

To the Committee on Agriculture: Jay Johnson of Wisconsin, Leonard Boswell of Iowa.

To the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight: Danny Davis of Illinois, John Tierney of Massachusetts, Jim Turner of Texas, Tom Allen of Maine.

To the Committee on House Oversight: Steny Hoyer of Maryland, Carolyn Kilpatrick of Michigan.

To the Committee on International Relations: Bob Clement of Tennessee.

To the Committee on National Security: Loretta Sanchez of California, James Maloney of Connecticut, Mike McIntyre of North Carolina.

To the Committee on Resources: Nick Lampson of Texas.

To the Committee on Small Business: John LaFalce of New York, Ike Skelton of Missouri, Norman Sisisky of Virginia, Floyd Flake of New York, Glenn Poshard of Illinois, Martin Meehan of Massachusetts, Nydia Velázquez of New York, Bill Luther of Minnesota, John Baldacci of Maine, Jesse Jackson Jr. of Illinois, Juanita Millender-McDonald of California, Alan Boyd of Florida, Carolyn McCarthy of New York, William Pascrell of New Jersey, Virgil Goode of Virginia.

To the Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Lane Evans of Illinois, Joseph Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bob Filner of California, Luis Guterrez of Illinois, Scotty Baesler of Kentucky, Sanford Bishop of Georgia, James Clyburn of South Carolina, Corrine Brown of Florida, Mike Doyle of Pennsylvania, Frank Mascara of Pennsylvania, Collin Peterson of Minnesota, Julia Carson of Indiana, Sylvestre Reyes of Texas, Victor Snyder of Arkansas.

To the Committee on the Budget: Eva Clayton of North Carolina.

Mr. FAZIO of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would inquire concerning whether the Committee on Science is included in the resolution.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a member of the Committee on Science appointed as a result of the resolution, one member.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection, and I move to table the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will ask, is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] to dispensing with the reading of the resolution?

Mr. FAZIO of California. The resolution must be read at this point. Is the objection to the unanimous consent request that it be considered as read, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is asking whether there is objection.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I do object to the dispensing of the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue reading.

Mr. FAZIO of California. The gentleman objects, so the Clerk will then read; is that right, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will then continue reading the resolution.

The Clerk continued reading the resolution.

□ 1300

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to table the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS). The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair would say to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] that the Chair assumes that the gentleman from Louisiana, [Mr. FIELDS], was not intended to be in the resolution, as the gentleman from Louisiana is no longer in the House. Is that correct?

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that that obvious inaccuracy be corrected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Does the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] seek recognition?

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to table the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FAZIO of California. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

I really do not know the answer. I would like the Parliamentarian to assist us. I am not sure there is any precedent for a resolution brought to the floor by the caucus or conference of either party being tabled. Is there any precedent for that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 4, rule XVI, the motion is in order as preferential to the motion for the previous question.

The question is on the motion to table offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] as preferential to the motion for the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair while counting for a quorum will notify the Members that the page just placed at the desk with the specific Member's election to the Committee on Science was not included in the resolution now pending before the House.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I cannot imagine that we could be correcting the resolution or even explaining the resolution when we have a vote or a quorum being called.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would the gentleman from Florida like to withdraw his objection?

Mr. CANADY of Florida. I do not withdraw my motion.

Mr. FAZIO of California. The quorum call is automatic.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count for a quorum.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FAZIO of California. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. I do not know what is holding up the action here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend. The Chair is counting for a quorum.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend. The Chair is counting for a quorum.

Does the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] desire to withdraw his point of order and motion?

Mr. CANADY of Florida. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion is withdrawn.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I insist on the enactment of the resolution, as is traditionally the case when offered by a conference or caucus of either party.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE FRANK TEJEDA

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join many of my colleagues who want to honor and celebrate the life of our friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Frank Tejeda.

As has been recounted over the past 2 days, Frank's accomplishments were many. While enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps, he distinguished himself as a leader and was selected to become a Marine Corps officer. Throughout his military career Frank was decorated and recognized by the Marine Corps, and he was a hero to many as he was given the Bronze Star, awarded the Bronze Star and Silver Star posthumously.

As a graduate of St. Mary's University, the University of California at Berkeley School of Law, Harvard's Kennedy School of Government, and Yale Law School, Frank was also distinguished as a student at America's finest schools.

Frank accomplished so much throughout his life; but what made him

a great man was not just his accomplishments, but his desire to take his own successes and use them as a tool to serve others. Frank Tejeda dedicated his entire life to serving others in his family, in his community, and in his country. This desire carried him to the Texas House of Representatives and Texas Senate, and finally right here to the U.S. House of Representatives, while remaining a devoted husband and father.

Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to attend Frank's funeral Mass at St. Louis' Catholic Church in San Antonio, TX, where he also served as an altar boy. Many times Members of this body frequently talk about the nature of being a good representative and being connected to their district. I would have to say that Frank was probably the quintessential district public servant. He grew up in the area that he was representing, he was connected to it, he never left it. He exuded the spirit and vitality of south San Antonio.

Mr. Speaker, I was touched during the service to find out that the very church we were in was also the church in which Frank was an altar boy. Throughout his life Frank Tejeda led by example and led by serving others. Today we honor Frank with our words. I am happy to participate in the numerous accolades to Frank, and would like to extend my own personal condolences to his mother, Lily, and his three children.

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 Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### A PROPOSAL TO KEEP SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENT

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in the week of February 27, we are expected to take up the issue of the balanced budget amendment. There has been a lot of talk about Social Security. How this amendment is going to affect Social Security and how changes in that amendment that might better portray what is really happening at the Federal Government.

I wanted to talk a few minutes about what the problem is in Social Security. That problem with Social Security is not having enough money coming in to

pay the benefits of retirees as we operate on, if you will, a pay-as-you-go system, where existing workers pay the benefits of existing retirees. That is the way it started in 1935 when we passed the Social Security bill. That is the way it has always been, and that is the way it is today.

If we look at the problems of the birth rate going down while the number of retired people increase—and they are increasing because they are living longer—we see what happens to the deficits of Social Security. Some suggest, such as Dorcas Hardy, the previous Social Security commissioner, that we are going to be short of Social Security funds as early as 2005. It presents a serious problem to this Congress.

Every retiree should be concerned about what might happen to those benefits if we delay some solution. Every worker in America, especially those under 45 years old, had better be going to the candidates that run for Congress and say, look, take your heads out of the sand and do something to protect Social Security.

This chart in front of me shows the kind of deficits we are going to have; in other words, the amount of money by which benefit payments will exceed revenues that have to borrow or shift from the general fund.

As I go around to my town hall meetings and into high school and college government classes, one statistic that I give them is the price that Social Security is costing a minute today. That price is \$600,000 a minute. But in 2030, it is going to be \$5,700,000 a minute. So the number of retirees increases because they are living longer. When we started Social Security, the average age of death was 63. Now if you are lucky enough to hit 65, the estimate is that you are going to live to be 86 years old. This represents the decrease in the number of workers that pay in their taxes to support each retiree.

In 1945, there were about 42 people working, paying in taxes to support each retiree. By 1950, that was down to 17 people working. By today, there are only three people working. The estimate is by 2030 there are only going to be two people working.

I have developed a Social Security proposal that has been scored by the Social Security Administration that keeps Social Security solvent. It does this in several ways. No. 1, it keeps the Government from reaching into the surpluses in the Social Security fund and spending those for other Government purposes. It allows a very modest investment in private savings accounts. The reason we do that is because Treasury is now paying a return, a real interest rate return, of 2.3 percent. If we compare that to the 9-percent the private sector has been getting over the last 80 years, we see the Social Security system is losing out.

□ 1315

So every proposal that came out of the President's advisory council in-

cluded some kind of private investment. What we also do is increase the retirement age by 1 year. That brings in additional revenues. The amount of those additional revenues can be eligible for private investments. We do not affect current retirees in this bill because they, after all, made their plans based on existing law; but gradually over the next 25 years, we make these changes.

Look, we have just got to, make an aggressive, conscientious effort to deal with these kinds of entitlement spending, whether it is Medicare, or whether it is Social Security, because the fact is, we are going broke. If we do not make changes now, those changes in the future are going to have to be much more drastic. It is going to interrupt our economy. It is going to interrupt the well-being of retirees. So let's act now.

#### THE BOMBING PREVENTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McINNIS). UNDER A PREVIOUS ORDER OF THE HOUSE, THE GENTLEMAN FROM NEW YORK [MS. SLAUGHTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly condemn what has been a wave of bombing activity throughout this Nation and to urge Congress to act. This type of violence must come to an end and I am working to do just that.

On January 7, I reintroduced H.R. 85, the Bombing Prevention Act of 1997, which would help end this vicious attack on innocent persons. I urge my colleagues to sign on as cosponsors. I know you were as shocked as I was over the weekend when government offices, including the court, in San Diego were targeted with pipe bombs that were sent through the mail. Two hundred employees were evacuated, the package detonated by bomb squads in the FBI parking lot.

Atlanta has faced an even more horrific tragedy. I still remember my outrage 2 weeks ago after an attack on a family planning clinic outside of Atlanta. The first bomb shattered concrete and blew away pieces of the wall and the ceiling at the building that housed the clinic. The second bomb was even more ominous. The terrorist designed it to spill blood by packing it with metal fragments and 3-inch concrete nails that were set to explode over a wide area. It was set to go off an hour after the first bomb so that law enforcement officials would bear the brunt of that explosion.

The people of Atlanta have fallen victim twice to a devastating crime which was likely perpetrated by domestic terrorists, a crime designed to intimidate women from exercising their constitutional right to seek health care and a crime that further eroded any sense of innocence left in our citizens.

The Centennial Park bomb at the Olympics 6 months earlier was not enough for the homegrown killers. We