

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

know now that the bomb that exploded at the Olympics consisted of three lengths of pipe packed with smokeless powder, an explosive substance that is completely unregulated by Federal law. This in itself is a scandal, and of course the perpetrators of the act are still at large.

We are not even safe in our homes. In upstate New York a 10-year-old girl opened a Christmas package left in her family mailbox. Instead of a gift, she was greeted with an explosion that burned over 27 percent of her body.

The bomb turned out to be a "message" from a disgruntled employee of her family. I would like to send a return message to domestic terrorists and I need your support. Unfortunately it often takes tragedies such as these to spur this House to action. I was shocked to discover 2 years ago that under current law possession of explosives is not a Federal felony. For years we said that certain people, for example a felon, should not be allowed to carry guns, and yet they can drive around in their car or keep at home 100 pounds of gun powder that is not even a crime and that nobody accounts for.

Bombers commit murder by remote control. They do not have to be in the same room as their victims or even in the same city. They never have to see the death and destruction that they cause, and their ruthless method of murder often kills random bystanders. It is no wonder that Americans are uneasy on the streets and their homes, in airplanes.

We need to act now against these particularly cold-blooded killers. We must not wait for another attention-grabbing attack. In recent years we have seen mail bomb attacks on a judge and civil rights activists in the South and a string of bombings at abortion clinics. How much more evidence do we need of the pressing need for stronger laws?

And do not think it cannot happen in your district. Two days ago, this week, a potentially deadly pipe bomb was discovered a few blocks away from my Rochester office and was just outside the headquarters of Eastman Kodak. Fortunately, no one was hurt. But perhaps next time we will not be so lucky.

We have got to keep explosive materials out of the wrong hands. My bill would require Federal permits for all explosive purchases and would mandate a nationwide background check for these permits. It also increases penalties for those who violate Federal explosives laws. Obtaining this permit is not a burdensome process. To receive a permit you only need to provide your name and address to the vendor and indicate the purpose of the purchase. This information would be invaluable to law enforcement officials who are investigating terrorism.

Such a process would allow us to screen out people who should not have access to these destructive materials, such as felons, fugitives and others who show a tendency to take out whatever

things they might have on their fellow Americans.

Moreover, my bill contains special provisions that requires every person who purchases more than 5 pounds of black or smokeless powder, and 5 pounds is enough for gun enthusiasts to have to make their own bullets that would make them hold a Federal permit. Criminal bombings have doubled since 1988. Think about that. This is almost becoming retribution of choice in the United States. They have doubled since 1988. One-third of those incidents involved black powder or smokeless powder.

Of course this is the part of the bill that will send our friends in the National Rifle Association through the roof. But under the current law, any purchase of less than 50 pounds of black powder is totally exempt from any kind of oversight. This is crazy. Fifty pounds of explosive powder can unleash substantial destruction. As every law enforcement official knows, bomb makers love that stuff. It is cheap, it is available, it is unregulated, and a little bit goes a long way. In fact it only takes a pound and a half to make a pipe bomb.

I would also like to point out these regulations will not harm legitimate sportsmen. As I pointed out a while ago, 5 pounds of black powder will reload 750 shotgun shells.

Each year, millions of pounds of explosives are purchased without any permit being required or no regulation, and we in Congress have a duty, I believe, and an obligation to protect the lives and property from bombings.

Last session, we passed my legislation to help protect innocent people from bombs made of plastic explosives such as the bomb used on PanAm flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland. It is time we got tougher on terrorists here at home. Passing H.R. 85 will give law enforcement officials another tool in tracking down these homegrown terrorists. It must be done. Nobody knows who is going to be next.

FAREWELL TO REPRESENTATIVE FRANK TEJEDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Puerto Rico [Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to join with so many of our colleagues in honoring Frank Tejeda for all his years of dedication and service to this Congress, to our people, to our Nation. As we honor the memory of the great person that Frank Tejeda was, I cannot help but look back and think about moments that I had the opportunity to share with him.

Frank and I began service in the House 4 years ago. And as a matter of fact, Frank was one of the first Members that I met when I arrived in Washington. I will always remember the time when I was invited to participate

in a hearing at the Committee on Veterans' Affairs where issues related to Hispanic veterans were being discussed and particularly Puerto Rico.

During my opening statement I proceeded to narrate the glorious and distinguished history of Puerto Rico's 65th Infantry Regiment. Specifically, I made reference to the time when the 65th Infantry Regiment was asked to cover the withdrawal of thousands of marines during the Korean war. Frank, who was a member of the committee and a marine himself, recognized the valorous service of Puerto Rican veterans in all the major wars and conflicts that this Nation has been involved in during this century but then took exception to my comment on the withdrawal of the marines and he said, with a smile on his face, "but you know, CARLOS, we, the Marines, never were withdraw from battle."

As you see, I believe that this statement characterizes Frank's life. He never withdrew from anything. He never gave up. His life was an incredible story of triumph over adversity. He lived a life of hard work, hard work in his district, hard work in the military, hard work here in Congress, hard work wherever he went.

But most of all Frank understood the value of freedom and honesty and he was well aware of the dramatic cost of keeping our cherished and hard-fought liberties.

Frank, I was privileged to have you as my colleague, but most of all I was privileged to have you as my friend. We will miss you but your memory will be with all of us forever and an example for us to follow.

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

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

HELPING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor first and foremost to thank Members for the way they responded to the President's remarks concerning the District yesterday. The President spoke, in his State of the Union speech, warmly of his own intention to assist the District, and partly in his words, "to renew this great capital city so that Washington, DC, is a great place to live, and is once again the proud face America shows to the world."

I appreciate as well the concerned words of Speaker GINGRICH, who devoted part of his own opening speech, upon being sworn in, to the District. The Speaker has in fact been very helpful to the District during the 104th Congress.