

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