

sign on to a letter to the European Union clearly stating Congress' belief that Europe should not meddle in the internal affairs of U.S. businesses. Europe should have no say in American markets' decisions that ultimately cost American jobs and American sovereignty.

□ 2130

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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 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 gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

BOTH DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS WANT TO HELP PEOPLE, AND VOTING FOR LESS GOVERNMENT IS FREQUENTLY THE BEST WAY TO ACHIEVE THAT

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, it is totally false to say that one party cares more about the environment or children or senior citizens than the other party. I do not understand why we have to constantly attack each other or question each other's motives to express our views.

Neither party has a monopoly on virtue. Neither party has cornered the market on compassion. I know I am going to state some things that should be obvious but that are often questioned around here.

Republicans love children just as much as Democrats do. Republicans want a clean environment just as much as Democrats do. Republicans have just as much compassion and sympathy for the disabled and senior citizens as Democrats do. Republicans support education just as strongly as Democrats do, and vice versa. I repeat, no one has cornered the market on compassion. No one has a monopoly on virtue.

We do have differences of opinion. We have different philosophies and beliefs

about the best ways to help people. But all of us, both Democrat and Republican, want to help people. We all want to make this Nation a better place in which to live.

Republicans believe that big government hurts children by taking so much money away from parents and spending it instead on bureaucrats, fat cat government contractors, and administrative costs. Republicans have looked all over the world and have seen that big government benefits the few, the elite, those who work for or have connections with the government. Republicans believe government means a minute, elite class and a huge underclass, and that conversely, a small government means a huge middle class.

Look at the former Soviet Union, where the leaders of the Communist Party had their limousines and dachas by the sea and special stores in which to shop, while almost everybody else led a starvation existence. Look at the United States in 1950 where the average person paid 2 to 4 percent in taxes to the Federal Government and another 2 to 4 percent to State and local governments. We had a huge middle class and a much smaller difference between the rich and the poor. Now almost 50 years later, Government has exploded and the average person pays almost half of his or her income in taxes when we count taxes of all types, Federal, State, and local.

What has happened? Many middle-income people are finding it harder and harder to keep ahead. Personal bankruptcies hit an alltime record of 1.1 million last year. The gap between the rich and the poor is growing wider and wider.

Also, where many mothers formerly had their choice of staying home with their children if they wished, today, with half of the average family's income going in various forms of taxes, one spouse has to work to support the Government while the other spouse works to support the family.

My point, Mr. Speaker, is simply this: Sometimes the best way to help children and families is not through another Government program which has a good apple-pie-and-motherhood title but which really helps only a few bureaucrats and Government contractors.

The Job Corps is a prime example. Today we spend \$25,000 per Job Corps student. This would shock most of these students, because almost all of this money is going to bureaucrats and contractors. We could take each Job Corps student and give them a \$1,300 allowance and send them even to an expensive private school and still save money. This is how ridiculously expensive this and many other Federal programs have become.

My time is limited, Mr. Speaker, but let me mention the environment. The worst pollution in the world has occurred in the Socialist and Communist countries. Big government is bad for

the environment. Only in a free market system can we generate the funds necessary to do the good things for the environment that all of us, both Democrat and Republican, want done. Also, people take better care of their own property than they do someone else's. Private property is not only good for the environment, it is essential.

John Stossel of ABC News had a special on television a couple of years ago in which he pointed out that to clean our air to the almost impossible standard demanded by some groups would cost so much that it could throw millions of people into poverty. He presented a study which showed that we might add one day to the life of the average person by getting tougher on clean air, but that poverty decreases lifespans by 7½ years.

Is it compassionate, Mr. Speaker, to vote for some bill because it does some microscopic good for the environment if in the process it destroys millions of jobs, drives up prices, and hurts the poor and working people? Is it compassionate to go overboard on the environment if it throws possibly millions into poverty?

Finally, Mr. Speaker, all I am saying is this: that both parties want to help people and make this Nation better. Sometimes we do that by voting for government programs. Today, with our huge out-of-control Federal Government, more frequently we help people by voting for less government.

AMERICA NEEDS A BALANCED APPROACH TO FIGHTING JUVENILE CRIME

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the issue of juvenile justice in this country. Everyone knows that juvenile justice and juvenile crime is a growing concern in this country. But with the majority party, it seems that they cannot make up their mind on how they want to approach this issue.

Yesterday, in a bipartisan approach, we suspended the rules and we passed H.R. 1818, the Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention Act, sponsored by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT], the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ], and the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS]. The bill reauthorized the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and made several changes to that office to refocus the Federal effort to prevent juvenile crime before it occurs.

The bill contained four core requirements which States must comply with: deinstitutionalization of status offenders, separating juveniles from adults in prison, limiting the time that juveniles spend in adult facilities, and addressing efforts to reduce disproportionate minority confinement.

It is a solid bill, and I was proud to support the bill. The bill further emphasized prevention and intervention through local initiatives, through local programs and projects which will address concerns in the local community, not something mandated by the Federal Government. It is our hope that these programs will discourage dropouts from high schools, reduce school violence, and prevent suspensions and expulsions.

However, the bill failed to identify and appropriate money for this Federal effort to prevent juvenile crime. Yet earlier this year the majority party on basically a very partisan vote did appropriate \$1.5 billion over the next 3 years in a juvenile justice bill that was named H.R. 3, which takes an entirely different approach to juvenile crime and juvenile offenders.

H.R. 3 that was passed in May rewards States that implement the most harsh new mandates against juvenile offenders. States would be required to adopt a controversial mandate that many children as young as 15 would be tried as adults. It requires automatic transfer of 14-year-old children to adult court, and prohibits judicial review of these juvenile transfers. It would reward these States with \$1.5 billion to punish kids and to treat them as adults, something that ensures that more 15-year-old children will end up housed with convicted adult criminals and convicted adult felons, greatly increasing the chances of rape, abuse, and suicide in our prison system, and increasing their chances of committing violent crime sooner upon release.

Mr. Speaker, having been a law enforcement officer, and we have dealt with many law enforcement officers throughout this debate on juvenile justice in the last few months, prosecutors, judges, teachers, counselors, and parents all agree that there is another, better approach, a better way to prevent kids from even becoming criminals in the first place. Intervention and early prevention programs in schools and communities and recreation centers have proven to be the most effective way to prevent juveniles from getting involved in illicit behavior.

In communities that employ prevention programs, the juvenile crime rates have fallen. Since an aggressive prevention program went into effect in Boston, not a single juvenile murder has occurred there since July 1995. It is a system that works. Let the local communities decide, give them the flexibility to do their job, and we should seek to encourage the development of these prevention programs in every community across America.

In fact, the alternative bill to H.R. 3, the Democrat bill I sponsored is exactly the approach it takes. As the other body prepares to consider the juvenile justice bill and is currently working on it at this time, I urge them to look at the facts. When it comes to dealing with children, you get tough on crime by preventing criminal behavior,

not by trying to lock up every juvenile offender.

On May 8, I offered, along with the majority of Democrats, a substitute to H.R. 3 which stated that over 60 percent of the funding should go to communities for their local prevention programs. Two hundred Members of this House voted for this substitute, rejecting H.R. 3, the majority party's punishment-only approach. We need a balanced approach to fighting juvenile crime. We need a bill that is tough and is smart.

Mr. Speaker, I just happened to receive in my office today this week's Time magazine. If Members look at the Time magazine this week, this debate that I just mentioned is highlighted in Time magazine starting on page 26, Teen Crime. "Congress wants to crack down on juvenile offenders. That is H.R. 3, the majority party approach. But is throwing teens into adult courts with adult prisoners the best approach?"

As we go through it they cite the Boston case that we as Democrats relied on, and how to start a cease-fire to reduce juvenile crime to make people safe and secure in their communities and their homes.

Then, unfortunately they show what a tragedy happened in Michigan here in the past few weeks. The bottom line of these three articles was basically there is an approach for juvenile offenders. There is a smart choice and a substitute for H.R. 3 that is the best way to go.

IN SUPPORT OF THE HOUSE VERSION OF TAX RELIEF, MEDICARE IMPROVEMENTS, AND MEDICARE CONSUMER PROTECTION

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to address a few issues with my colleagues; first, the tax cuts that have been discussed earlier this evening by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON].

I think it is good to point out that in the charts that he showed, it was interesting to note that 75 percent of the tax cuts would go to families with incomes of \$75,000 or less, and that every family would have a chance to be able to use one tax cut or the other, whether it is child tax credits, estate tax relief, education tax credits, and capital gains tax cuts, of course, to help create new jobs and savings. The last time we had such success was with the Kennedy and Reagan administrations.

Tonight, I also wanted to talk about how the House is on the move in the right direction on Medicare, and how we need to stop, therefore, the proposal within the Senate in the conference committee. The Senate has talked about raising Medicare's age from 65 to 67, to increase patient's copay for home care to \$5 per visit, and to means-test Medicare.

From the perspective of the House, we want to make sure in the conference committee that the House version prevails, Mr. Speaker, because that will make sure that seniors who have paid into the system will, in fact, get the benefit of knowing at 65 they will have a Medicare that in fact will be a cost-effective program for them.

Currently many seniors, Mr. Speaker, who retire early, either voluntarily or forced, are uninsured. These seniors, while eligible for COBRA, often find themselves with a gap between the time COBRA ends and Medicare begins. By increasing the Medicare eligibility age, we can assure an increase in the number of uninsured seniors.

It also should be noted that the Medicare proposal from the House which is so positive includes voluntary choices for seniors with Medicare plus. It also provides for traditional fee-for-service Medicare, provider-sponsored organizations. It also includes medical savings accounts and preferred provider organizations.

The most important part of the new Medicare proposal, Mr. Speaker, has preventive services, a new package of health care benefits for our seniors. It includes, among other things, annual mammography screening, annual Pap smears, annual prostate cancer screening, colorectal cancer screening, diabetes self-management, annual vaccine outreach for pneumonia, and influenza. The bill includes these essential items to give seniors increased health care coverage when they need it most, before they become ill.

It also includes some very logical, tough, antifraud and abuse efforts. It is amazing for people to hear about this, but there is \$30 billion a year in fraud, waste, and abuse in Medicare. If we can make sure that gets back to seniors from their health care, we will go a long way to making sure that Medicare is solvent not only for the next 10 years but beyond that, Mr. Speaker. That is a very important feature.

We can also reduce the paperwork costs of Medicare. Traditionally it has been about 12 percent. With electronic billing we can reduce that to 2 percent.

But some of the most important provisions of the bill make sure that we have consumer protection. The bill contains in the House Medicare version a wide-ranging series of changes of design to modernize Medicare's 30-year-old payment and health care delivery system. Primary among them are the new consumer protection. The modernization program requires that all Medicare Plus programs make medically necessary care available 7 days a week, 24 hours a day, and 365 days a year. It also makes sure that Medicare Plus plans have grievance and appeal mechanisms in place to protect beneficiary rights.

So I am very hopeful that the conference committee, they have received letters from a bipartisan group of House Members that have gone to the Speaker of the House, the gentleman