

out of the sky, Congress held hearings and passed legislation, the Aviation Security Act of 1990.

Section 108 of the public law was entitled "Deployment of Explosive Detection Equipment." Certain guidelines were put in place for the deployment of high-technology equipment which could detect plastic explosives such as used in Pan Am 103.

Mr. Speaker, on July 20, 1996, The Washington Post ran a story with the following headline: "U.S. Airports Lack High-Tech Scan Devices To Detect Explosives." This article details how the Federal Aviation Administration developed several high-technology pieces of equipment to detect plastic explosives.

Currently, the Europeans have about 90 such machines in use. Germany has approximately 50 machines like this in use, the rest being in the United Kingdom and France. That is all well and good. I think they are right to want to protect their citizens.

Do my colleagues know how many of these machines are used in the United States? None. We are now testing about four of these machines in San Francisco and Atlanta because of the large volume of visitors passing through these airports, but we have only four of these type machines in use in a testing mode in the United States.

Something is definitely wrong with this situation. We developed this high-technology equipment at taxpayers' expense here in the United States. Then we sell it overseas and we do not even use it here at home. I believe legislation to rectify this problem is long overdue because, as much as I wish I were wrong, I believe such barbarous and cowardly acts of violence will continue to be committed against the United States as well as other countries.

Machines such as the EGIS and the updated CTX-5000 that works like a CAT scan, slicing up objects visually, ensure that we will find all such bombs and plastic devices on board. We are now using 20-year-old x-ray machines that can only detect 10 percent of this. I hope all my colleagues will join me in sponsoring my legislation to protect all Americans.

MEDICARE SHOULD NOT WITHER ON THE VINE

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, while I share the concerns of the last speaker about terrorism, I am amazed by his comments defending Speaker GINGRICH and his comments about Medicare and his challenge to my good friend, our colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE.

I wonder if the gentleman has ever listened to Speaker GINGRICH's exact words, because they could not be clear-

er in what he said, nor in how he interpreted these words himself and his press secretary interpreted these words. Furthermore, the Speaker's determination to let Medicare wither on the vine is consistent with everything he and his Republican colleagues were doing throughout this period of time.

Let me refer to his precise words. They were said on October 24, 1995. We have got a chart here with those words on it. He said, the key words, "But we believe it's going to wither on the vine because we think people are voluntarily going to leave it."

So the big debate and the attempt at intimidation of people all over in this country who would have the audacity to hold the Speaker to these words is, well, it referred to some government bureaucracy. Well, he was not talking about downsizing a Federal agency. People were not going to leave a Federal agency. They were going to leave Medicare.

But one need not take my interpretation of it today, because only 2 days later, after Speaker GINGRICH demonstrated what his gardening ability would be for the seniors of America and for generations who would rely on Medicare, he commented on it himself. The Atlanta Constitution and Journal reported on October 29 of last year that, quote, "Gingrich said he was referring to the fee-for-service portion of Medicare, which he believes seniors would leave." Fee-for-service Medicare, the Medicare system that President Johnson signed into law in 1965.

As if that verification from the Speaker himself as to what he meant when he said let Medicare wither on the vine were not enough, his press secretary, Mr. Tony Blankley and some of the only words Mr. Blankley has ever said that I found reason to agree with, told the Los Angeles Times, quote, that "it," the statement that he referred to, referred to fee-for-service Medicare. Blankley said that GINGRICH's comments were consistent with Republicans' anticipated belief that most seniors will voluntarily choose to leave this traditional form of Medicare.

Indeed, Mr. Blankley is right. The Speaker's position, which he is so desperate to run away from, as are all of his followers who here in this Republican Congress thought merely following the Speaker 90 percent of the time to cut Medicare was a sign of disloyalty, you ought to be there with him every time you get an opportunity to cut Medicare, those folks want to reinterpret his remarks this year. They want to tell television stations they will be intimidated by a crew of the biggest thick carpet lawyers that they can find to sue them if they run the Speaker's own words with him saying let Medicare wither on the vine.

This crowd of people were the same ones who cheered last year when the No. 2 Republican, DICK ARMEY of my own State of Texas, was saying that he though Medicare was an imposition on his freedom, to use his words. He said

he would have never voted for Medicare in the first place and would like to see its demise. He also was demonstrating his gardening ability and the desire that Medicare wither on the vine.

But it was the very same day that Speaker GINGRICH gave this speech, October 24, 1995, that Bob Dole, the other half of the Dole-Gingrich ticket that we have this year, Bob Dole was telling a group on that same day at another part of our country that he was proud, to use his words, proud to have been 1 of 12 people who stood up and voted against Medicare because he did not think it would work in 1965.

Yes; some three decades ago and a year, Bob Dole was here in the Congress voting against Medicare because he did not think it would work. I would have to say to his credit, at least he is not trying to run away from his comments the way these Republicans are determined to run away from the comment that they want Medicare to wither on the vine, as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] commented a few minutes ago.

The are scared to death that the American people are going to understand their determination to destroy the Medicare system as soon as they can pick up a few more votes in this election cycle. Meanwhile, let us distract the American people and everything else, but come 1997, let it wither on the vine.

INTRODUCING THE WHITE HOUSE INSPECTOR GENERAL ACT OF 1996

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

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I am here to talk about a bill I am going to introduce establishing an inspector general for the White House, but I cannot help beginning by making a comment concerning the remarks of my friend from Texas a second ago.

As they say in poker, the cards speak, and the fact is that those television stations would not have removed those ads from the air if they had said what the real record shows. What NEWT GINGRICH said at that point was, and I quote,

Okay, what do you think the Health Care Financing Administration is? That's HCFA. It is a centralized government bureaucracy, it is everything we are telling Boris Yeltsin to get rid of. No, we do not get rid of it in round one because we do not think that is politically smart, but we do it through a transition. We believe it is going to wither on the vine.

Now what does that mean? That means that the choice here is whether we protect, improve, and preserve Medicare or whether we protect a Federal bureaucracy. That is the issue before us today, and we plan to move forward.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the White House Inspector General Act of 1996, to establish an Office of Inspector General in the Executive Office of

the President. The White House IG, like other IG's in the executive branch, would serve as the principal watchdog of White House financial management procedures and fiscal resources. This legislation would provide the President with an essential tool for rooting out waste, fraud, and abuse in the White House.

As many of my colleagues know, the Inspector General Act of 1978 established offices of inspector general within certain Federal departments and agencies to protect the integrity of Federal programs and resources. Inspectors general are appointed without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of a strong background in accounting, auditing, or financial management. They are provided the authority and independence to perform audits and investigations in order to combat waste, fraud, and abuse.

More specifically, the three principal responsibilities of inspector general are, first, to conduct audits and investigations relating to Federal programs and operations; second, to issue recommendations that promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of Federal programs and operations; and, third, to keep agency heads and Congress fully informed of problems and deficiencies in Federal program administration and operations.

Today 61 Federal entities have an inspector general, including all 14 Cabinet departments. Of these 61 IG's, 29 are appointed by the President subject to Senate confirmation and the remaining 32, primarily in smaller agencies, are selected by their agency heads. The Presidentially appointed IG's have a total of 10,000 staff and an aggregate budget of approximately \$900 million.

According to information gathered by the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, funding for IG's is indeed a sound investment. In 1994, IG investigations and audits led to over 14,000 successful criminal and civil prosecutions. Furthermore, IG's returned \$1.9 billion in investigative recoveries to the U.S. Treasury and made efficiency recommendations that could save a total of \$24 billion.

As I mentioned previously, IG's have significant authority and independence to conduct their audits and investigations. They have direct access to all records and information of the agency, and possess the power to issue subpoenas and administer oaths for taking testimony.

With regard to their independence, IG's have full control over hiring and managing their own staff and resources. Moreover, they can be removed only by the President or the agency head who appointed them, and the President or agency head must communicate his reason to Congress when exercising this authority.

As I already mentioned, my legislation will establish an Office of Inspector General for the Executive Office of the President. The White House IG

would be appointed by the President and could be removed without cause by the President. All the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978 would apply to the White House IG, but the bill also includes special provisions relating to sensitive information in matters that would protect the constitutional prerogatives and operational effectiveness of the Presidency.

The first exemption assures that the White House IG will not interfere in areas relating to policy, intelligence or national security interests, similar to the IG's in the defense area, in defense-related departments. The second broad exemption assures that the White House IG does not hinder the President in carrying out his constitutional responsibilities.

Under the IG Act of 1978, agency heads are strictly prohibited from obstructing an IG audit or investigation. However, under my bill the President would have the authority to prohibit the White House IG from conducting an audit or investigation.

I do hope my colleagues will join me in cosponsoring this important piece of legislation.

SORTING THROUGH THE REPUBLICANS' VOTING RECORD

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, as we go into any election, one of the hardest things is to figure out where the candidates really stand on issues. And when we go into any third-grade class in America and we ask the 8-year-olds, "Okay, what is the best predictor of what someone is going to do if they get elected, how they have been voting and what they have been saying or what they say in the last 6 weeks before the election?" every third-grader in America will tell us that the best predictor is what they have been doing, not what they were promising as the heat turns up in the last few weeks. So the difficulty is to find out and to sort through that voting record.

No one has ever elected a President or a Member of Congress or a Member of the Senate who was for big debts, loved war, hated kids, wanted to tromp all over the elderly, could not stand trees. No, no one has ever done that. So when we see the promises and then we see the performance, it is very different.

I must say, after saying that, I am very troubled about the debate we have been having here on the floor today, because no matter who the candidate Bob Dole selects for his Vice President, his real Vice President is going to be the Speaker of the House. People know this is a team and whatever comes out of here is going to be signed by President Dole, if he becomes President Dole. So that is why all this great concern about what the Speaker said about Medicare.

The Speaker said about Medicare, and all sorts of the written press reported it, The Washington Post and all sorts of other newspapers, he said, "we don't get rid of it in round 1 because we don't think that is politically smart." Get it? Members do not want to let them know exactly what they think about it.

Then he goes on to say we are going to go through this transition period and "we think it's going to wither on the vine," because they are going to offer these little goodies that we have seen that will lure out the wealthiest and the healthiest, so that the thing will suddenly be left with the sickest and the poorest and suddenly folks will say we cannot afford it, let them go.

Now, we know what that is. The gentleman from Texas just went through and pointed out that when his press secretary was asked about it, he indeed said yes, yes, that is what we meant, we were talking about Social Security. When he was home talking in Atlanta, the Atlanta Constitution got the same confirmation, yes, that is what he means, not Social Security but he was talking about Medicare, so he clarified it over and over again. It was on TV. We have got tapes of it.

Now there are people trying to run ads so the American people will know what President-elect or Presidential candidate Dole's real Vice President, Speaker GINGRICH, really thinks about this issue.

If they continue to try and take these ads off TV, we are going to be in the same position Red Riding Hood was, because what they are trying to do is let Speaker GINGRICH dress up in grandma's clothing. That is exactly what they are trying to do. They are trying to now take their words back and get the wolf in bed looking like sweet little old grandma until this election is over, and then they can go back to round 2 and take on Medicare the way they hope to.

So I really hope that America's news media does their research, looks at this and continues to let people know what third graders want to know when they vote, and that is what do they really think and how did they really vote and what did they really do, rather than what are they now trying to cast themselves as we go to cast our vote.

WELFARE REFORM CONCERNS OF MY CONSTITUENTS

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 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the important thing about representation is to ensure that Members go home and relate to those who have elected them. As I go home every weekend, I try to solicit from my constituents their concerns or reflections on the past week's legislative activity,