly can to make sure that there is less of a chance that something like this will ever happen again in this great country.

I think we all need to really feel and share some of the pain with the Ryce family because we are a community of America, and as a community we need to really work on ourselves as a community to make sure that the sickness that exists and the indescribable sickness is eliminated as much as we possibly can.

To the Ryce family, I can only say to them that their strength and their perseverance will, I am sure, be clear that there will be something that will occur in this time, and we know that Jimmy Ryce's soul is in Heaven, and we pray for its continuation.

UKRAINIAN COMMERCIAL LAUNCH POLICY

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Clinton administration will give away another U.S. industry: the United States domestic commercial space launch industry.

A decade ago, the United States held nearly 100 percent share of commercial space launches. Today the United States holds 30 percent of the market. This loss of market share is largely due to the fact that our competitors receive heavy subsidies from their governments.

Between 1996 and 2001, it is estimated that there will be 350 commercial satellite launches—120 of these will be geostationary launches. These are the high Earth-orbit, expensive launches that the United States dominated until recent years.

For each of these launches that goes overseas the United States loses \$50 million—if we lose all 120, that's about \$6 billion that will go overseas.

I'm all for the free-market. But I will aggressively oppose any plan that gives the advantage of foreign competitors that receive heavy subsidies from their governments. Mr. Clinton's plan does just this, and that's why I'm an aggressive opponent of his plan.

This chart shows what may happen to our commercial launch industry.

There will be 120 geostationary launches between 1996 and 2002.

It is a given Arainespace—Europe's subsidized space launch industry—will receive 72. That's 60 percent of these launches. Their subsidies allow them to undercut the United States unsubsidized prices.

Under an existing agreement with the Chinese, the United States will allow 20 satellites to be launched on Chinese-Government subsidized launch vehicles.

Under another existing agreement with the Russians, the United States will allow eight satellites to be launched in Russian-Government subsidized launch vehicles.

This only leaves 20 launches for U.S. companies. Well, that is until tomorrow.

Under the new agreement that the Clinton administration will sign with the Ukrainian Government tomorrow, the Ukrainian-Government subsidized space launch company will get the other 20 launches.

This leaves U.S. companies with a grand total of zero.

Yes, it's true that U.S. companies can compete for the launch of these vehicles, but with the billions in subsidies from their governments, our foreign competitors will easily be able to undercut U.S. companies.

It is very possible that of the 120 geostationary launches over the next 6 years, none of them will be launched from U.S. soil.

This is a tragedy for U.S. leadership in space. For the American workers who have dedicated their lives to making these launch vehicles. And, for the dedicated and highly skilled workers at our Nation's space launch facilities.

I, along with others, in a bipartisan effort urged the Clinton administration to renegotiate some of the earlier agreements to ensure that the Ukrainian launches were not in addition to those already allotted to our competitors. This suggestion was soundly ignored by the Clinton administration.

I'm pleased that many of my colleagues have also expressed their concerns about this agreement.

The Florida delegation sent a strong bipartisan letter expressing grave concern over the Clinton-Ukraine Agreement which I would like to submit for the RECORD. The distinguished minority leader, Mr. GEPHARDT of Missouri, let the administration know of his concerns in a letter which I would also like to submit for the RECORD.

The Governor of Florida, Lawton Chiles, has expressed his opposition to this agreement. The Colorado congressional delegation also raised objections to the plan.

Mr. Chairman, this Ukrainian agreement is bad for this nation. And, I am disappointed that the Clinton administration appears to have given no consideration to our concerns. In fact, I'm still waiting for a response to my letter of 3 weeks ago.

America is the loser in this deal.

As vice-chairman of the Space Subcommittee, I have called for a Congressional hearing on this issue. I will continue my aggressive opposition this agreement. I urge my colleagues to take a closer look at this and other international agreements that the Clinton administration is negotiating.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, November 15, 1995.

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

DEAR AMBASSADOR KANTOR: We are very concerned about the direction the Administration is taking regarding United States launch policy. Last year, the Administration issued its National Space Transportation Policy. This policy contained a commitment to negotiate and to enforce international commercial space launch services agreements with relevant non-market economies (NME's). It also contained a commitment to launch U.S. government payloads on U.S. launch vehicles.

Your office is currently in the process of negotiating an agreement with the government of Ukraine. It is deeply troubling that the Administration is considering giving up even more of our domestic launch industry to competitors who are overly reliant on subsidies by their own governments, which distort the competitive market place. Any U.S.-Ukraine agreement must reflect the realities of the commercial market. U.S. commercial launch providers have relied upon the 1994 National Space Transportation policy and have invested hundreds of millions of dollars to build launch vehicles which are built with virtually 100 percent American components, technology, and labor. It is imperative that the following be observed and acknowledged:

Highly subsidized competitors place U.S. launch providers at an unnecessary and unfair disadvantage.

Both the Ukraine and Russia benefit from any Ukraine launch agreement since much of the content of the Ukraine vehicle is of Russian origin.

The purchase or the launch of any NME-built vehicle by a U.S. entity should be counted against any quantity limitation in the relevant trade agreement.

The basic terms of the current US-China and the US-Russia Space Launch Services Agreements should not be modified before they are due to expire.

Additionally, we understand that the Department of Defense (DoD) may be changing its current policy which prohibits national security payloads from being launched on non-U.S. launch vehicles. We have serious objections to allowing DoD to use non-U.S. launch vehicles for military payloads. This would seriously erode our nation's ability to launch military space assets during times of crisis and severely jeopardize our nation's domestic commercial launch vehicle business by undermining the U.S. launch industrial base.

These policies have the potential to undermine the U.S. national interest of maintain-

ing our domestic launch capabilities and infrastructure. Florida's long, proud history in the U.S. space launch industry may be seriously jeopardized. For our government to give away this heritage and these high-tech, high-wage jobs is unacceptable to American taxpayers and the Florida Congressional delegation.

The U.S. space launch industry is ready to work hard and fight competitively for their market share. But we shouldn't ask them to do so when its own government changes the rules in the market place. We understand that if the proposed plan goes forward, 70 to 90 percent of the commercial, and potentially national security, launches will occur outside the United States. This would be, in our view, very detrimental both to our national security and to our own prospects for future investments by our own launch industry in this country's space infrastructure.

We request that you brief our delegation on your intentions prior to your upcoming meeting with the Ukraine. We look forward to hearing from you very soon.

Dave Weldon;
Mark Foley;
Dan Miller;
Carrie Meek;
Bill McCollum;
Peter Deutch;
Bud Cramer;
Tillie Fowler;
Bill Young;
Porter Goss;
Clay Shaw;
Alcee Hastings;
Lincoln Diaz-Balart;
Charles Canady;
Cliff Stearns;
John Mica;
Jim Traficant.

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, November 28, 1995.

President WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing to you regarding a matter that has already received much attention by our colleagues in Congress as well as many in the U.S. space industry.

It is our understanding that the Administration is in the process of negotiating a bilateral agreement with Ukraine which could allow their nation to launch up to 22 U.S. commercial satellites. It is also our understanding that these discussions have prompted Russia to propose reopening its current agreement with the U.S. in hopes of raising their quota to 20 launches.

Without a doubt, such agreements will have a major impact on the U.S. space launch industry and our nation's trade balance. However, it is not clear to us exactly what the effects would be and what other options could, and perhaps should, be pursued by our government as we explore ways to assist these nations to strengthen their economies without hindering U.S. efforts in this area.

We have not passed judgment on this matter since we have not been briefed by the Administration, nor are we aware of any formal briefings being held for Congress, regarding this issue. It seems reasonable that before an agreement is negotiated that the Administration inform Congress of what is being contemplated for agreement as well as its ramifications on the U.S. economy and space industry. Therefore, we ask that finalization of any agreement with Ukraine be delayed until either Congress has been briefed or has had an opportunity to hold hearings in this matter. Consistent with this, we ask that

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 MICKAEL 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 MICKY 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. MICKY KANTOR,
U.S. Trade Representative,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MICKY: 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 that 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