

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

makes sense because if you look at my own State, the State that I come from, the State of Louisiana, in the State of Louisiana we have the highest incarceration rate per capita in the whole country. We also have the highest high school dropout rate.

If you look at the people incarcerated in the State of Louisiana, 80 percent of the people who are behind jail cells in Louisiana are high school dropouts. So it does not take a rocket scientist to realize that education and incarceration does have some nexus. It makes more sense that if we spend \$60,000 to build a jail cell and then \$30,000 a year to maintain that jail cell, it just makes more sense to me that we put that kind of money in education, when we only spend about \$4,000 a year to educate a child.

So this amendment that I will introduce tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, will do just that. Up to \$2 billion that we will allocate for enforcement and crime and crime prevention, we will earmark 10 percent of that, which would be \$200 million, that will be designated for the sole purpose of crime prevention.

On another note as relates to crime prevention and education, I am going to introduce another bill, because I have gotten to the point that I am somewhat tired of us debating the issue of crime on the floor of the House of Representatives and never talking about the real root of the problem, and the real root of the problem is prevention.

I am introducing legislation that would deal with one of the main roots of the problem, and that is education. It is ironic that we have spent time, days and nights debating the crime bill and appropriate billions upon billions of dollars to put people in jail, and by the same token, we spend very little time talking about how to provide education to our children.

There were discussions on this very floor to eliminate the Department of Education. How can anyone even entertain the thought of eliminating the Department of Education in this country? What message do we send to our children?

I am introducing a national education plan the latter part of this week on this House floor that will provide for a national educational trust fund. Those moneys will be used for three purposes and three purposes only, Mr. Speaker. One, moneys will be used to provide a book for every student for every subject. I think that is a commitment that we as Members of the Congress ought to make. There should not be a student who walks into a public school in America that does not have a book, the very basic requirements, a book for every subject.

Some may think that is very radical. But we spent \$30,000 to build a prison cell, but we will not spend \$10 to buy a kid a book and guarantee every kid in America who goes to a public school have a book for every subject that he or she engages in.

□ 2115

How do we expect teachers to teach and kids to learn if they do not have the proper tools; so I just think that is basic sense and basic logic for me.

The second part of this legislation I will introduce will deal with infrastructure. I am sick and tired of walking into schools all across this country and the schools are in worse conditions than in our jails. I have visited schools and jails, and, when I visited jails in Louisiana and in this country, the ceilings are never leaking, the air conditioners are always working, the infrastructure is absolutely gorgeous, but when you visit public schools in this country, unfortunately many times the ceilings are leaking. I mean the building is about to collapse. But yet we study, put down more and more money into jails and prisons and fail to make the investment in our children and in our schools.

And lastly this bill would provide for the funding of teachers' salaries. We take money and put—I think the national Government, the Federal Government, has an interest in what we pay teachers. You know we cannot any longer expect teachers to work and raise a family for little or nothing. I mean teachers cannot buy bread and milk cheaper than anybody else. So I think we have to make that investment now.

Many say how are you going to fund this. I mean we are facing trillions of dollars of debt. And we have a deficit. I mean how are you going to fund it? It sounds very great to stand up on the floor of the House and talk about providing a book for every student and providing teacher's salaries as well as building new schools and improving infrastructure of the schools we presently have.

Well, there is a proliferation of gaming that is taking place all across this country. You know I think we ought to have a Federal tax on gaming, 5 percent, and that 5 percent ought to go to a national education trust fund, and those dollars ought to be used solely for the three purposes I enumerated on the House floor tonight, and it is amazing what we will do with education in this country if we can put those kind of dollars in education.

I see the gentlewoman from Texas is standing in the well, and I would be happy to yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the gentleman give us really an agenda, because someone would be listening and ask the question how do we pay for many of the things that I heard you express concern about, but the real question becomes how do we focus, what are our priorities, and you mentioned education taking some of the most devastating cuts, chapter 1, many of our rural and urban schools where children need an extra leg up or an opportunity.

Again I always emphasize it is not a handout, it is a hand up, but yet we are going almost to the bone on programs

that provide special educational opportunities for our children. There is a lack of focus. The infrastructure where we find that our children go to schools with leaking roofs and windows that do not shut or those that shut tight and they cannot get any air.

Then we have a situation where we say to our seniors, and in fact I want to emphasize again, and I was on the floor of the House saying this before, it is not just our seniors that are impacted by Medicare and Medicaid. We want to do a \$270 billion cut, not because we have heard from the task force put together to assess the condition of Medicare, and they did indicate that Medicare needs to be reformed, but specifically they said it needs to be reformed in the context of a total health reform package, and they also mentioned that what needs most to be emphasized in Medicare reform is elimination of fraud and abuse. No one disagrees with that. But I do wonder about the \$270 billion cut that is now proposed by Republicans to give a tax cut to those making over \$200,000 and then another proposal to voucher those individuals receiving Medicare benefits.

And so the question becomes focus because, if you eliminate and cause seniors to have to pay an increase, which they will, in the amount of the Medicare premium, the balance is going to come on the backs of those seniors, either that they will not be able to pay that increase and, therefore, their health will go down, their health maintenance program will go down, or they will choose between eating and health care.

But more importantly for those of us who think, well, it does not impact me, those are our parents who will have to come back into our homes or rely upon the meagerness of the income that you already have while you are trying to raise your children and send them to college on a cutback on student loans by the way, and then you have to face the concerns and the needs of your parents.

It is a question of focus, and I was looking, if the gentleman would yield just a little bit more, on what we do in terms of crime. We stood here today, and argued, and tried our best to bring some reason to the Department of Justice appropriations. That is also a question of focus. When we had already in the 103d Congress—my predecessors; I was not here—had already reconfirmed the value of having cops on the street, community policing, we had confirmed through the crime bill of last year that it is important to have preventive programs, late night parks that are used in the city of Houston, the DARE program, drug-free schools, very, very important measures to get to young people and say, "Be a part of our gang and not theirs."

What do we get? A slashing of that program so drastically, and, when we come back with a very measured, reasoned proposal to include the cops on

the beat program, to include more preventive programs for our children, and also to include the violence against women prevention programs and support for those kinds of programs under the Violence Against Women Act, what happened? We reject it, or it was rejected by the majority.

And so I think that we have a problem with focus in this appropriating process, and we are not focused on the future, we are not focused on those who need the extra helping hand.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments, and she certainly makes some very strong points in both areas, first in terms of the seniors. I mean it is so important that we not forget about those people who have worked hard all of their lives, who have built this country, and their mothers and fathers, and their grandmothers and grandfathers, those people who built this country, and who worked hard, who fought our wars, who served in our governments and who just did basic things, those people who worked in hospitals and those people who worked in schools, and to say to our seniors now that you are just not important anymore to me is absolutely asinine and unconscionable to say the least.

So, we have to have some consideration when we talk about this whole issue of Medicare because it is an important issue, and it will impact when you talk about billions of dollars in cuts.

You know you could call it what you want to call it. It is a cut, and it will impact a bunch of senior citizens in this country, and I am glad that the gentlewoman took the time to stand up in the well tonight to talk about the need to preserve programs such as that and the need to protect elderly people in her own State in Texas and all across this country. So I thank the gentlelady.

I yield to the gentlewoman for just a second.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. One of the things that moved me most when I go home to the district would be those who would say, "Do not cut me off Medicare." It was not individuals who did not realize that we had to make sure Medicare survived into the 21st century. They were not being selfish, but they wrote letters or have written letters to my office asking are those of us who are going to be put off? Are those who will become eligible in the year 2000 not be able to secure the necessary health maintenance and health benefits necessary for what has been very positive in this country, which is old age, the ability for our citizens to live longer and healthier lives; is that something that we should give up when most nations look to this country in admiration that we can do that for our seniors?

And then let me just add to the focus question to include two other areas, and that is the question of homelessness. We had begun to make strides in

the homeless area serving homeless persons. Again let me emphasize a hand up and not a handout. We had uniquely been able to focus on what we call transitional housing that allows people to get support services and survive. What do we do? Drastically cut transitional housing because there is not a focus, pitching one support need against another, and then they take it a step further and put in jeopardy the Ryan White treatment dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I recall when these moneys were first proposed for AIDS treatment that Houston was then 13th on the list. It may be 7th now in HIV cases, and so the Ryan White treatment dollars are a vital component of treating those with this deadly disease and, as well, carrying forth the message that we care, but most importantly, that we are in partnership with local health entities that face and have the greater burden for HIV cases. Are we saying to them that we, the Federal Government, are throwing up our hands, we are no longer going to be partners in this very vital effort that we are making both in AIDS and in homeless? And those living with AIDS will now be impacted by not having dollars that may be helpful.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I thank the gentlewoman for her comments and, taking it a step further, in the VA-HUD appropriations they also cut off moneys for national service. I mean eliminate the President's program on national service. Now here was a program, or here is a program, that dealt with kids who were caught in the middle and parents who were caught in the middle, I mean parents who made a little bit too much money to qualify for Government assistance to send their kids to college, but did not make enough money to afford to send their kids to college on their own. So last year we came up with this innovative idea. We said we are going to have a national service program under the President's leadership, and it was a program that did not have an income criterion. If you want to volunteer your services and work your way through college or work your way even after college and pay off your student loan because of the high default rate we had among students who graduated, and even those who did not graduate from college, so this Congress came up with a unique idea to provide a national service program for kids, young students, who decided to go to college, and work their way through college and work with nonprofit organizations.

In this legislation, it totally wipes out that program, zero dollars, not phased down, but wiped it out. I mean 20,000 kids right now and today are benefiting from the national service program what will not be in effect in 1996 if this appropriation passes this House.

You know I mean what are we saying? On one hand we are telling seniors we are going to cut Medicare, on the other hand we are telling young people we are going to cut out drug-free

schools in communities and national service programs. And then we tell them God knows if you have AIDS in America, then you are going to be cut out of public housing. I mean zero, not phased down. I mean zero.

I mean to zero these kinds of budget items to me is you have got to have a hard conscience or no conscience to make these—to come to these kinds of conclusions. I mean from the elderly to the youth, to those people who need assistance, the most—you know, people with AIDS—to tell them that they are no longer going to have this kind of public assistance as relates to housing—you know, what is wrong with the conscience of this Congress to be making such drastic decisions?

In fiscal year 1995, for example, we appropriated \$18.7 billion for housing programs; in 1996, only \$13 billion were appropriated, which means that is going to be a \$4.9 billion cut. I mean \$4.9 billion; that is a 26-percent cut in this program. Assisted housing programs, 1995, we appropriated \$11 billion. Next year we are going to appropriate, according to this legislation, \$10 billion. That is a \$1 billion cut. Well, you say that is a \$1 billion cut. What is wrong with a \$1 billion cut? Well, let me tell you what is wrong with a \$1 billion cut.

First of all, it is 9 percent, and you have more homeless people. We have 600,000 families in America right now today who are homeless. We are not fixing the problem. We are adding to the problem when we cut assisted housing programs and homeless programs to the degree that we are cutting them in this budget.

I mean homeless programs. This year we appropriated \$1.2 billion. We are going to cut about \$576 million. I mean next year we are going to appropriate \$576 million, which will provide a \$544 million cut in the homeless program, not to mention what we are going to do to the environment.

□ 2130

We are talking about how we need to preserve the air, water, and soil. But if we do not have an agency that has the wherewithal to do that, then we are failing. We cannot grow more land in America. It is the Federal Government's responsibility to preserve the air and preserve the water and preserve the soil.

That is our responsibility, in my opinion. If we do not do it, who will? Are we going to just depend on somebody from space to protect the air and environment that we live in?

We talk about deficit reduction. We have a deficit reduction as relates to the environment as well. There are a lot of cleanups that we must provide, a lot of cleaning up that we must engage in right here in this country.

In my own district, I have several Superfund sites. There needs to be an agency in Baton Rouge, LA, next to a community called Ethel and next to a community called Scotlandville. There

is a polluted Superfund site that needs to be cleaned up. But will the EPA be able to do it? We appropriated \$7 million last year. Next year, they will appropriate only \$4 million, \$2.3 million cut, 32 percent.

We expect our kids to look at us and say yes, son, we are going to make sure when you go fishing 10 or 20 years from now you can fish in clean water. When you walk outside you can breathe clean air. When you decide to grow crops, you are going to be able to turn over clean soil. Yet we are failing to provide EPA the kind of mechanisms they need to protect these natural resources.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. The gentleman from Louisiana does not know how right he is on the Environmental Protection Agency. I am as we speak dealing with a problem of lack of resources: An area in a community of 3,000 homes of individuals in my community, in the 18th Congressional District, Pleasantville, bedroom community, stalwart citizens, experienced in their nearby neighborhood, a very tragic, if you will, and disturbing fire of a warehouse that contained hazardous materials.

We have been trying to work for weeks now in order to get the resources put in by EPA that is so downsized already, to get into this area and do additional testing. That is why I am so opposed and concerned about a \$2 million cut, because when neighborhoods that need to be secure, people who live in communities, have invested in their property, suffer this threat so close to their community, and then when we call upon the resources that need to be utilized for testing, to protect their lives but as well to make sure they are safe in their living conditions, we face this response of downsizing and no resources.

It is the same kind of response that you hear with the homelessness and that you hear with the question of the AIDS treatment, and the same kind of response that you may have to give now those 99.1 percent of Americans that have Medicare and Medicaid, that eventually you will have to say there is no more room at the inn.

The question that you have asked, I would like to answer, is that we do not have focus. We have taken away from the American people their dreams, their aspirations, and their hopes. I think once you do that you have turned away the responsibility of the Federal Government to capture hopes and dreams and aspirations of the American people. We have lost our focus.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Further in the environment portion of this legislation, as the gentlewoman knows, it also cuts money that deals with water treatment grants. Fiscal year 1995, we appropriated \$2.6 billion. This year, for 1996, we appropriate \$1.7 billion.

Now, there is some who probably do not appreciate, as I do, the need for these grants. I have several little small towns and villages in the district I represent that do not have water treat-

ment plants and do not have the wherewithal, do not have the tax base to develop a water treatment plant.

I have citizens who live within the district that I represent who do not drink clean water everyday, not because they enjoy drinking water that is probably not safe. There are people who live in my district, I can give you a town; for example, the town of White Castle, I have an excellent mayor, Maurice Brown, who worked hard. We were just able to appropriate money to that town so they could improve their water situation. Before such time, we have citizens who were drinking water that had color in it. Some refused to drink it. Some just bought bottled water. Then they asked, Congressman FIELDS, I drink bottled water, but what do I do when I have to take a bath? Those kind of things. I do not think people really have a real appreciation of those kind of problems that really exist in rural America today.

To cut this kind of program to this degree will not allow this Congress to help small towns like White Castle. It will not allow this Congress to help little, small towns like the town of Donaldsonville and other small towns in rural America. That makes sense. It is through no fault of their own.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas for coming out tonight to discuss some of these budget cuts in these appropriations bills, because they are devastating, and they will have an effect on real people back home in all of our districts. It is something we need to be cognizant of.

Lastly, I just wanted to say tomorrow, when we debate the amendment on the Commerce appropriation, that we will put 10 percent, earmark 10 percent of the dollars to prevention.

I would hope that Members of this body will stand up and support that amendment, because we cannot fight the crime problem in this country by only dealing with jails and penal institutions. We are going to have to fight it from both angles. That is incarceration, law enforcement, and prevention. I think that this bill fails to provide that.

PRESENTING THE FACTS ABOUT MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this evening to present to you and to the American people the facts about Medicare. The course of the discussion I will take is well-traveled, but I do not think that there has ever been a more pressing issued facing our Nation than the crisis concerning Medicare. I want to lay out the facts tonight and discuss the very immediate steps which must be taken to preserve and to protect Medicare for everyone

who plans to live longer than seven more years.

I am going to start with the bottom line tonight and work my way backward, back to the point which brings me to this podium late this evening. We must keep one singular, simple, and brutal clear point in our minds as we utter every word in the debate about Medicare: According to the Medicare trustees, the Medicare trust fund, which pays the hospital expenses for Medicare beneficiaries, part A, will be bankrupt by the year 2002.

I have with me tonight that report that was issued by the Medicare trustees. This report goes into detail as to why the Medicare trust fund is on a path to go bankrupt by 2002. Mr. Speaker, if someone was wanting to get a copy of this, they should call the congressional phone line, which is 202-224-3121. Mr. Speaker, that is 202-224-3121.

At that point, the trustees tell us, the system as we know it today will cease to exist. All of the accusations we have had and the political bickering and the semantics are pale when we compare the simple fact that the Medicare trust fund is going bankrupt, when we lay that fact on the table.

Medicare is going broke and will not survive another generation unless we act to save it today. In a sense, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking hypothetically about this situation tonight, because, as the Republican Party, we are going to do everything we possibly and physically can to prevent that from happening. We intend to provide quality, affordable, easily accessible health care for all of our seniors.

Nobody likes to hear the word bankrupt. I guess if you spend enough time in Congress or if you work for the Government long enough it might not mean too much, but as someone who spent a lot of time in the private sector, in the real world, I have a healthy respect for the word. The concept is clear: Everyone out there tonight understands that when you expenditures consistently and substantially exceed your revenues or your reserves, you will go broke.

I think this chart that I have very clearly says it all. The part A trust fund is going to be empty by the year 2002. It starts here with the current trust fund that we have in 1995 of about \$150 billion. You can see that as time goes on, as we achieve the next 7 years, by 2000 the line here is marked zero, and the expenditure line, the trust fund, cross at 2002. That is an indication that the trust fund is at that point broke. It has no more money in it. You can see after that it runs a deficit for the next few years.

This situation though goes way beyond the Medicare system. It affects our entire budget once we start running a deficit.

I firmly believe that this Congress was elected in large part to balance the budget. The President has finally admitted that if we can balance the budget, it will actually be good for our