

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

from Georgia, Mr. NEWT GINGRICH, and they are going as well to the minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. GEPHARDT, to the majority leader, Mr. LOTT, in the Senate, and as well to the minority leader in the Senate, Mr. DASCHLE.

□ 2145

We believe that the House version is a positive one for seniors, the one that should pass. We know in fact that it is best because it will make sure that we do not have means testing. We stop the co-pay increase for home health care and we make sure that the Medicare age is not raised from 65 to 67. So all seniors in America will be protected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DELAHUNT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DELAHUNT 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 Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SCOTT 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 California [Ms. LOFGREN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. LOFGREN 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 North Carolina [Mr. WATT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### THE REPUBLICAN TAX PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HULSHOF] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Speaker, this week there is much discussion, there is much speculation about the negotiations that are ongoing between the President and congressional leaders in the House and Senate. Hanging in the balance, Mr. Speaker, are the prospects of a bipartisan balanced budget plan. Hanging in the balance are the prospects of staving off the impending bankruptcy for Medicare, our health care system for senior citizens. And hanging in the balance through these negotiations are the prospects for per-

manent tax relief for men and women all across this country, essentially whether or not we want to let moms and dads across this great land keep more of what they earn.

With the recent debate, Mr. Speaker, about tax relief centering more and more around detailed numbers and percentages and Treasury Department calculations, perhaps I should say Treasury Department miscalculations, it is easy to lose sight of what our tax relief package is all about, what it means to working families who have not had tax relief in nearly two decades.

I know that I am but a single voice crying out on behalf of hard-working men and women across this country, but I hope to include the pleas and the statements of those who came to Capitol Hill. Some working mothers in fact who came to Capitol Hill this month who quickly reminded us, gave us a reality check that tax relief is more than just abstract numbers. It is about take-home pay. It is about purchasing power. It is about freedom to make choices in raising a family.

For example, it is about Debra from Dale City, VA. Debra is the divorced mother of a 17-year-old, an 11-year-old and a 10-year-old. Keeping more of her money means being able to help her three children reach their dreams. The dream of Debra's college-bound daughter is to attend college and become a doctor. For Debra's middle daughter, she aspires to be a teacher. And although Debra is determined to help bring her daughters' dreams to fulfillment, it is not going to be an easy task.

Mr. Speaker, the House-passed version of the Taxpayer Relief Act a couple of weeks ago will make things a little bit easier for Debra and for her family. With the child and the education tax credits, for instance, Debra will get to keep more of what she earns, making it easier to send her kids to college and to fulfill their dreams. In fact, just with the child tax credit, the Republican version of the child tax credit, in calendar year 1998 Debra will get to keep \$800 more of her own money next year and \$1,000 more in the following years. She can save for her kids' education, putting money away in a dream savings account.

Our House plan also allows Debra to participate in education initiatives like the education credit for college deduction which helps defray the expenses, the out-of-pocket expenses for Debra's college age or college bound kids for tuition, for books and for fees.

That is what this tax relief is about. It is not about numbers; it is about real people. It is about Don and Carnetta from my home town of Columbia. Don and Carnetta are both in their senior years. Don recently retired from a career at Wal-Mart. Part of the compensation package that Don had during his career at Wal-Mart was that he was given shares of Wal-Mart stock as incentive to build for his pension, to put his nest egg away for he and Carnetta.

He fervently hopes, anxiously is awaiting whether or not the President will sign our tax package into law because what it means to 2 million seniors that are in the 15-percent income tax bracket across this country is a capital gains cut from the 28-percent margin all the way down to 10 percent, if the President would enact and sign into law this much-needed relief effort. It is not about numbers. It is about people.

I happened to receive a letter in the last 2 weeks that I want to paraphrase just a bit, Mr. Speaker, if I can. It says, "Dear Mr. Hulshof, I am a star-ranked scout in Troop 50. I will be a 7th grader at St. Peter's in Fulton, MO. I am 12 years old. I am in favor of the tax cut," says Michael, "because if taxes are cut, people will have more money. When they have more money, they spend or invest more. Then if they spend more," Michael writes, "more needs to be produced. This increased demand means more people are needed to produce and then employment goes up. Increased employment means people are working more and paying more taxes which increases revenue to the Government, which means fewer people collect entitlements from the government resulting in less expense to Government."

Michael goes on to write, keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, Michael is a 7th grader, 12 years old at St. Peter's in Fulton, MO. Michael says, "Every time I hear the Democrats or certain members of the press talk about tax cuts, they say, how will the Government pay for the tax cut? But they never ask how the employed taxpayers are going to pay for the tax increases. Thank you for all the hard work you do. Thanks for considering my input." Signed, Michael.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think sometimes suffer ye unto the little children and out of the mouths of babes sometimes come pretty poignant points. I think Michael has somehow grasped something that we here in Washington from time to time forget. It is not our money. It is the American people's money. We are not giving it back to them. We are letting people keep it in the first place.

For instance, in my congressional district, in the 9th Congressional District of Missouri, if the President will sign into law the Republican-passed tax relief package, the child credit alone, there are 84,000 children in the 9th Congressional District of Missouri whose parents will qualify for the \$500 per child tax credit. What that means is nearly \$39 million get to stay in the 9th District of Missouri and do not have to be collected by the Government and sent here to Washington where oftentimes we spend it very unwisely. This is just one way that this tax relief package will help all Americans. It is not about numbers. It is about people.

I see my friend and colleague from Missouri, from the 7th Congressional District of Missouri, is in the well of the House.