

of the next few weeks would purport to do is to grow and expand that role into new areas of American life and create an even bigger dependence upon the Federal Government. And, again, what people have to realize is ultimately they have to pay for that, and they will pay for it in the form of higher taxes and they are also going to be giving up a good amount of freedom in the decision-making process, because when we marry ourselves to the government and when we become the so-called partnership with government, we end up being the junior partner.

I thought it was interesting a while back in the Washington Post that there was a senior administration official that said because we had gotten our fiscal house in order we could afford to be a little more generous. That was an interesting comment because it reflected a mentality that I think permeates this entire city, and that is that it is their money. I realize, and I think what the gentleman from Georgia realizes, is that ultimately it is the money of the taxpayers of this country. And that is a concept, that is a truth, that is a principle that I will never forget in representing the people of my good State of South Dakota, and I would suspect the gentleman from Georgia will never forget in representing the people of his district as well.

#### A PERSPECTIVE ON CRIME POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wanted to talk a little bit about an article that I read called U.S. Victory in the Crime War, written by Timothy Maier, and it was from "The World and I" magazine. It is a great article, and it just puts a perspective on some of the crime policy that we talk about.

I live in an area that has a lot of crimes, a lot of sad stories. I was talking to the DA, Steve Kelly, the other day about a case that he had where a 68-year-old woman was raped while her husband was held at gun point by some teenage thugs. And Mr. Kelly is a very aggressive, very competent DA, and he was able to get a prosecution on that, but it was just a heartbreaking story.

I remember another story in Savannah, Georgia, of a woman who was bathing her 2-year-old in the bathtub and somebody knocked on the door. And she looked out and decided not to answer it, and so the perpetrator went from the front door to the back door, kicked it in and raped this woman while she was bathing her 2-year-old.

And those kinds of heartbreaking stories we all hear, and we all hear too often, but in the crime debate we often forget the victim.

What I wanted to talk about is some of the things Mr. Maier had pointed out. The good news is that over the last

4 years violent crime, which includes aggravated assault, rape and murder, dropped 7 percent. Homicides fell 11 percent, about 7 people per 100,000 in population. Robberies were down 8 percent. Aggravated assaults dropped 6 percent. And rapes dropped 3 percent. Property crime, such as burglary and auto theft, also dropped. So there is a lot of good news.

Now, the interesting part is who is claiming credit for this. And, of course, in Washington we want to point to our tough crime policy and the President wants to point to some of his policies, but Mr. Maier said that the real success lies in the State governments, since that is where so many of the violent crimes end up in court. He pointed out that the States that have truth in sentencing laws, such as Virginia, are leading the way in the reductions of crime. He pointed out that in Virginia that they have had a truth in sentencing law and their simple policy is we want to get the bad guys off the streets.

Think about this, Madam Speaker. The hard working taxpayers in your district in New York should not be afraid to walk down the street at night. They paid for the street. They should not have to look over their shoulders. But the thugs who beat up old people and grab girls off the streets, they should be in jail. They should be afraid to walk down the streets, because we want to catch them and we want to lock them up and segregate them from decent society.

And so what Mr. Maier has pointed out is States that have the truth in sentencing laws and building new prisons, and they are purging these people off the streets, getting rid of the bad apples, they are leading the way. So truth in sentencing was part of it.

Now, another thing he looked at, another factor, was the COPS program. The President has said that because we have 100,000 new cops on the street it has made a new difference. But the reality is that there are not 100,000 new cops on the streets. And depending on who you are talking to, that number is actually as low as 20,000 and sometimes up to 57,000 people.

One thing he did show, he said there are more than 17,000—he talked about Washington, DC. He said in Washington, D.C. there are more than 17,000 police officers, including Federal police in Washington, but the city still averages 60,000 violent crimes a year. Here we are in the Nation's capital and one person out of eight is going to be a victim of a violent crime.

So does the Cops on the Street program work? I would say we really do not know for sure, but I can say this: The communities that have been flexible with the money seem to have been the most successful.

In Statesboro, Georgia, they have actually put a police satellite station in one of the housing projects that was in an area where there was high drug high crime, lots of problems. And right

smack in the middle of it the police in Statesboro put in a satellite station. I went to visit it and they said immediately they ran out the bad apples. The children come up to the police officers now. Instead of being afraid of them, they come up and hug them. They tell them when somebody from out of the housing area is in the area that should not be.

And the turnaround in that area has been tremendous. The commercial businesses, which had been closing down, are coming back and reopening. Church groups come to this area. It has been a great community success story in Statesboro, Georgia, and now they have done this in another housing project.

So when the COPS grant money is used in the way that the local community needs it to be used, I think that it does have an impact.

The third factor which Mr. Maier examined in terms of reducing crime was what about gun control. The President was quick to say, well, it is the Brady bill. The Brady bill is something that requires a background check on people before they can buy a gun. But Mr. Maier points out that in the time that it has existed, which I believe is 4 years now, that under the law there have only been seven prosecutions and of those seven, only three were sent to prison for illegally trying to obtain a handgun. So we have to say that really is not the main factor.

Now, he does point out something else. What portion of violent crimes actually involve the handgun. The answer is about 10 percent. And this statistic suggests that controlling handguns is not the final factor. In fact, Mr. Maier pointed out from 1980 to 1992 the number of firearms increased by 18 percent. But during the same period of time, the portion of violent crimes committed without a firearm dropped 4 percent. So the bottom line, according to Mr. Maier, is more guns on the street does not necessarily increase gun crime. And he shows a lot of examples.

One thing that is very interesting also is that he points out that in terms of guns, or where a gun has been fired or displayed, which actually comes to about 2½ million times a year in self-defense, the number of police arrests for violent crimes has fallen. So that there has been a positive impact for those folks who own guns and who use it to defend themselves.

The next factor that Mr. Maier looks at is juvenile crime. And one of the things that we are all concerned about is how much violent crime can be traced to young children. And young children can be anywhere from 13, 14 years old, in their mid-teens to their young 20s. But it is depressing to look at the stats on that.

The FBI statistics show that while violent crime is declining, juvenile crime continues to increase. The number of juveniles charged with murder increased 104 percent nationwide from

1970 to 1992. Since 1980, juvenile gang killings have increased 371 percent, and the rate of recidivism for juveniles runs as high as 75 percent. In fact, the FBI shows that before someone goes to jail as a juvenile, he usually commits 15 different offenses that have gone by unpunished.

One of the big problems is that the age group of the drug pushers who are in their mid-20s go out and recruit the very, very young kids for the most dangerous, the most risky part of their business, and they consider these kids both expendable and impressionable. You can get them to do things that older and smarter folks would not want to do. So when there is a turf war, usually the casualties are your 16 and 17-year-olds.

The next question, the final thing I want to touch base on, Mr. Maier says are we actually winning the drug war. And a lot of people will point out the fact that we are grabbing more marijuana and drugs as they come into our country. Although it would depend on what statistic you look at, we are probably grabbing as little as 15 percent of what is actually coming into our country from south of the border. And one of the things that has happened, because there has been a de-escalation in terms of prosecutions, that the drug dealers are actually more set in, and their territories are somewhat established because they are not gunning it out any more.

This is a real interesting article on crime. I think that what Mr. Maier does is raise some things that we in public policy need to consider. I believe that this Congress should continue to go in the direction that it has: Full sentencing of 10 years means 10 years. If someone is in jail they need to have a work program. No more sitting around watching TV, lifting weights and playing basketball. It means also the work that they do should be meaningful. It should be skill building, so that when they get out they can utilize that into a paying job.

I think also there should be an education program. I believe that a lot of these people who are in jail are intelligent but, somewhere along the line, they dropped out of school. They had a problem. They need to have that second chance while they are in jail, tied in with good behavior or whatever, but give them that opportunity.

Finally, I do think there needs to be spiritual rehabilitation, because I think that is the beginning of real rehabilitation for anyone behind bars. I believe that taking these steps, sending out the message that we are serious, that a person cannot just be caught selling drugs and get their hand slapped any more, I think if we continue on this path, that our crime rates will continue the downward trend.

□ 1930

#### SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 7, 1997, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN) is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the Majority Leader.

Mr. NEUMANN. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about a lot of the issues that are facing the country today and what we are hearing about as it relates to the President's budget plan. I rise in particular to talk about an issue that I think many of our senior citizens, many of our folks in their 50s and 40s and many of our young people are also concerned about, and that is Social Security.

My son, who mowed lawns last summer and earned a reasonable amount of money doing it, like \$1,500, because he did a lot of them, talked to me about whether or not he should pay any taxes on it. And, of course, for a young person in their teenage years who mowed lawns last summer and earned some money, there is no Federal taxes due. But then I said to him, "You still have got to file, Matt; you have still got to file a tax return."

And my 15-year-old son, who is going to file his tax return, has to pay into the Social Security Trust Fund. As a matter of fact, he found that he paid over about 15 percent of all of his earnings into the Social Security Trust Fund because he would be treated as a self-employed person.

So when we talk about the Social Security issue, it is certainly very important to our young people to understand very clearly that they are putting this money away for retirement. But, in fact, it does not seem to affect them because they do not believe Social Security is going to be there for them; and they are certainly, at age 15, are not very interested in thinking ahead to retirement. They are more interested buying a car and their college education than they are in thinking ahead to retirement.

So when we think about this Social Security issue, I start with the younger group to understand that it does have an impact on them. When we get to the folks in their 30s and 40s, they are putting this money away. It is being taken out of their paychecks. But instead of being put away in a fund for them, it goes into the Social Security Trust Fund.

I would like to spend a little time tonight talking about how the United States Government handles this money that is being taken out of their paychecks and how that affects our senior citizens and the potential of Social Security actually being there for them when they reach the retirement age.

If I could ask one of our pages to bring that stand over, I brought a couple of pictures with me.

For any of my colleagues that have seen these numbers before, we took the time today to update the Social Security numbers so that it reflects what is actually going on in the Social Security system in 1998.

This whole thing becomes relatively easy to understand as it relates to So-

cial Security if we just take a look at how much money is actually coming in and how much is going out to our senior citizens in Social Security.

Virtually every worker that has a paycheck has money taken out of their paycheck for Social Security. Altogether, the United States Government in 1998 will collect about \$480 billion in Social Security money from the paychecks of workers in America. The Social Security system will write out checks to our senior citizens of \$382 billion.

This is pretty straightforward. They are collecting \$480 billion, and they are paying \$382 billion out to our senior citizens. That leaves a \$98 billion surplus. That is to say, they are collecting \$98 billion more than they are paying back out to our senior citizens in benefits.

That money is supposed to be put away. It is supposed to be put into a savings account so that when they are, these two numbers turn around, the baby-boom generation is clearly headed toward retirement, and eventually we reach a point where there is not enough money in and too much money being written out in checks to our senior citizens. Well, this money that is supposed to be put away in a savings account today is not actually happening today.

I would like to talk about this and the reference of what the President referred to in his budget address and something that many of us in this Congress feel very strongly about.

That \$98 billion that came in goes directly into the big government checkbook, the general fund. Now we spend all the money out of the general fund, and when we are all done spending that money there is not enough money left to put the \$98 billion down in the Social Security Trust Fund. So, instead, what our Government does is it makes an accounting entry and simply puts an IOU down here in the Social Security Trust Fund.

The technical name for this is a non-negotiable Treasury bond. But the bottom line is that \$98 billion of surplus goes straight into the big government checkbook. They spend all the money out of the big government checkbook, and there is nothing left to put in the Social Security Trust Fund. So they simply make an accounting entry. It is called a nonnegotiable Treasury bond that goes down here.

It is important to understand what nonnegotiable Treasury bond means. Nonnegotiable Treasury bonds means it cannot be sold.

So when we come back to this other picture and we take a look at what happens down the road a little ways when the baby-boom generation gets here, remember the revenues, the amount of money that is coming in today, is higher than the amount of money that is being paid out to our seniors in benefits. So today it works.

The idea is that when those two numbers turn around, there is not enough