

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I was not here on Thursday, March 30, as I was in Michigan attending a funeral. I missed two rollcall votes: rollcall vote No. 278 and rollcall vote No. 279.

If I had been here, I would have voted "no" on rollcall 278 and "no" on rollcall 279.

I ask that this be reflected in the RECORD.

□ 1745

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

## MISSILE PROLIFERATION, ONE OF THE GREATEST THREATS TO AMERICA IN THE 21ST CENTURY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to an issue that is dominating much of the discussion of the House and Senate Armed Services and National Security Committees dealing with missile defense.

Those of us who saw CNN yesterday report that the Russians have now decided to offer for sale the SS25 missile launch architecture to other nations of the world realize that the potential for this technology, that in fact could launch an intercontinental ballistic missile to any part of our country, is in fact being offered for sale to Third World nations and to nations to be used as a space launch assembly. This greatly concerns me and many of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, because of the potential for a rogue nation to obtain this technology in a very short period of time.

In addition, we see where the Iranians are now putting together cruise missiles along the Straits of Hormuz, which could threaten the shipping lanes in that area.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that one of the greatest threats that we will have to face as we approach the 21st century is that of missile proliferation.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, there are three specific areas we have to focus on. The first deals with cruise missiles, low-flying, the kind of missiles we saw Saddam Hussein use in Desert Storm against the Israelis, known as the SCUDS.

Cruise missiles are currently in the hands of 77 nations around the world, Mr. Speaker. In fact, 20 nations of the world are not producing cruise missiles. In fact, we in this country, much to my objection, just allowed the technology to be transferred to China to allow them to increase their cruise

missile technology in terms of their motors to drive those cruise missiles.

It is an area we need to focus on, and Mr. Speaker, one that we are not putting enough emphasis on in terms of national security interests.

Mr. Speaker, the second concern dealing with missiles deals with theater missiles, those systems that could protect our troops from an attack in a theater of operation, like we saw the SCUDS do in Desert Storm. We are working aggressively in this area, Mr. Speaker. The President supports theater missile defense. I support that effort. I want to make sure we give General O'Neill the maximum support possible in terms of theater missile defense.

The third area deals with national missile defense. Most of the public at large in this country does not realize that currently we have no protection against a deliberate or accidental launch of one missile aimed at our mainland.

What further concerns me, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that China now has a missile, the CSS II, that has a range of 2,000 miles. North Korea is developing a missile, the Taipodong II missile, that has a range of several thousand kilometers, that could one day reach Guam and perhaps even Alaska. We have no defense against those kinds of missiles.

In fact, as I mentioned at the onset of my comments tonight, Russia is now offering the SS25 architecture, one of their main missile launch systems, to other nations.

Mr. Speaker, with these things in mind, we are now trying to provide for Members of Congress a detailed assessment of the threat and what our capabilities are in terms of missile defense technology. We are holding five hearings in the Committee on National Security on missile defense, the technology, where we are today, the threat, and what we have bought and what we have received for the dollars we have invested.

Mr. Speaker, I would invite all of our colleagues to come out tomorrow morning in the Rayburn Building in H.R. 2118, the Committee on National Security main hearing room, where we will have assembled the technologies that we have purchased with our missile defense moneys over the past decade or so. Members will be able to see these technologies, ask questions, and be briefed by General O'Neill and those people in the Navy, the Air Force, and the Army who have been working on missile defense technology.

Following that walk-through, which is open to every Member of the House and Senate, we will have a press conference at 11 o'clock and then open the entire display to the public. From 11:00 until 1:00 the public is invited to come to 2118 Rayburn, where they can see the kinds of technology that we have developed over the years and that is ready to go into deployment, in some cases, over the next several years.

Finally, at 2 o'clock in the afternoon in that same hearing room, General O'Neill will come before the Subcommittee on Research and Development of the Committee on National Security, and we will explore in great detail with him the technologies that are in fact available today, those that are being deployed, and those technologies that are on the horizon for us to be researching and looking to implement.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask all of our colleagues to join in this assessment of where we are going with missile defense technology, and to join with a bipartisan effort in making sure that Members of Congress understand the threat that is there. Some would say that with the demise of the former Soviet Union there is no more threat.

Mr. Speaker, one only has to look at what is happening in the real world to understand that we are today unprotected.

## THE CROWN JEWELS OF THE REPUBLICAN CONTRACT WITH AMERICA GO TO WEALTHY CORPORATIONS, NOT TO MIDDLE-INCOME AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the Speaker said it all over the weekend. He talked about the crown jewel, or the crowning achievement of the Republican Contract on America; that is, the coming tax cuts.

I would say it is a crowning achievement for certain, because we are talking about \$188 billion over 5 years. That is even more than these precious jewels on this crown here could represent: \$630 billion over 10 years. This is quite an achievement.

We have been cutting and hacking our way through domestic programs the school lunch program, the Women, Infants, and Children Program, and a whole host of other things that are important to middle-income Americans. We are putting that in the pot. That is going to help begin to pay for the crowning achievement, for the crown jewels.

We could say, in fact, that figuratively the Speaker and his party have been taking dollars and cents out of the pockets of middle-income and less-well-off Americans, thrown them all together in one big pot, in order to buy a crown for those who are already at the top.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most startling proposals, and this wasn't in the contract to come forward, but it has been added after some corporate arm-twisting and lobbying, big business got a very, very special break here. Everyone's eyes start to glaze over a bit when you talk taxes, so I guess no one thought much when suddenly the Republican contract had a little addition; that is, a repeal of the alternative corporate minimum tax.

What does that mean? Let us go back to 1982, before we had a corporate alternative minimum tax. Here is what it meant back then.

From 1982 to 1985, AT&T—American Telephone and Telegraph—had profits of \$24,898,000,000, and guess how much they paid in taxes: nothing. In fact, after \$24,898,000,000 in profits over that 4-year period, they were entitled to a \$635.5 million tax credit. That is, working Americans people who go to work every day, and every day the Government takes something out of their paycheck, a little bit of that went to give AT&T a tax credit for taxes that it did not pay.

Who else? What else did this mean back in 1982? The Boeing Company was doing a little better back then. They were selling more airplanes. They had profits of \$2,271,000. How much did they pay in taxes? Not one red cent. In fact, they got a refundable tax credit of \$121 million. The list goes on; Texaco, \$1.5 billion, a \$68 million credit.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the loser at the bottom of this list of 50, Middle South utilities, with a puny \$2.5 billion in profits, paid nothing, but they were not eligible for a credit. They did not get the crown. However, maybe under this new proposal they will.

It is ironic that the Republican tax proposal would not give a refundable tax credit for children. That is right, for people who are already at the bottom of the rung, people earning around \$20,000 to \$25,000 a year, they cannot get a refundable tax credit for their children, but our corporations now will be able to get refundable tax credits.

Doesn't that make you feel a lot better? Doesn't that give you a little bit better idea what this is all about?

The estimates are that these credits would flow to the largest corporations in this country; 90 percent of the alternative minimum tax that was paid in 1990 was paid by firms with assets of more than \$250 million. Three-quarters—75 percent—of those firms had assets of more than \$2 billion, so it is those poor struggling firms with only \$2 billion in assets to whom we are going to extend a refundable tax credit through this legislation this week.

Working Americans, the day after the crowning achievement of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], the Contract With America, passes, will go to work and the Government will still take a nice piece of change out of their paycheck. That will not change a bit, particularly if you only earned \$20,000 or \$25,000 a year. However, the corporation you work for might just get a nice big, fat tax break, particularly if they are worth more than \$2 billion. Think about it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. RIGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. WYNN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### URGING MEMBERS TO JOIN IN SIGNING THE STOCKMAN DISCHARGE PETITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to the fact that since we have been negotiating and working out problems here on the floor, trying to save the taxpayer \$100 million here and \$1 billion here and \$1 billion there, that billions of taxpayers dollars have been ripped off and sent to special interest groups, powerful interest groups, domestically and internationally. We are talking about the Mexican bailout.

Yes, in the name of bailing out a country that made horrible decisions, economic decisions, and is governed by a corrupt elite, the American taxpayer has been ripped off to the tune of tens of billions of dollars, and the cash is still flowing.

As we speak, every debate that goes on, the cash is still flowing to a corrupt Mexican elite, and to Wall Street speculators that decided instead of investing in the United States of America to create jobs here, they would invest in Mexico, to get a higher rate of return. As soon as they lost their shirt, because it was a risky investment, they come back to the American people and ask us to use our hard-earned money to bail them out. It is a sin. It is a crime against our own people that millions, and yes, billions of dollars are being spent for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to join the gentlewoman from Ohio, MARCY KAPTUR, and myself and others who are dedicated to stop this flow of billions of dollars. Already tens of billions of dollars have gone. We can stop it before it is \$50 billion by signing the Stockman discharge petition. If we can get 218 signatures on a petition from the rest of our colleagues, we can bring this issue to the floor for a vote.

I ask my colleagues to join me, and I ask the American people to see if their Congressmen have signed the Stockman discharge petition. How can we in good faith cut the services for the American people? Yes, I think it is important to do that if we are going to bring down the budget deficit, so future generations do not have to pay for those services, but it is immoral for us to cut the benefits and services that our people have paid for over their lives in order not to balance the budget, but instead, to give us revenue to send to people who speculate in foreign countries and to prop up a corrupt

Mexican elite, an elite that ends up shooting their own brothers and sisters; an elite that is so corrupt that when they cross the border, their former deputy Attorney General ends up being arrested in this country.

We cannot permit the hard-earned dollars of our taxpayers to keep flowing in that direction while we try to balance the budget by just taking a little bit here and saving a little bit there. Let us get to this very serious issue. I think the American people ought to know that while we are debating these types of peripheral issues, that a large chunk of cash, larger than any of the issues we are talking about, is flowing in this direction.

Mr. Speaker, I would please ask my colleagues to sign the Stockman discharge petition, and I would ask the American people to see if their Congressman has, indeed, gone along with this righteous attempt to protect the hard-earned taxpayers' dollars that should be going either to bring down the deficit, or providing the services that are necessary for our own people.

□ 1800

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just like to endorse his proposal to the membership to sign House Discharge Petition 2, the Stockman-Sanders discharge petition. There is a bill ready to come to the floor supported by a large number of Members on both sides of the aisle, and I want to commend the gentleman from California for bringing the importance of this to the American people as well as the membership.

As one of the signers of that discharge petition, I know that it is the only alternative we have left to get a full debate in this House on Executive action that has gone beyond the bounds of precedent.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. It is a bit cynical, I believe, for us not to mention this, and to keep talking about other issues, about how we are trying to bring down the budget deficit.

How can we debate bringing down the budget deficit by \$100 million here or we are going to cut this benefit over here that is going to bring down the deficit supposedly by \$2 billion, when billions and billions of more dollars are actually continuing to flow to bail out Mexico and these Wall Street speculators? It is a sin against our own people.

Sign the Stockman discharge petition.

#### A BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). Under a previous order of