

is going to be their personal passbook savings account, their property, so at least for those funds they do not have to be worrying about a government that is going to use these moneys up and eventually not pay those payments.

Over time, the assets in workers' accounts will grow very rapidly, producing genuine retirement security. The balances grow so rapidly that it seems only fair to ask these successful investors to agree to lower Social Security benefits. Thus, worker/investors will still receive Social Security checks, although they will be smaller than those defined under part 1, as well as full ownership rights to their plans. However, the benefits flowing from their personal retirement savings accounts will more than make up the difference. Furthermore, account balances will belong to workers and will be passed on to their heirs, improving the financial security of wives, husbands and their children. Personal retirement savings accounts are a very good deal.

With some guidelines I believe it should be up to each worker to determine how his funds will be invested or if he wants to fund a personal retirement savings account at all. In fact, workers may elect to remain in the existing system if they wish and collect only Social Security benefits. It will be their option alone whether to place a portion of their paychecks in the hands of professional money managers. However, eligible investments in accounts include only assets now eligible for investment in individual retirement accounts [IRA's]. Also, under the proposal, managed investment accounts will have to meet investment and reporting requirements.

Another important benefit of this proposal is that it will stabilize fiscal policy. This year, Social Security will take in \$75 billion more than it distributes. By 2005, the annual cash flow surplus will rise to \$135 billion. But in 2025 and beyond, there will be annual cash deficits of \$330 billion and rising as far as the eye can see. Under this plan, cash flow in and out of the Social Security System will always be equal. Pressure to cut other spending or to raise taxes will not be required by cash flow problems. Social Security will be depoliticized—as it should be.

I plan to introduce this bill soon and invite my colleagues to cosponsor. Together, we can restore the solvency of America's most popular program and make it even better.

THE TRAGEDY OF FLIGHT 592

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized during morning business for 4 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER]. Knowing her long years of service in the area of our defense appropriations and spending, I simply want to pose the question to my Republican colleagues, what kind of House are we when we are not allowed to debate fully a reduction in the defense budget, a fair, open discussion about how best to utilize the precious

dollars that we have in this country to serve America?

However, Mr. Speaker, I have come to the floor for another concern. Before I start, let me say to my colleagues that I am a former member of the city of Houston's Aviation Committee. I think if my colleagues review my record, they will find me a strong and active advocate for the aviation industry.

I also will say that I believe that those who work in the aviation industry are some of the more dedicated workers and employees and individuals committed to service. But this is not about questioning the integrity of our industry and who works in the industry. It is, of course, raising a question about a terrible loss of life just 1 day before Mother's Day in Flight 592. We realize that many mothers lost sons and daughters, and families were destroyed and devastated.

But the question becomes, when we come to the U.S. Congress, I always thought that we should be problem solvers and not dart throwers. It was interesting to listen to the expose of Rush Limbaugh. He always gives us such pointed dialog, sometimes greatly erroneous, as I thought his comments were in giving us a gravity study and a gravity talk about how wonderful it is that airplanes float and fly and how we should marvel at that, and why is there such hysteria and emotion around the loss of 109 lives?

Well, I will tell you, Rush, because America is a humanitarian Nation. And yes, we lose lives in violence, gun violence and car crashes, but every time there is a tragedy like Flight 592, we raise our voices because we want to ask the question why, and does it have to happen again? Rush, I am not interested in your debate and comment on flotation and the marvel of aviation. I understand that. The question becomes, why did we lose those 109 lives?

First, this particular airline or airplane was some 30 years old, almost. Its maiden voyage for this particular airline was in 1993 but it was actually purchased in 1969. I am not against old airplanes, but I am for maintaining them.

In addition, some seven times this particular airplane was forced back to the gate to return for some mechanical problems over a 2-year period. The question becomes, to FAA Administrator David Hinson, "What kind of job is the Federal Aviation Administration doing? What kind of safety measures are you providing for the American people?"

I am now asking for a full report on inspection procedures that are done by the FAA. I want to find out the status of staffing, the expertise of those who inspect, the years of experience and what kind of criteria they use to inspect our Nation's airplanes.

I would like to know whether or not we in this Congress have provided sufficient resources so that the planes we travel in can be in fact inspected. And,

yes, I will be exploring legislation that requires that when a plane has been pulled back for mechanical violations a certain number of times, it be retired, out of commission, until that plane meets all safety standards.

Yes, I am in pain about the loss of 109 lives, just as each and every one of us each time we lose an American through such a terrible tragedy. I think it is a travesty for us to make excuses about what should have been done and not do it.

Oh, yes, Rush, next time I hear from you, I look forward to hearing a discussion about flotation, but I am going to stand on the side of saving American lives.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address the Chair and not others outside the Chamber.

REPUBLICAN LEADERS WANT MEDICARE TO WITHER ON THE VINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized during morning business for 4 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, Medicare provides quality health care benefits for over 32 million senior citizens, but the Republican leadership wants to transform Medicare into a program of substandard care.

The Republican leadership says that Medicare is in crisis—that it is now running at a deficit. I would argue that minor adjustments, not a major overhaul, could ensure Medicare's solvency. When Democrats were in the majority, we made sure that Medicare was being adequately funded. In 1982, the Medicare trustees predicted that the Medicare trust fund would run out of money by 1986. Obviously that did not happen.

Democrats protected Medicare and maintained a level of quality care for senior citizens into the 1990's.

Now the Republicans are scaring seniors by saying that Medicare is again going to go bankrupt in the early part of the next decade and using the words like "reform" to disguise their efforts to destroy the Medicare Program. Senior citizens are not in danger of not receiving health care, but Speaker GINGRICH still claims that a major overhaul is necessary.

His real motives lie in an earlier speech he gave during last year's Medicare debate, where the Speaker said he wanted to see Medicare wither on a vine. Only minor adjustments need to be made to ensure Medicare solvency. When Democrats were in the majority, Medicare never ran deficits. It is a sign of the misguided Republican leadership that Medicare has run its first ever deficit in its 31 years as a health care program for senior citizens. Enough is enough with Speaker GINGRICH and his

band trying to dismantle Medicare yet one more time.

The new Republican budget calls for over \$168 billion cuts, reductions, or whatever you want to call them, in the Medicare Program. Basically, the Republican leadership is proposing to take money out of the Medicare Program for their \$176 billion tax break for wealthy individuals.

Although the amount of money being taken from Medicare is significant, the devil is really in the details, because the Republican leadership is proposing a major overhaul of Medicare to make it less efficient and more costly for seniors. Their proposed calls for coopting senior citizens into managed care. I do not have a problem with managed care per se, but I do not believe in Speaker GINGRICH's attempts to force seniors into managed care and call it "Medicare Choices."

The only choice that the Republican leadership is giving to seniors under this radical Medicare plan is the choice to receive substandard health care.

Where Medicare historically offered patients their own choice of doctor, protected against high out-of-pocket costs, and offered a guaranteed level of coverage, the Republican leadership's proposal would take it all away.

In addition, the Republicans are again proposed to incorporate medical savings accounts—or healthy wealthy tax breaks—into the Medicare overhaul. Last year, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office stated that these tax breaks would actually cost Medicare several billion dollars. This proposal is largely untested and very controversial.

Unfortunately, this is all a repeat of the failed Republican attempts to overhaul Medicare last year. I would urge my colleagues to vote against this impractical budget proposal on Thursday and urge senior citizens to call on Congress to protect Medicare from further raids by Speaker GINGRICH.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL DOES NOT PROMISE REAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE] is recognized during morning business for 4 minutes.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, I have brought here a chart that shows what we do with the money that the Congress has discretion over and over half the red part is Pentagon spending. The other part is everything else, education, income security, health, environment.

The House Committee on National Security has increased defense spending this year by \$12.9 billion more than the President requested and more than the Pentagon even asked for. Republican and Democrat Members went to the Rules Committee with 5 different amendments to cut some Pentagon spending, from \$1 to \$13 billion, in be-

tween. We were not allowed to bring those to the floor and the leadership refused to allow us to discuss this most vital issue.

What does it mean when we increase Pentagon spending by \$13 billion? It means that we have to cut everything else, all these other things. Cuts, cuts, cuts, cuts.

What does that mean to the American people? It means that we are putting our citizens' security in jeopardy. How? For instance, in the State of Oregon that I represent a district in, last year 38 children died from child abuse or neglect. One of the reasons they died was there were no shelters there for their mother to bring those children into a safe, secure home. Why is there no money for shelters? Because we are spending all our additional money on huge weapons systems that we really do not need now that the cold war is over.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the time has finally come when we must put common sense back in the U.S. budget, when we must say what is real security? Is it having police in our streets? Is it having places where our children can go to be safe? Is it a whole security? Or are we only putting our security into cold-war weaponry?

Mr. Speaker, I ask the leadership to allow us to vote on amendments that would cut some of this additional \$13 billion that the President did not ask for and, most significantly, that the Pentagon did not ask for.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. COMBEST] at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

May the beauty of the day remind us, O God, of the beauty of Your blessings to us; may the majesty of Your creation remind us of the majesty of Your power; may the growth of the blossoms that surround us remind us of the nurture we receive by Your hand; may the splendor of the Sun remind us of the warmth of Your presence in our lives and may the opportunities of this new day remind us that we should serve others with grace, with dignity, and with justice. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the

last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TRAFICANT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

THE COMMUNITY RENEWAL ACT

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, today, under the leadership of my good friends, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT], a bipartisan coalition will introduce the American Community Renewal Act of 1996.

The bill reflects a critically important understanding that government must stop being the enemy of the family. Nowhere has the destructive power of the arrogant Federal bureaucracy caused greater harm than in our heavily urban areas, such as my district in Cincinnati.

The Federal Government cannot be a substitute for strong families and vibrant neighborhoods. Instead, we must work to unleash the creative energies and the talents of all Americans, including especially those Americans least equipped to overcome government-erected barriers to economic success. The Community Renewal Act will provide parents of needy children greater choice in education. It will recognize that religious groups can be valuable colleagues in arms in the war against drugs, and it will help to promote individual entrepreneurship in areas where government heretofore has smothered it.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the introduction of the legislation and encourage its adoption.

RICHARD SPECK'S EASY TIME IN PRISON FOR MURDERING EIGHT NURSES

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago Richard Speck killed eight nurses in Chicago. Opponents of the death penalty said Richard Speck should get life in prison. That is much harder time and much more punishment.

Well, check this out. News reports now confirm that while in the Illinois State Prison, Richard Speck had total