

first class with his wide seats and free liquor.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

THE LINE-ITEM VETO: WIN ONE FOR THE GIPPER

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 asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I quote from President Ronald Reagan's final State of the Union Address on January 25, 1988. He said at that time,

Let's help ensure our future of prosperity by giving the President a tool that, though I will not get to use it, is one that I know future Presidents of either party must have. Give the President the same authority that 43 Governors use in their states: the right to reach into massive appropriation bills, pare away the waste, and enforce budget discipline. Let's approve the line item veto.

We have the opportunity, hopefully by Monday, to pass that important legislation to reduce wasteful spending. On Monday it will be former President Ronald Reagan's birthday.

The line-item veto, together with a balanced budget amendment, constitutes the Fiscal Responsibility Act pledged by Republicans in the Contract With America. These two measures will work together to restore fiscal responsibility to an out-of-control Congress.

Every year, ridiculous projects and tax benefits are buried in appropriation bills and tax bills. It is clear from the writings of Madison and Hamilton in the Federalist Papers that the Framers intended a two-branch review of all laws, including appropriations. The line-item veto will restore the constitutional system of checks and balances over each individual appropriation, preventing future Congresses from effectively eliminating the President's veto authority through creative legislative packaging.

The States, the laboratories of democracy under our decentralized federalist system, have proven that the line-item veto works. State legislatures have recognized its effectiveness as an important tool in restraining the growth of government.

The goal of the line-item veto is to allow the President to rescind pork-barrel spending. Pork-barrel projects are usually attached to bills of vital importance to the continued operation of the Government or bills that enjoy wide popularity. As such, the bill is assured of passage and the President's signature. All of this will change with the adoption of the line-item veto.

The years 1993 and 1994 saw plenty of wasteful appropriations that would have been targets for the veto pen if the President had been able to exercise that authority. These are just a few: Fifteen billion to build never authorized courthouses opposed by the Federal judges in the region where they were to be built; 1.1 million for a plant stress lab; and 35 million to eradicate screw worms in Mexico.

I call on my colleagues on Monday to adopt this important legislation unanimously, a line-item veto, to help us restore fiscal responsibility to the United States of America.

SUPPORT HEAD START

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Ms. WATERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, in 1965 the Office of Economic Opportunity launched Project Head Start to help break the cycle of poverty. It provided pre-school children of low-income families with a comprehensive program to meet their emotional, social, health, nutritional, and psychological needs. In 1969, Head Start became a permanent program within the Administration on Children, Youth and Families at the Department of Health and Human Services. Since its beginning, Head Start has served over 13.1 million children and their families, representing all races, classes, and regions of this country.

After nearly 30 years, Head Start is being recognized by educators, child development specialists, community leaders, and parents across the Nation as the most successful publicly funded children's program there is. However, this program is now in jeopardy—it could be cut—it could even be eliminated.

The Republican Contract With America proposes to take Head Start out of the hands of local communities and make it a function of State child care block grants. This would be disastrous.

First of all, Head Start is not a child care program. Head Start is a comprehensive family-focused developmental program that addresses child and family needs. Head Start puts a premium on parent involvement by encouraging parents to participate in important program decisions. Head Start staff are members of the communities they serve, many are former Head Start parents. Program decisions are based on community needs, as defined by the community. Block granting Head Start would undo local control of addressing unique community needs. At a time when so much emphasis is placed on personal and family responsibility, it is more important than ever to have a program that is family-oriented. By lumping Head Start with other children's programs, the focus on families will be lost and important elements such as parenting skills, male involvement, literacy, and employment skills would be compromised.

Mr. Speaker, I have received numerous letters from concerned parents and educators urging this Congress not to destroy the Head Start Program. Many parents have shared their personal experiences with me. They tell how Head Start has helped their families, how they have learned to be advocates for their children. Many of these parents started out as volunteers with their local Head Start Programs and went on to become permanent employees. I think these are the stories that we need to hear.

Head Start must remain in the hands of local communities to ensure that important program elements are maintained. Head Start makes it possible for millions of children to look forward to a better future. To change the program now will close the door of opportunity on millions of children yet to step through a Head Start classroom door.

Head Start is an investment in the human potential of children—children who often fall behind in their first years of school and find their troubles compounded in later years. These children belong to all of us; they are the children of the Nation. We must preserve Head Start as a Federal to local program. We can no longer afford to sit back and hope that logic and sense of what is right will prevail. We need a national mobilization around Head Start, a coming together of parents, educators, community leaders, and public officials. A national mobilization that will transcend the traditional political process. Together we can make a difference. Let's not turn our backs on our children.

□ 2030

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

[Mr. NEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, tonight I want to discuss an issue that I believe is critical to successful welfare reform. That is the whole issue of child support enforcement.

The interests of our children must come first in welfare reform. We cannot look out for those interests unless we demand more responsibility from their parents, especially in the area of child support.

Our country's failure to adequately collect child support has had a devastating impact on our children. The statistics are startling. Sixty-three

percent of noncustodial parents do not pay child support. In 1989, only 37 percent of the almost 10 million custodial mothers caring for children under 21 received any child support. And currently only \$14 billion of the \$48 billion in child support payments is being paid each year, leaving a gap of \$34 billion uncollected. Just think of the basic needs of these children that are not being met, adequate housing, proper clothes for school, healthy meals at the dinner table, things that all of us take for granted.

In my home State of Connecticut, failure to pay child support is the greatest cause of poverty among single parent families. Child support delinquencies in Connecticut exceeded \$475 million in 1993 alone. Only 40 percent of families with child support orders in the state actually received payments.

I recently met with a group of mothers who told me horrific stories about the choices that they are forced to make because their ex-husbands refuse to honor their court-ordered child support payments.

One woman works a full-time day job and three part-time jobs at night, because her ex-husband has not paid child support in 12 years. She still finds herself falling behind, and she broke down one day in a grocery store because she had only \$40 with which to buy 2 weeks' worth of groceries.

Another woman has been working four jobs for 14 years in order to support her children. She has taken her ex-husband to court more than 100 times to force him to pay child support.

These hard-working women, through no fault of their own, are just one step away from needing public assistance to support their kids. All because their children's fathers are refusing to pay what they owe.

It should not be this way. It should not be this difficult for hard-working single parents to provide for their children. Every child has two parents, and both of them should be required to live up to their financial responsibility.

Unfortunately, many do not, resulting in increased rates of childhood poverty and AFDC enrollment. And that is why the issue of child support enforcement must be addressed in the context of welfare reform.

The best welfare reform of all is reform that keeps parents and children from needing government assistance in the first place.

I want to send a clear message tonight, that when it comes to welfare reform, a solution that does not include tough child support enforcement is no solution at all.

The Republicans Contract With America falls woefully short. The contract calls for stepping up child support collection, but it neglects to include any worthwhile means of improving child support enforcement. It takes a step in the right direction with a paternity establishment provision that requires States to establish paternity

in 90 percent of their AFDC cases, but it is not enough.

I believe the paternity establishment is an essential step toward enhancing child support collection. That is why we fought for provisions in the Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 to encourage more voluntary in-hospital paternity programs. To truly improve child support collection, legislation is needed that will: First, work to establish child support awards in every case; second, to ensure fair award levels, and; three, to collect the awards that are owed. We also advocate changes in the law that will penalize noncustodial parents for failing to meet their child support obligations.

It is my hope that the Republicans will prove to be open to these kinds of changes and suggestions. I look forward to the subcommittee's meeting and hearing on Monday, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on this very important issue.

I hope that our motto for welfare reform, besides rewarding work and responsibility and allowing people to go to work to do that and to get off welfare, but that we will put our children first.

CRIME LEGISLATION

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased and proud to report that the Committee on the Judiciary today concluded work after 3 days of markup and several days of hearings earlier in the month of January on a very important component of the Contract With America. And that is a series of pieces of legislation that will correct many of the deficiencies, serious deficiencies that were contained in last year's so-called anticrime bill, and go beyond that bill in many important respects.

This bill, for example, Mr. Speaker, says that no longer will police have their hands tied in cases where there may be a technical violation, an unknowing violation of certain constitutional provisions. But if they, in good faith, rely on objective information and can satisfy a magistrate or a court of that reliance objectively, that the evidence will go in and that individuals who are guilty will not be back out on our streets.

Further, Mr. Speaker, this new crime bill which will make its way to the floor, hopefully next week, and receive the imprimatur of this great body, says, no longer will our death penalty system be the laughing stock of this country, that for the very first time in many years people can look up to that system and say, yes, it does mean something.

Habeas corpus will no longer be abused in our Federal system.

□ 2040

The system will work better for the people, for the victims, and for all of us.

Mr. Speaker, this crime bill says that those in a position to know what our law enforcement needs are in our communities all across this land, that those who are in a position to determine how best to meet those needs, will in fact once more be in charge of meeting those needs insofar as Federal moneys coming back to the States and the local governments are concerned.

No longer will we have, as we had under the crime bill passed last year, a smoke and mirrors approach to law enforcement whereby we heard that 100,000 police officers will be on the streets, are on the streets, and will remain on the streets, because we know out on the streets that that was not true. It is not true, and it would not be true.

This crime bill, Mr. Speaker, these crime bills that will make it to the floor, and which the Committee on the Judiciary, under the leadership of Chairman HYDE, concluded action on today, takes those Federal moneys, which are indeed the taxpayers' moneys of this country, and turns them back to the States and the local governments and says:

We recognize that you must determine, you are in the best position to determine, how those funds ought to be spent, how your needs in your community ought to be met to further the objectives of law enforcement and prevention.

It does this, Mr. Speaker, through a block grant program.

Further, Mr. Speaker, it goes on to say:

In the area of incarceration there are two and only two ways to ensure that those who deserve to be in jail are in jail and remain in jail. More prisons must be built, and this bill provides substantial funds to States to build more prisons, if in fact the States have shown through a history of reforms in their sentencing systems that more people are being incarcerated, according to their laws, and for longer periods of time, according to their laws.

This bill also, Mr. Speaker, says that in those cases where States make significant progress toward instituting a system of incarceration and sentencing whereby inmates serve a full 85 percent, at least, of their sentence, which, after all, reflects not only the will of the people but the will of the juries and the will of the judges, that they will be eligible for additional grant moneys to build those prisons.

Mr. Speaker, this is a realistic crime bill. Mr. Speaker, this is not smoke and mirrors. Mr. Speaker, this is a series of legislative proposals passed by the Committee on the Judiciary with input from very learned experts from all across this country, with substantial input from Members of this great body on both sides of the aisle that deserves careful attention, that deserves the votes of this body, so that it can get back to the decisionmakers in our communities what they need.