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