

of this if we are going to get a conclusion.

I see that the gentlewoman from Washington wanted to make a comment.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. I wanted to ask you a question, how I got the number, but you happened to say how I got the number. If they want to call our offices, though, and find out or if I want to tell someone, is it better to use that number or our own office number?

Mr. HOKE. If they have the office number, it is better to use the office number.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. If not, what number?

Mr. HOKE. It's 202-224-3121.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Thank you. Listening to you, what really excites me about this is that we are not to the end; in fact, we are just at the beginning. I look at all that has been coming up, and the proposals are clearly that there are ways to fix this system and there are ways to make it better.

Mr. HOKE. I see that my time has expired. Maybe we could talk about that in the next special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON from Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

#### TRIBUTE TO EAGLE SCOUT FROM MAINE

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

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the great privileges of being a Member of this body is the opportunity to address this Chamber and to address remarks to the Speaker. I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to call attention to an outstanding young man from my district who last Saturday was awarded the rank of Eagle Scout.

What is significant about this award is out of the thousands of scouts who do achieve the rank of Eagle Scout, this is the fourth son of Charles Gaspar of North Berwick who has achieved that rank; his son John, again, the fourth of four brothers.

He has many accomplishments. Most recently he ranked first in his high school class. He is an accomplished chess player and he aspires to be a physician. Mr. Speaker, I certainly would want to state for the RECORD my pride in having this young man as a resident of my district.

#### NATIONAL LOBSTER MONTH

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to address to the Chair, and knowing the Chair's great interest in fine cuisine, that my district is the home of the

Maine lobster. The month of August is going to be Maine Lobster Month and I know that many Members who potentially may be taking vacations may have an interest in traveling to the rockbound coast of Maine to partake of this culinary delight.

We have over 6,500 licensed lobstermen in the State, over 400 dealers, and last year we produced nearly 40 million pounds of lobsters; almost 100 million dollars' worth of production that was distributed around the world.

Again, it is a great source of pride to me, Mr. Speaker, to represent the First District of the State of Maine and particularly the fishermen and the lobstermen in the State. Again, I compliment them on the great accomplishment of Maine Lobster Month in the month of August.

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

[Mr. OBERSTAR addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

□ 2100

#### WE NEED TO LOOK AT MEDICARE MORE CLOSELY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I think that we need to talk more about Medicare, because I am finally beginning to have hope. I took the report, the task force report home, that yellow book that scared me so much, and I flew 7 hours with it and I read through it and I read each section. Surely enough, the President's trustees were right. Financially, it is trouble.

I think what has been exciting to me as a newcomer here, a freshman in this particular year, is that solutions are coming quickly. What really is clear is that the people suggest and the ones coming up here say that we should be clearly looking at fraud and abuse, we should be looking at paperwork and how much there is, and that if we would do those two things, it would be a good beginning to fixing the system. We are going to protect the system.

I have not heard one person on either side of the aisle say we are not going to have Medicare. It confirmed what I have been saying, which is I am not willing to have any person that is on Medicare now, any person relying on this vital program for their life, to wake up one day and have it gone by default, because we do nothing to preserve the system, or by taking it away from people we have made a commitment to.

So what we are seeing now is people getting out the rhetoric. There are a few people that stand up here each day and harp that it is going to be gone, but they are the minority in both par-

ties now. Most are saying, let's fix it, let's preserve it, let's make sure it is stronger and it is simpler.

The system is too tough for me, and my background is paperwork. So if my background is paperwork and I cannot figure out the paper, then how can someone else that is trying to manage after an illness? So that is just an exciting thing that I am seeing happening and a great hope for the system.

Mr. HOKE. Would the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. I would be glad to yield.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I think that it is very important that we remind ourselves and each other and the Speaker that one of the criteria that we will follow in this is that every single person who is currently on Medicare has an absolute guarantee from the Republican Conference in this House, the majority of this House, that those people, if they choose to stay on the Medicare Program the way that it is designed today, that is a choice that they will be absolutely guaranteed to have, and that nobody, at least on this side of the aisle, nobody is suggesting anything other than that.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I think the exciting thing about that is that it is like a rainbow. We have had this system that everyone has known for nearly 10 years was going to be in financial trouble, and they kind of just shoved it to the side. The system just sat there and got internally financially worse.

Now what we are hearing about is something nobody talked about because they knew there were problems in the system, and that is choice for senior citizens.

Mr. HOKE. I think you are right and I think that is what is exciting. The place that we can look first in terms of having hope for being able to solve this problem, other than the fact that I hope that as Americans, we all just have a general positive sense of our ability to meet any challenge, under any circumstance, and meet it positively and with vigor and with dignity and know that we are going to succeed.

One of the places that we can look, and probably the place we ought to look first generally, is in the private sector. I know, as you know, what has happened in the private sector. We have gone from over double digit inflationary rates in health care down to about 4 percent in the past couple of years. We are running at 10.5 percent in the public sector inflation per year, at 4 percent in the private sector. Clearly, if we simply use that as our model, right there, that is actually less than the increase that we have budgeted in Medicare over the next 7 years.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. What the gentleman from Ohio is saying, is let's look at what worked in the general medical to bring down the inflation rate for Medicare. You know what they did? They streamlined paperwork, they got rid of fraud, they dealt with giving individuals choice.

We need to bring all of those things in. But we have to secure the confidence of those that are on it now and make sure everyone out there knows, or everyone knows, whether it is my grandmom or my mother-in-law, that they know that tomorrow they are going to still be taken care of. I hope the rhetoric goes down, because we have to fix this. With the rhetoric, that could stop us from fixing it.

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

[Mr. PALLONE 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 Idaho [Mr. CRAPO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### THE VOTERS' BILL OF RIGHTS

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to inform my colleagues that tomorrow I will be introducing a series of pieces of legislation that I think will get us back onto some of the agenda items that we need to address this fall. We have had a very successful year beginning early in the year with the Contract With America, moving on now through a process of going through 13 appropriations bills. But I believe the legislation that I am going to be introducing tomorrow, at least parts of them, are going to require serious consideration this fall.

What I do is I call them the Voters' Bill of Rights. Because really, what we are doing with these pieces of legislation is we are empowering American citizens to help set the agenda in Washington, and to hold their Members more accountable for their actions in the House and in the Senate.

Specifically, the three pieces of legislation include three items, the first of which is the national voice on term limits. As many of you know, we had a vote on term limits earlier this year. We had a majority. We failed to get the required number because it was a constitution amendment.

I think it is now time to nationalize the debate, to have a national debate during the spring, the summer and the fall of 1996, and then we are going to have a unique experience if this legislation passes. We are going to have the opportunity to have every American citizen in this country to vote and express their preference on what they would like congress to do with term limits. That would happen in November of 1996. Then, as the Speaker of the House has committed, if Republicans

are still in control of the House in 1997, January 1997, a vote on term limits would be the first vote that we will have on our legislative agenda in January 1997.

So what a beautiful process. We will have a national debate. We will have a national advisory referendum, and then we will have instructed Congress how to vote, and then in January 1997, we will have that vote on term limits, which I am sure will get us over the hump and move us to actually completing the work, or completing the work in Washington on term limits so that we can then move it to the States.

The second piece of legislation that I am going to be introducing tomorrow is the opportunity for citizens in their districts to recall Members of the House and Members of the Senate. Currently, if, during their term of office, the Member in the House or the Senate loses the trust or the confidence of the people of their district, there is no mechanism by which the Member or the citizens of that district can hold their Member accountable.

Recall is an extreme measure. The hurdles that we have in our legislation will make it very difficult to recall a Member of the House or of the Senate, but it provides that opportunity where the trust between the Member and the citizenry has been broken, for the citizens to go through a petitioning process and to call for the recall of their Member of the House or of the Senate.

It moves accountability and the ability to hold a Member accountable during a term of office back to the people, another element of our Voters' Bill of Rights.

The third element of our Voter Bill of Rights, and there are a couple of others, but the only other one that I want to highlight this evening, it is something that I saw for the first time 3 years ago, and I kind of chuckled the first time I saw it, but then I actually figured out how it worked.

What this calls for is FOR the States in the election process to list the individuals who have qualified through a petitioning process, or have qualified through a primary process. So it lists the names of the individuals who have qualified to be on the ballot in a November national election or House election or a Senate election. It has the names on there, and then it is going to add another interesting little category. It is going to add the category: None of the above. We call it NOTA, None of The Above.

So often we hear our citizens saying, we are not really satisfied with the choices that we have. In this new process, they can vote for the individuals that are listed or they can vote for none of the above. If none of the above receives the majority of the votes, a new election will be held, and the individuals that were on the original ballot will not be eligible for this second election.

#### RESTORE CRIME PREVENTION DOLLARS IN H.R. 2067

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS] is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, today we are debating H.R. 2067, which was the legislation that we debated earlier today and the legislation we will resume debating on tomorrow. On tomorrow we will introduce an amendment to this piece of legislation to restore money for an interest that I have, an interest that I feel is very important to the American people, and that is the prevention dollars that were taken out of the bill and put in a block grant form and give the States the discretion to use money, either for prevention or for incarceration.

Mr. Speaker, I think one of the problems we have in this country, we fail to realize one of the problems with crime, is that we do not put money where I believe it needs to be, and that is in the area of prevention. If we just send block grant money to States and let them make the decision as to where they want to spend this money, we could very well end up with 90 percent or 100 percent of the dollars that we send to a particular State being used in incarceration, building more jails and prisons, and not dealing with the root of the problem. And in my opinion the root of the problem is in fact prevention.

The amendment that I introduced today, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, and will debate on tomorrow will provide that 10 percent of the funding must be used for crime prevention, which would allocate about \$200 million of the total \$2 billion that is allocated in this appropriation to crime prevention. It just makes basic sense to me, Mr. Speaker, that we take 10 percent of the dollars and use it for crime prevention.

We passed the legislation last year to appropriate about \$30 billion to fight crime. We allocated X number of dollars to go toward building jails and prisons, and we also allocated X number of dollars that would go toward prevention, because we felt that was a balanced approach.

We felt that in order to fight the real crime problems in this country, you had to do it twofold, not only just build jails and prisons, but also have drug treatment, also have educational programs and recreational programs for youth all across the country.

In this bill, I am sad to say, this bill does not address that problem. Many argue that you can use the money for crime prevention or you can use the money for incarceration and enforcement. That is absolutely true. But the trend in this country is many States are using money only for locking people up.

Let me tell you why prevention makes sense, Mr. Speaker. Prevention