

Seventy percent of all African-American children growing up in single parent families live at or below the poverty level. Surely these figures demonstrate that decisive action is needed.

There are many things we can do to improve and enhance the current child support system. For example, we can require uniform procedures for dealing with interstate cases, which are currently the most difficult to pursue. We can improve tracking of delinquent parents through national reporting of child support orders and by establishing a Federal registry of child support orders.

Moreover, we need tough new penalties for those who refuse to pay, such as authorizing withholding part of wages and allow suspension of professional, occupational, and even drivers' licenses as a means of forcing the delinquent parent to comply with support payment orders.

If we do not take action on child support now, we will be requiring young mothers to be responsible, while we give fathers an exemption. The Personal Responsibility Act, H.R. 4, cuts young, single mothers from welfare, but it does nothing to improve child support enforcement.

By ignoring child support enforcement we are sending the wrong message. It says that the noncustodial parent who is 50 percent responsible for the child does not have any real responsibility to support his child. If more noncustodial parents are made to pay child support, welfare will not be necessary for many families.

Sensitivity has always been a characteristic of the American experience. In good times and bad, we have been a caring nation that values responsibilities to continue this tradition and make sure that children in America are protected.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, America is experiencing a serious problem: Too many working and able-bodied parents are not taking responsibility for their children. The time has come to declare war on our current welfare system so that we can properly address the situation.

In every war, battles must be fought and won. One of the biggest battles we must fight is improving and reforming this Nation's child support enforcement problem.

The reasons for engaging in this battle are clear: 63 percent of the absent parents in this country do not pay child support. Approximately \$35 billion is lost each year in uncollected child support payments. And in my own State of Maryland, absent parents defaulted on more than \$325 million in court-ordered child support in 1993. Most importantly, we all must remember—the children suffer when child support is not paid.

As a nation and as a society we cannot afford a social safety net without expecting obligations and demanding responsibilities. For any type of welfare reform to be successful, individuals must accept the responsibility of working and providing for their families. In 1990, absent parents paid only \$14 billion in child support. But if child support reflecting current ability to pay were established and enforced, single parents and their children would

have received almost \$48 billion. This translates into more money for food, shelter, clothing, and child care and a reduction in the Federal burden. We must send a clear signal that both parents who bring children into this world must take responsibility for supporting them.

That is why we need a tough, smart child support program which requires both mothers and fathers to live up to their responsibilities. We must target those individuals who believe they don't have to take care of their kids because their neighbors—hard-working, tax paying, responsible citizens—will. The buck must start and stop with the parents.

The children of this country need the billions in outstanding and uncollected child support. Payment of child support could save this country billions of dollars if we could move people off welfare and keep others from joining the rolls. The financial burden of supporting the children must once and for all shift from the government to the parents. If we can do this, we will be well on our way to winning our first battle in the war on welfare.

Any comprehensive welfare proposal must include child support enforcement. Yet, the Republican Contract With America does not. Are the Republicans saying to the nonpaying parents that they do not have to support their kids? If they are here to promote personal responsibility and do the people's business, this critical area should have been included in the Personal Responsibility Act.

At the urging of Democrats, I am pleased Chairman SHAW has agreed to include this child support enforcement within the Personal Responsibility Act.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my time by 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That request cannot be extended in fairness to others that have had the 60-minute.

Under the rules, a single Member cannot control more than an hour. However, if another Member would like to yield time, that would be appropriate.

COST EFFECTIVENESS IN WELFARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the Speaker very much, and I thank the Republican leadership who are at this point graciously allowing me to speak out of order.

Mr. Speaker, at this juncture, at the conclusion of the special order, we are invoking Mo Udall's old saying that everything has been said but not everybody has said it.

As we conclude this, I would just like to point out that one out of five children in the United States is poor. Poor. Fifteen million children live in single-parent homes, that is, where there is only one parent, and those children are

five times as likely to be poor as children who live in families that have two parents.

□ 2000

That is a staggeringly large number, millions and millions of children who are in this condition.

Thirty-seven percent of the women who control these households get support from the men who father the children, but over 60 percent of these women get no help from the fathers.

Let me give some statistics. Nationwide each year \$34 billion goes uncollected in child support from fathers, \$34 billion. Contrast that with the total amount of money that every taxpayer in America is asked to contribute to help out these mothers. It is \$23 billion.

So for all of the AFDC mothers and children in America, the total amount of money which is paid is \$23 billion.

The fathers owe \$34 billion. Taxpayers have every right to be outraged. Why should they dip into their pockets to pay for what fathers across this country should be responsible for kicking in every day? I don't think the average taxpayer would mind paying if they felt mothers and fathers actually needed it.

I hope we continue to discuss this subject in the future.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order this evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PROGRESS ON THE CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I am looking forward to this special order that I have asked some of my colleagues to participate in, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON], and what we want to do this evening is review some of the things we have already done in this Congress, review some of the things that have happened immediately preceding and some of the things that we expect to be doing.

I want to point out first of all that today we took a very important step on the road to recovering the confidence of the American people that began with the election last November. That is because what we did today is

we passed a bill that will examine unfunded mandates to the States, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN] is going to discuss that in detail a little bit later. But we have been following this road map that was laid out in the Contract With America for getting more done, more quickly than even we could have imagined, and best of all this is the work that the people of America want us to do.

Let me give a fact on that, because a poll was released this past Monday by the Washington Post and ABC News which contains extremely good news for this House and good news for the American people. In only 3 months public confidence in Congress has actually doubled. That is the largest increase of its kind since the 20-year history of the poll that has been taken.

The majority of Americans now say that Congress can deal with the big issues facing our country, and we are dealing with the big issues just like we promised. Anyway, why has this happened? Why is there this rising confidence in what the American people can expect from Congress, and why is this cynicism starting to drop away?

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield. Just to repeat those numbers again, Congress went from about a 20-to-40-something-percent approval rating because for the first time in recent memory Congress is following through on campaign promises.

Mr. HOKE. Elected Members are actually keeping the promises that they made to the people, and the impact that that has on confidence in our institution is really immeasurable. But it is wonderful to see in this kind of polling result that actually people are able to express that yes, they have more confidence in the U.S. Congress' ability to solve the problems, the major problems that are facing our country.

Look at what we have done; and why is it we have done this? And in less than 30 days we have cut the fat out of Congress, we have reduced staff and committees and we have passed reforms that will make it the most open and fair public legislative assembly in the entire world.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, if I might add to that, what we did was we campaigned on the word "trust." We said to the voters, for many years you have not been able to put your trust in the Congress. We are giving you a written agenda, a contract, and we intend to stand by this contract.

To the gentleman from Ohio I would say I am pleased that when I go back to my State of North Carolina I am stopped in the grocery stores, I am stopped on the street, people that I really do not even remember their names because it has been so long since I have seen them telling me, "Keep on working, keep the focus. We are proud of what you are doing in Washington, D.C. You are rebuilding the trust level that has been lost for so many years."

Mr. HOKE. I think one of the most remarkable things about this Contract With America is that it has created a road map for us that even we did not realize it was going to be so important to us in terms of keeping us focused on exactly what the American people wanted, what they expected and what we promised to deliver to them. And that is exactly how it has worked for us.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield, I got a letter recently, and I assume I was one of 435 Members of Congress who got such a letter. It was not a constituent, it came from Ohio, or some other exotic spot that we had to study about in seventh grade geography, but it had the letters DWUSUWGTD. It says to a Member of Congress: I want you to put it on your desk and look at it every day. On the back of the letter it stands for: Do what you said you were going to do. And my staff sees the sign every day, and I think that is in somewhat of a nutshell what the Contract With America is about. That is why it was in writing, that is why we signed it, and that is why we keep referring back to it.

Mr. HOKE. Let us tick off exactly what we have done so far. Cut the fat out of Congress, reduced committee staff by a third, cut the budget of Congress. We have made Congress subject to the same laws that everybody else in this country is subject to, and we passed last Thursday, I am extremely proud to say, a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States. And today, thanks to the very able stewardship of Congressmen CLINGER, DAVIS, and PORTMAN we passed the unfunded mandates bill ending the Government practice of spending States' money to finance our own mandates to them.

Mr. PORTMAN. If the gentleman will yield, we had an exciting day today. It was truly a landmark piece of legislation. It was a historic day for the House, the first time we have ever, ever, as a Congress done anything to stop these unfunded Federal mandates.

And it was bipartisan. The gentleman mentioned a few of the major sponsors of the bill. Another one is GARY CONDIT of California, a Democrat.

Mr. HOKE. Who gave an extraordinary speech on this floor a couple of days ago to rousing bipartisan applause.

Mr. PORTMAN. We had a vote today of 306 to 74 on this legislation. We worked on it for 2 weeks on the floor of the House, over 30 hours of debate. That means we got about 130 Democrats to support the bill today. This is despite again a lot of disagreement on the other side. We had health debate and we worked hard on this bill. None of this stuff is easy to do. You have to roll up your sleeves and really work at it.

But we got to the point of final passage after accepting a lot of amendments and perfecting the bill where a large bipartisan group of the members

of this House decided yes, it is time to step up to the plate and start being accountable for what we do for the States and localities.

Mr. HOKE. Maybe that is one of the reasons why in this same poll the majority of the American people say that "Republicans are breaking down legislative gridlock." As you can see, this clearly was a bipartisan effort.

What was the vote count again?

Mr. PORTMAN. The vote was 360 to 74. And I have to be honest, the first few days one wonder whether we were getting back into gridlock because we committed to have an open rule on this. This meant any Member of Congress could come to the floor of this House and file an amendment, and we had 174 of them filed, and then have a debate on that amendment, with no time limitation because everyone can speak for 5 minutes, and that can be expanded.

So it was a challenge and I have to tell you we spent 3 or 4 days on a very small part of the legislation that was even preliminary to the real meat of the bill, and I was concerned that we were getting into a mode that might be viewed as filibuster or too much dilatory tactics. But finally, after staying to midnight one night we broke through that and got into serious discussion of some of the outstanding issues.

Again if you roll up your sleeves and work at it you come up with a bill that makes sense. This bill is in the Contract With America, but on the House floor we improved it. It is even a better bill than it was.

Mr. HOKE. I thought the comity at the end of debate today and especially the kind words for the chairman by the gentlewoman from California, they were both well taken and they went an awfully long way toward building an even better spirit of working, although we were not working together in that case, but clearly working on something that was of importance to your constituents in a way that reflected well on this body as opposed to reflecting poorly.

□ 2010

I think the American people want to see us get the job done. The gentlewoman you are talking about did not vote for the bill. She did not agree with the premise of the bill. But as you say, in the end, in a spirit of comity, she talked about how the chairman had been fair, how we had an open process on the floor. That is what the American people want to see. They want to see an honest debate on the issues. If we have differences, they want to see us air those differences. But they want to get on with the business of managing this country.

Mr. HOKE. Could I ask you a question? I think there is a lot of misunderstanding about this bill. I think people think and there is a general misunderstanding in the public somehow we will no longer be able to legislate anything

that would cost the States money. Is that what the bill does?

Mr. PORTMAN. No. That is not what the bill does. The whole premise of the bill is if something is important enough for us to mandate at the Federal level, to tell the States and localities you have got to do it our way, we ought to be able to step up to the plate and provide funding for it. This bill says there has to be, for the first time ever, first time ever, we have never had this in Congress before, a cost analysis of what the legislation is going to cost.

How many times have you come up to the House floor and never had any idea what the cost is to State and local government of something you are going to vote on? Frankly, we have not had that information. That forces us to get that information.

Mr. KINGSTON. I heard a statistic this morning I thought that was interesting. There are 39,000 municipalities in this great country of ours. Eighty percent of them are populations below 10,000, and 48 percent have populations below 1,000. We sit up here in our inside-the-beltway ivory tower mandating all these ridiculous programs on them. They do not have the money to pay for them. They do not have the personnel. Inevitably they have to turn around and raise the taxes on all the constituents back home.

Mr. PORTMAN. They have two choices at the local level, and it is pretty obvious, if you think about it. One is to raise taxes at the local level, and that tends to be property taxes. Talk about regressive taxes. And the second is to cut services, the very services our constituents are saying they want more of, fire, police protection, personal security. That is what they do. These are the communities the gentleman is talking about that are going to have to go with one or two fewer police officers during a particular timeframe. That is not what we want to be doing to the people we represent and who are also represented by State and local officials who are having to live under these mandates increasingly.

Mr. HOKE. So you are saying it is going to require a cost analysis? Does anything else happen then?

Mr. PORTMAN. It requires a cost analysis so we will know what we are voting on. Then on the floor of the House, any Member of this House can stand up and raise what is called a point of order, which means it can stop the whole process if a new mandate is not funded. So you know what the cost is, and if some committee sends a bill to this floor that is not funded, in other words, it has a new requirement that is not funded, then any one of us or any other Member can stand up and say, "Point of order; this legislation needs to stop," and it stops right there, and you have a debate on the floor of the House about the unfunded mandate in that legislation.

Let us take an example, the motor-voter bill, the first bill that I had the privilege to consider here in the Con-

gress when I walked in my first day. I had to vote up or down on motor voter. I kind of looked at it. Everybody wants to have more voter registration. But I did not think it made sense, because Ohio, as the gentleman from Ohio knows, has a good voter registration program. It is run at the State level, as all programs were until we passed this national bill. I was told by some members of the Governor's office here in Washington this was going to cost the State of Ohio several million dollars a year. Nobody was sure, because there was not a good cost estimate. There was no Federal money to pay for it.

I voted against the bill on that basis. Now we are finding out many of these States, including California, are suing the Federal Government for precisely that reason. It is costing them a lot of money for voter registration.

Mr. HOKE. What is Ohio estimating it is going to cost them just to run the Motor-Voter Act?

Mr. PORTMAN. Twenty-nine million dollars is what the Governor is saying annually.

Mr. KINGSTON. It is \$3 million in Georgia. It is interesting the party in power in Georgia was even against it, the same party as the White House and those who were pushing it here, so it is really not a partisan issue.

Mr. PORTMAN. It is not. That is an excellent point. Let me just for a moment, we talked about, you know, it takes a lot of hard work to get to this point. You have got to have a bipartisan group here in Congress to support and get behind it. This is not a partisan issue outside of this room really, and outside the Beltway.

One of the concerns I had with the debate on the House floor over the first few days is it appeared to be sadly a partisan debate. If you go out into the real world, if you talk to township trustees, you talk to county commissioners, mayors of these small towns the gentleman talks about, it is not a partisan issue; whether you are a Democrat, Republican, or independent, you are getting sick and tired of the Federal Government having a one-size-fits-all Federal requirement coming down on you with no money to pay for it.

Mr. HOKE. You know, I listened to the debate today. It sounded to me like some of the things coming from the other side that this bill, this unfunded-mandates bill, would repeal all of the legislation we passed, you know, since 1789. Is that the case?

Mr. PORTMAN. No. It is not. What this bill does is it looks prospectively. It looks to the future.

Mr. HOKE. So it has nothing to do with anything we passed in the past?

Mr. PORTMAN. No. It does not affect the Clean Air Act. It does not affect the Clean Water Act. Now, if those bills come up for reauthorization or there are new mandates attached to them, absolutely, it applies to that. The whole idea is we have got a critically, critically ill patient on our hands. There is a crisis out there. The first

thing we do in an emergency room is stop the hemorrhaging, and that is what we are doing here, we are trying to stop the practice, to get Washington to get serious about this, and for the first time ever today we passed a bill to force Washington to do that. It was a historic day. It was part of our contract. It is us keeping our promise. It involved a lot of hard work. We have got to work with the Senate to come up with a compromise between the House and the Senate version, and we will be able to do that as we work with the Senate on this bill.

Mr. HOKE. If I can interrupt and ask you a question, because I agree with the gentleman that it is absolutely a critically important first step.

As you said, what you can raise with this is a point of order that stops all of the business on the floor with respect to a new mandate on the State, and debate then takes place as to whether or not that mandate should, well, as to how much it costs. We have to have a cost analysis of it, and then, at that point, does that mean that bill will no longer obtain or what happens?

Mr. PORTMAN. No. It does not. What happens then, if Congress chooses, Congress may, by a majority vote, waive that point of order. But it forces us to face the issue.

Mr. HOKE. Creates accountability?

Mr. PORTMAN. Exactly. You know, it is again, an up-or-down vote on this House floor because of our rules has historically been very difficult. Motor voter, again, a good example, there was never a debate on this floor as to whether there was an unfunded mandate. There was never any cost information to have an informed debate, and then there was no up-or-down vote on whether to impose the unfunded mandate.

What this bill does again for the first time is it says let us be accountable. If we are going to do this, let us step up to the plate and do it in the full view of the American people, the press, and so on.

That is why the Governors, the other State and local officials, mayors, county commissioners, and so on, supported this bill and worked with us to draft a bill that makes sense for them, and why even today they were here congratulating us on passing this bill. It was the No. 1 item for the National Conference of Mayors, No. 1 item for the National Governors' Association, and so on.

Mr. HOKE. Are there more Democrats or Republicans in the National Conference of Mayors?

Mr. PORTMAN. It has typically been the case that there are more Democrats. It is not a partisan issue again. We happen to have more Republic Governors than Democrats right now, but I can tell you that some of the Democrat Governors have been leading advocates on this issue to get Congress to get its requirements under control, and it is part of a much bigger picture, I have got to say to the gentleman from Ohio,

and that is the whole issue of federalism: What is the role of the Federal Government?

We are finally getting to the point in this Congress where we are beginning to debate that issue in a serious way. It is going to come up with welfare reform, it is going to come up with health care reform if we get into that again later in the year: What should the role be of the Federal Government? Should we be dictating everything here from Washington, or should we be giving the States and localities more flexibility, more say in how they go about solving the problems of this great country?

Mr. KINGSTON. We are at this point 2 out of 10 on the contract?

Mr. HOKE. Actually, no. We are about 3 out of 10. We have congressional accountability, we have knocked down unfunded mandates, and we passed the balanced budget amendment.

Mr. KINGSTON. Does that bring us to crime on our discussion?

Mr. HOKE. Yes. I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio for spending the time. If I could ask the gentleman from Ohio one more question, because the gentleman has had and has been instrumental in pushing this unfunded-mandates bill through. If this is the first critical step, do you have anything to share with us as to what the next step is in this process?

Mr. PORTMAN. Well, I do. The next step in the process is there will be a year-long study of all existing mandates which would include the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, and so on. There will be a report to the Congress a year from now, assuming this legislation is signed by the President and goes into law, and that report will go through all the existing mandates in a comprehensive way, and in a logical way, because you want to look at all the different pieces, and it will make recommendations that are very specific as to what we as a Congress should do legislatively to change existing statutes and existing mandates.

This is one reason again these State and local officials supported this legislation so strongly, because it gives us the ability to figure out what makes sense to be mandated from Washington and what does not.

Mr. HOKE. Find out how much it costs, not to eliminate it, not to repeal it, but to find out what it really costs, because certainly there are some programs that cost much more than they are worth, but we will never know that if we do not have a bona fide critical analysis of it.

Mr. PORTMAN. Absolutely.

Mr. HOKE. I thank you very much for spending your time with us.

It is a good way to segue into another area of extreme importance in the Contract With America that we are going to be getting to, and that has to do with crime and welfare as well. Maybe the gentleman from Georgia [Mr.

KINGSTON] would like to talk a little bit about where we are going with this.

□ 2020

Mr. KINGSTON. It is interesting you put crime and welfare right on top of each other because there is no question they are very related. The situation that we are in as a society is, we are not free if we cannot walk down the streets of America without having to look over our shoulder, without having the security guards, without discussing whether or not you can carry a gun to protect yourself. We are not free as long as there is the criminal, slime element on our streets.

The Clinton program basically was a Hug-a-Thug program. Their idea of getting tough on the criminal was having him foul out in midnight basketball. Our criminals need arraignment, not entertainment. They need to be in the big institution or pay restitution. I mean, that is just the bottom line. We need to have the truth in sentencing law that says "All right, if you are sentenced for 10 years you are not going to serve 3½ years, which is the 35 percent normal sentence; you are going to serve the full 10 years," or at least 9 years or 8 years. But currently it is just the revolving door, we bring them in, they have basketball, they have libraries, they have TV's. You cannot even make them work. Then we say: Why isn't it working? Why aren't our streets safe? We should say that we are going to put you in jail and you are going to stay there, and we will make you work while you are there.

Mr. HOKE. May I ask the gentleman a question? Could the gentleman run down again a couple of those things once more, those that rhyme, particularly?

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, you will have to buy the record.

Mr. HOKE. No hugs for thugs?

Mr. KINGSTON. No hugs for thugs. They need to be in an institution, which we call the big house back home, or pay restitution. I do not know what they call it on Ohio, but you need to have people in jail. They have broken the law. We have decided in society that certain people need to be insulated from others and they need to be in jail. They need to be in an institution or they need to be out on the streets paying restitution, if they have stolen money they need to pay back to the victims.

You know, we always forget the victims.

I had a constituent call me. The woman was at home bathing her 3-year-old and some slime kicked down the door and raped her, and the son-of-a-gun was caught—fortunately not because of that, but because of another crime, and incidentally he had raped three or four people—he was getting out of jail 5 years later. Now, how would you like to be that husband, that sister, that brother, knowing that creep was back out on the streets in your hometown? It is not right. That is what we have got to change. That is

what the Contract with America tries to do.

Mr. JONES. I would like to add to the gentleman from Georgia's response to the gentleman from Ohio's inquiry.

During our campaign, the polling we did before we entered the race for Congress and during the race for Congress showed that crime and punishment was always among the top issues with the people. They believed that the Clinton crime package, if you will, that you made reference to, was too soft, that it did not do what needed to be done to protect the citizens.

Quite frankly, I think that is why our Contract with America, when we get on this issue, you will see the response from the American people will be just as strong today as it was when they elected the Republican majority. Because they want to see, they want to be protected; they have felt for so long, as the gentleman said, they have a locked-in mentality while those who should be locked in are out on the streets.

So I just wanted to add to the gentleman's comments that this part of our contract is extremely important. That is why we have been given this opportunity, because the majority of the past, which is now the minority party, did not do the job to protect the citizens of this country.

Mr. HOKE. Well, does the gentleman think that it has to do with the pendulum swing? If the pendulum has swung so far over to favoring criminals, favoring thugs, favoring those people that are abusing our society, that are abusing other people, and are simply antisocial that we have to move it back to the center? Is that not what is happening?

Mr. JONES. If I may just touch on what happened. It just so happened that yesterday the Governor of North Carolina, Jim Hunt, a Democrat, had a luncheon for all the Members of the Congress here in Washington, DC. He had sent us a letter 2 days before about a person in North Carolina who spent 13 years on death row. The individual had kidnapped three cheerleaders at a small college in North Carolina, three girls, put them in the trunk, took one out, raped her, and then killed her. He spent 13 years on death row through all these endless appeals.

That is why people are sick and tired of it. The Governor of North Carolina in his letter to us and also at the luncheon yesterday said that we need to end these endless appeals.

I think in our contract we are talking about a 2-year limit.

Mr. HOKE. Let me give both of the gentlemen some good news. I happen to have the honor of sitting on the Judiciary Committee, where today we marked up and passed out and reported out the reform of habeas corpus, which is the Latin phrase referring to the endless rounds of appeals that can go to the State court, to the Federal court, back to the State court, to the

Federal court. We have limited and compressed that timeframe dramatically now so that you will not be able to go into endless round of appeals.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, that is part of the process. The gentleman has alluded to it. That is the frustration that common, decent Americans have with the penal system when people are not serving their full sentence, who get endless appeals, they get to tie up courts. It really, in this country, has become a matter where they can tie them up forever and get away with whatever crime they committed.

You know there is another aspect of our crime reform bill that I think is very important: 22 percent of the prisoners in the Federal penitentiaries are illegal aliens, who are not American citizens, 22 percent. Again, they are getting all the amenities that you or I would only be able to get if we went to a good hotel room. Yet we cannot even deport them.

This changes that. We want to deport them. I believe that any kind of fooling with the trade bill, foreign aid bill, immigration; I would say "Look, you folks are welcome to our country legally any time you want." They come here illegally, then they are going home on a one-way ticket and "Don't send them back, we are going to bill you the costs back," through negotiation.

I think it is time that we start tightening up; we cannot afford to pay the bill for 22 percent of the non-Americans—

Mr. HOKE. It also goes a step further with respect to legal aliens. That is people in this country legally, but who commit violent felonies, criminals, they get convicted and do time. That then becomes an issue upon which they can be deported upon having done their time in jail. And this is a change in the law—if they are sentenced regardless of whether or not they actually do the time, if they are sentenced for 5 years or more for a felony, they can be deported for that and they also lose the privilege of ever becoming an American citizen.

These are important things because citizenship in this country is a privilege, and we should not be extending it to violent felons.

Another thing I wanted to ask the gentleman about with respect to the crime bill and the changes we are going to make: I believe there are three things that are absolutely necessary. I call them the three C's. For the criminal justice system to work as a deterrent, you have to catch, convict, and confine. And you have to do all of that in a compressed period of time. When you do that, then somebody who is contemplating criminal activity knows that when they commit a crime they are going to be caught and when they are convicted they are actually going to do time.

They are going to have to go to the big house, as the gentleman said. When that all happens in a compressed time

period, then you will find the justice system works as a deterrent to stop people from committing crimes, because they know they are going to go to jail. We have done things in this contract that specifically go each area there.

First of all, we increased the number of police on the streets as a result of it. This is in a block grant way directly to the communities.

Mr. KINGSTON. And let the municipalities under this bill spend the money as they see fit. They may not need policemen, but they may need police cars. So this gives them that type of flexibility.

Mr. HOKE. The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. KINGSTON. It is not the big brother telling them what to do.

Mr. HOKE. Exactly right, the gentleman is absolutely right.

Now, No. 2 is that with respect to conviction we have given the courts the ability to use evidence that may have previously been not allowed because of the exclusionary rule.

Mr. KINGSTON. So as I understand that, if you find the gun but for some reason the investigating officer did not have the warrant perfected, maybe some little technical wording problem, you cannot use the gun as evidence, which is ridiculous. This says if it is a good faith mistake you still can use this as evidence, the gun, hatchet, or whatever it is.

Mr. HOKE. That is exactly right. It is the good faith exclusion. What it says is that we are going to discipline the police officer, teach that person how to do it right. But if it was done in good faith and it did not impair the criminal's rights, then we are going to allow that evidence to be admitted. That is an important thing because that swings the pendulum back to punish criminals and to be on the side of victims.

□ 2030

Mr. JONES. May I ask the gentleman from Ohio a question?

During your debate on this bill, during the campaign, I heard numerous times people say, "I'm so tired of reading in the paper where a person incarcerated, serving time for a crime, is given the opportunity to file suit over some usually frivolous type issue, and we, the taxpayers, are paying for this."

Mr. HOKE. You mean prisoners who are—

Mr. JONES. Absolutely, those that are incarcerated.

Mr. HOKE. That is exactly right.

Well, we dealt with that today in the Committee on the Judiciary, as a matter of fact, specifically, and in fact there is an element of the bar that makes a full-time living in contacting prisoners and then using shotgun approach lawsuits to file for all kinds of ridiculous and frivolous things like, for example, the food is not good enough, we want better food, we want different kinds of silverware, we want towels that are not so scratchy. I am not mak-

ing these things up, and the reason they do this is because the bar, the attorneys, can actually be reimbursed their fees, all of them, by the Federal Government when they bring these lawsuits, civil lawsuits, on behalf of prisoners.

What we have done is we have said that you can bring the lawsuits. We are not impairing a prisoner's right to bring lawsuits. But you can only be paid if you win, and you can only be paid on the part that you do win on.

Now it is a little bit technical; I understand that, but typically what happens is an attorney will file a lawsuit with 50, 60, 70 different complaints and hope that he or she is going to hit on one of them, and then they get paid for the entire lawsuit, all of the time that they supposedly put in. This changes that dramatically.

Mr. KINGSTON. That is another aspect. You mentioned it just briefly with your action in the Judiciary Committee today.

I am sick and tired, as I know my colleagues are, because of the police officers actually being treated like criminals by the lawyers when they get in these courtrooms. The police officers are the men and women who are out there on the line risking their lives, and remember they are not arresting people for the second or third time. They are arresting people under the current system for the eighth, ninth, or tenth time, and I ask, "How would you like to be a plainclothesman working the street in a dangerous neighborhood not knowing if the last guy you sent up the river is going to be bumping into you at the convenience store?" But that is the situation we are in now.

As my colleagues know, there is another aspect, and I know we need to move on to welfare reform. I wanted to mention this bill also authorizes \$10 billion for new prison construction, and I would say, just like Tom Bodett, "We're going to leave the light on for them."

Mr. HOKE. Well, it is catch, convict, and confine. Catch extra police. Convict habeas corpus, or exclusionary rule reform. Confine \$10 billion in prisons. And with that, a requirement that a prisoner must do 85 percent of his sentence time.

Mr. KINGSTON. As my colleagues know now, one of the root causes of the crime problem, the explosion of crime particularly in the inner city, is the breakdown of the family. The previous speaker mentioned that there were 15 million children being raised in single parent homes. Actually there is 15 million being raised in homes generally without fathers.

Now of the children on AFDC or basically on welfare, 92 percent live in a home where they do not have fathers, and that is homes really where small children are being raised by teenagers. We are talking 17-year-old mamas raising kids and often on top of going to

high school, and sometimes a 17-year-old is raising two children. There was a study that said one of the biggest correlations between crime in the neighborhood is an education. It is not poverty. It is just having fathers at home, and one of the key elements of the Contract With America's reform plan is to reunite that family saying that if you are under 18 years old, you have got to identify the father, and I will mention that a little bit more later, but also you got to stay at home with your own parent in order to get that welfare check, and I think that will help strengthen the family unit which has been broken down really because of Government policy.

Mr. HOKE. Well, I could not agree more, and I look forward to a very spirited debate on this because, as the gentleman knows, there is a great deal of feeling, certainly among my constituents, that we are a big part of the problem, having created this problem, that we have created financial incentives, or if "incentive" is too strong a word, at least we create the financial viability of the single parent family in this country, and there was no financial viability under the Great Society, until we abused a program that was devised for widows to be able to have—be able to provide for their own children in a widowed situation. We have taken that, and it has grown into this extraordinary bureaucracy that has brought much, much grief and much, and little happiness to our country.

Mr. KINGSTON. Here we are, 30 years later, \$3 trillion later, and here is a definition of a trillion: "If you spent a hundred thousand dollars a minute 24 hours a day, it would take 19 years to get to one trillion."

We have spent \$3 trillion starting with the Great Society under Lyndon Government-Can-Solve-Anything Johnson, and during that period of time the poverty level in 1965 was 14 percent. Today it is 14 percent.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have accomplished absolutely nothing except for the absolute destruction of inner city families.

Mr. HOKE. Well, as my colleague knows, the thing the people want, they never want to agree there are any correlations here, that they are causal things going on, but the fact is today two-thirds of all minority births are illegitimate. Twenty-five percent of all nonminority births are illegitimate.

Those are shocking, shocking number when you consider that—

Mr. KINGSTON. The national combined average is 30.1 percent.

Mr. HOKE. Thirty point one percent, and when you consider that in 1960 we were at less than a third of that.

Mr. KINGSTON. Twenty-nine out of 1,000 15- to 17-year-old girls will have a child illegitimately, and when we talk about that 30 percent level, we are not talking 30-year-old Murphy Browns who have a career, and income coming in. We are talking 18-year-olds. We are talking 14-year-olds who cannot care

for themselves, much less the awesome burden of being a parent.

Mr. JONES. If I can just add briefly to this?

What we have had is a system; the Speaker has spoken of this so many times. We have had a system that has perpetuated this type of behavior. We have had a system that has through payments encouraged people to have children out of wedlock, and, as the Speaker has said so many times, we want to help people get off welfare. We want to help people become productive citizens. Welfare should not be a ham-

mock.

Welfare should be a springboard. Mr. HOKE. I heard PHIL GRAMM say it very well the other day. He said, "The problem with welfare is it's no longer a safety net. It's become a ham-

mock."

The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. KINGSTON. The other thing about this, and there is a work requirement, too, but before we leave this single parent thing, what our society has said, what our Government welfare program has said, is, "You're a young girl, 17 or 18 years old, and you get pregnant. That's your baby, you're responsible, and you're responsible to raise the baby, the child. You're on the hook for the next 21 years."

Now for the 17-year-old boy who is the father, "Don't worry about it."

Mr. HOKE. No accountability, no responsibility, no requirement that paternity be established. Are we changing that in the contract?

Mr. KINGSTON. We are changing it. You have to establish paternity. What we are saying to these alley-cat dads is, "Come on home. We are fixing to get serious. We are going to domesticate the alley cat."

That is what we need to do.

Mr. HOKE. And we have got some very strong, across-state-line laws that we are looking at to go after deadbeat dads as well.

Mr. KINGSTON. Absolutely, and there is a barrage of other laws that will go after deadbeat dads if the Republican Contract With America welfare plan gets passed because there are other laws that are contingent on this that will further make life hard on deadbeat dads and could include revoking drivers licenses and so forth. We are going to get the money from the dad, and we are going to bring him back in the formula.

Mr. HOKE. As my colleague knows, as I thought about welfare in the United States generally over the past couple of years, it strikes me that what we say to a young woman, a 16-, 17-, 18-year-old woman, is, "Look, we're going to make a deal with you. If you want to have a child, you can do that, and we are going to help you out with that child. We are going to help you with housing, we are going to help you with food, we are going to help you with day care if you want that, we are going to help you even with job training, and

we're going to give you money as well so that you can provide for that child."

□ 2040

There are two conditions for this good deal we are going to give you, OK? No 1 is you have to promise us that you will not get married. That is No. 1. Just promise you will not get married. No. 2, you have to promise us you are not going to get a job. Do not get a job, and in the meantime we will provide you also with health care in addition to all those things. But as long as you fulfill those two promises, then we are going to take care of you. You just cannot get married and cannot get a job.

Now, what is it we are saying to people? We are saying if they are in a single-parent family, they have much less of a chance of giving that child an even break in terms of being raised. Statistics do not lie on this. It is absolutely crystal clear in terms of outcomes that kids coming out of single-parent families have a tougher time, graduating, finishing school in time, not needing psychological counseling, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

What is the other thing that we are doing? We are robbing that person of the fundamental dignity of having a job, of having work, of having self-reliance. It is a bad deal.

Mr. KINGSTON. What is also good about this program is there is a work requirement that they do try to get involved in some sort of work training, and dads again must participate in it. There is also another part of it which I would say is internal, and that is combining so many of these government bureaucracies, which simply duplicate what the other one is doing. What they want to do is not make people independent, but keep them dependent. They create a clientele. So they are all fighting for it. But if you suggest why do not we combine it and cut out some of the bureaucrats' jobs so we can get more food to the child in the classroom that is hungry so they can learn math better or science better and so forth, so they can break the cycle, then you have this resistance from the bureaucrats. But the contract goes after these programs and combines them.

Mr. HOKE. One of the things I am looking forward to with respect to our welfare reform is block granting this money to the States. There must be a State in this Union that will have the courage to actually eliminate welfare and require that its citizens reach out to help those people that need that help, require its citizens to go out and one-on-one adopt, be a part of, become completely bonded and a part of the needs of its community.

It seems to me that that will take tremendous courage on the part of a State. But when we do that, we will see a very real, a very different attitude, and a complete change in the way that that State deals with the problem of indigency, the problem of illegitimacy. And that will be the beginning of the

restoration of a much more sane commonsense approach to dealing with these problems in a way that is deeply compassionate, that truly connects people with people, and that does not alienate us from each other as neighbors in our communities, and does not alienate us from our institutions as well.

Mr. JONES. If I can just add one situation that happened months and months ago before I even became a candidate for Congress, in my business I was calling on a manufacturing firm, and I will never forget the story the gentleman was telling me about a lady that lived in the housing project in this small county and small town. And one of the best workers that he had, every time he give her a raise, her rent went up. So she got to a point that she came back to him and said, "Why work? I am working harder, but I can't achieve because the government continues to raise my rent."

There has got to be some way to work out a system so that an individual that is trying to do better for themselves through work is somehow given an opportunity, for example, using this as an example, hold the rent down for a couple of years, and make that individual put money in a savings account and let that be monitored by local agencies.

But any time somebody tries to do better for themselves, many times through this archaic system that we have, they are being penalized. There are many people that want to get off welfare, but the system keeps holding them down. And that is what we are talking about in this contract. That is what you have been talking. We can change it, and we are going to change it.

Mr. KINGSTON. Gentleman, I need to leave you, and I know you are going to go on and talk about term limits and so many of the other good elements of the contract. I appreciate your time and leadership both of you all have shown on these issues. Let us do it again sometime.

Mr. HOKE. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for participating and for being a part of this.

I want to just close with the idea of this block granting with one final thought, and that is that I think that what we will find out is there is a tremendous amount of creativity in the States. There will be States that will try all kinds of different solutions to the welfare problem, and they will come up with many, many different programs and ways of dealing with it, and some States that may, as I have suggested, even eliminate certain programs, certain welfare programs, to others that will try a very different approach. And that is what we need.

We do not need a one-size-fits-all type of approach. We need to unleash the creativity, allow that creativity to erupt and to try different things that will truly work. We do not know what will work, we do not know what will

not work, but we do know what is not working. By giving the States that kind of flexibility, we are going to get a heck of a lot more of an idea of a better direction to go in to solve that particular problem that is so very, very difficult.

I wonder if I could ask, Mr. JONES, if you could talk to me a little bit about the work that you have been involved in with term limits and where you expect that to go and how that fits into our Contract With America?

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman for this opportunity. It has been a great experience for a freshman. I have been here 4 weeks, and this has been an exciting day in many ways, passing an unfunded mandate, and a balanced budget amendment last week, and participating with you tonight and with the other two gentlemen.

In the area of reform, there is probably not anything more important than giving the people of America the opportunity to vote on term limits. Quite frankly, I was in the general assembly in North Carolina for 10 years. I have worked hard in the area of campaign finance reform, ethics, rewriting the lobbying laws for the lobbyists in the State of North Carolina, and I have got some background, so to speak, in this area. And I started years ago talking about the need for term limits.

If I can just for a moment cite a story. My father served in the U.S. Congress for 26 years. About 3 years ago, 4 years ago, I was talking to him in our hometown of Farmville, and I was telling him how I believe very strongly in term limits. Again, he served 26 years. And he said, "I did not do a very good job of raising you, if you feel that good about term limits."

Mr. HOKE. If I could ask you, was your father a Democrat or a Republican?

Mr. JONES. My father was a Democrat.

Mr. HOKE. Are you a Democrat or a Republican?

Mr. JONES. I am a Republican.

Mr. HOKE. So not only are you not a Democrat like your father, but you are also telling him you want to have terms limits. Were you a Democrat in the North Carolina House?

Mr. JONES. Right. I was. I developed the reputation of being the foremost advocate of reform in the North Carolina General Assembly, which I am very proud that I earned that reputation.

But I will tell you this, since you asked me about my father. He did know, and we talked about it before he became ill and he eventually died, that I would be changing my party affiliation. He stated he supported that decision and would state that publicly, but obviously he did not live long enough.

I listened to the people, and in our contract we listened to the people. Every issue we have talked about tonight, every issue, came from the fact that when we developed this contract,

we listened to the people of America. These 10 bills in this contract is what the people of America want to see pass in the U.S. House of Representatives, and hopefully the U.S. Senate.

But I will tell you in the area of term limits, this is one of the utmost issues that the American people, every poll that I have seen, a minimum of 65 percent of the people in America say they want term limits, and quite frankly, as high as 75 percent say they want term limits.

We look at Tom Foley, the former Speaker of the House, and his people in his State wanted term limits. And he took his people to court, and I am glad he did, because we have a fine representative from Washington there.

But my point is so many States already, 22 I believe on their own, have passed term limits. The people of America want this Congress to give them the privilege to act on term limits. We know and you know that we need 290 votes on this House floor. Right now the best that we can figure that we have is 228. So if there are any citizens throughout America watching this tonight, I hope they will call their Congress person if they feel strong that they, the people, would like to have the vote on term limits.

□ 2050

Quite frankly, we have three bills, two that have been filed, one is three terms, that is 2 years times three, 6 years, a 6-year term. The other is a 12-year term. That has been introduced, I believe, by the gentleman from Florida, [Mr. MCCOLLUM]. He believes that it should parallel with the Senate, that would have two terms, 6 years each, 12 years. Then I believe that the gentleman from Florida, [Mrs. FOWLER] will be offering an amendment on the floor that will speak to 8 years, four terms, four times two.

So we are going to have a choice. I just hope that we will give the people of the United States the same choice that we have here on the floor. And I hope, again, we think we have 228 people that have signed on or signed the pledge on the Republican side and the Democratic side. I hope we can get the 290 and get some form of term limits to the people.

Mr. HOKE. As a strong proponent and supporter and agitator for term limits for a long time, I think you are right on the money when you suggest that people ought to call their Representatives and lobby and make known their feelings about this issue. Because I am absolutely convinced that term limits, the combination of term limits, which will truly reform this institution, as well as the balanced budget amendment, which will reform the way that we spend money, that those two things form the cornerstones of making our Government completely and truly representative once more, of the American people.

Mr. JONES. Absolutely. If I could add this, because I think it is of interest, according to Stephen Moore of the Cato Institute, if term limits had been in effect in recent years, the balanced budget amendment would have passed in 1990. The Clinton and Bush tax increases would have failed. The Penny-Kasich spending cuts would have passed and the congressional pay raise of 1989 and 1992 would have been defeated. What happens is that we have a system that continues to perpetuate itself, perpetuate itself because it is based on seniority. And we both know that obviously an incumbent has an advantage, particularly when it comes to raising money. And I, quite frankly, think that if we give the people the opportunity to vote on term limits, we will have a better system that will be the system that the people of America want.

Obviously, if we give them the opportunity to vote and they do not pass in enough States to change the Constitution, then obviously the people have had the chance to speak on this issue. I think that is what the people want.

Mr. HOKE. I think you are absolutely right. I would actually urge people not to lose sight on this, especially people who generally are very happy with what is happening with the Contract With America, who feel really good about the direction that the Congress is going in. Some of those people who have moved this polling that says that Republicans are breaking down legislative gridlock and that the Republicans are bringing integrity and honor and confidence back to this institution, for Heaven's sake, it strikes me, do not get fooled into thinking that, therefore, we should not have term limits. It is essential to the viability of this institution and to the vitality of it going on.

I will tell you, I have got another bill that I have been very excited about with respect to term limits that actually changes the length of the term from 2 years to 4 years and then limits it to three 4-year terms. I believe strongly, as I have for a long time, that the 2-year term, while clearly was introduced for specific reasons by our Founding Fathers, is outmoded in the 20th century and that, unfortunately, what it means is that we are only working 50 percent of the time, because essentially we are legislating for a year and then become more and more distracted with campaigns in the second year.

And that distraction is not just because the legislator wants it to be and is motivated to do that, but, in fact, that is when the sniping begins and when all of the negative stuff starts with respect to somebody trying to take your seat, and it really becomes a tremendous distraction.

Mr. JONES. May I ask when the gentleman filed the bill? I just heard about it today, and I thought it was a very exciting idea.

Mr. HOKE. The other thing is, if you look at the other legislatures around

the world, the shortest one is 4 years in Western Europe. I think New Zealand might have 3 years, but most are 4- and 5-year terms. I think I like the idea of the symmetry with the Senate, and I think that it is very important toward moving toward becoming a citizen legislature.

Mr. JONES. If I might add to this, because I think the people that might be watching tonight need to know that probably the term limit issue will be debated in the committees probably in March, sometime in March. And they really, as you said yourself, people need to really let their elected Congress person know exactly how they feel on this issue.

Mr. HOKE. And in Ohio where we passed a law that would limit Members of Congress to four 2-year terms that I supported and I campaigned for and I voted for, I will have the opportunity to vote on the amendment of the gentlewoman From Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] with the four 2-year terms.

I think that you are right on the money when you say that people ought to really work hard on this, because it is critical to the citizen legislature that we all envision.

I would say one other thing, and that is that we often, we hear the phrase that power corrupts. And there is no question about it. Power does corrupt. But what I would suggest to you is that power corrupts relatively slowly and that the problem that we had with the fact that one party was in control for 40 years did not come about, we did not have a problem in the first 10 years or the first even 15 years necessarily, but the arrogance and the occupation that became endemic to this institution really began in the 1980's and continued through. And it seems to me that we cannot get lulled into thinking that anybody has—that there is some sort of a corner that one party has on purity or righteousness. The problem is when one party is in control for far too long.

Now, do not misunderstand me. There are philosophical differences that are very, very fundamental and basic to the way that the Democrats view the world and the way that Republicans do. And I think it is fair to say that Democrats have a great deal of confidence in the Government's ability to fix things, and Republicans have little confidence in that and a great deal of confidence in the ability of individuals and families and private institutions to fix things.

But I think it is also fair to say that I, for one, do not believe for a minute that any group that has power for 40 years straight is going to stay lily white. And I think that that is a problem that we have to address.

Was there anything you wanted to add to that?

Mr. JONES. Just one other point. Did we, in our reform package as it related to the rules, did we put a number of terms that a person could as chairman? I think it is important to remind the people that we have done this, 6 years,

and also the Speaker, four terms, 8 years; is that correct?

Mr. HOKE. That is correct, yes. We have done that. We have limited the terms of committee chairs and of the speaker, and we did that because we could do that in our own rules package. We actually did that in terms of ranking Members in 1992 at, frankly, the insistence of my class, which I feel very proud of.

Mr. JONES. Congratulations to your class.

Mr. HOKE. I really thank the gentleman from North Carolina, and I thank the gentlemen from Ohio and from Georgia for participating.

It has been a pleasure doing this with you. I think it has been very helpful to me to have your input. I really appreciate it. So I just want to say that.

I want to close by saying this, let us review the bidding on what we have done and where we are at with this Contract. On the first day of Congress—I want to review the bidding with respect to the notion that somehow this is the Republican Contract With America, because the truth is that this is not. This is an American Contract, and every single thing that we have done on this floor has gotten bipartisan support.

Let us review, on the very first day of the Congress, every single vote to reform the rules of the House received Democrat support, sometimes by as many as 203 Democrats, practically their entire caucus.

□ 2100

When we passed the congressional accountability law, a total of 171 Democrats supported our bill, 171 out of about 200 Democrats supported the bill. When we passed the Balanced Budget Amendment, 72 Democrats broke with their leadership to do the right thing. When we passed the unfunded mandates bill, another 130 Democrats sided with Republicans to give the American people what they wanted.

Given the degree of bipartisan support that our Contract has received, the American people may well wonder why it has taken so many years to get these badly needed reforms passed, and the answer is very simple. For years the way too liberal, way too powerful, way out of touch leadership of this Congress, of the Democrat party, throttled these bills and kept them from the floor, from even being considered.

In their power and in their arrogance, the Democrat leaders not only ignored the wishes of their own party, but more importantly, they forgot about the needs of the American people. We have not, and we are not going to. This is a Contract With America, it is a Contract For America, and it has finally given America the government that it wants and it needs.

Mr. Speaker, this Contract is right on target. This Contract is right on track.