

funds, asking, "What's wrong with letting them use Federal funds for less expensive but still effective programs rather than for costly hiring?"

Precisely. So I urge the President to heed the Post's advice and sign the bill when it reaches his desk.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the Post editorial for the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 14, 1995]

BLOCK GRANTS FOR CRIME?

The House moved yesterday to consideration of the last in the current series of crime bills—a couple have been postponed until the spring—promised in the "Contract With America." This one has drawn the heaviest fire from the administration, including a threat by President Clinton that he will veto the measure if it passes in its current form. The bill would substantially change the law enacted only last fall by eliminating three sets of grant programs: \$8.8 billion for hiring new police; \$1 billion for drug courts; and \$4 billion for social programs of various sorts designed to prevent crime. In their stead, the Republicans would authorize a \$10 billion program of block grants to local authorities to be used for the general purpose of reducing crime and improving public safety. The president wants at least to preserve the mandatory funding of what he says will be 100,000 new cops on the street.

When last year's bill was enacted, that 100,000 figure was cited as the most important feature of the law. Almost immediately, though, it was challenged by law enforcement experts and some local officials. In fact, the law created a five-year matching program during which the federal government's share diminished and eventually disappeared, leaving localities with the full cost of maintaining the new officers. Since the maximum federal contribution could not have exceeded \$15,000 a year per new hire, the program would never have supplied enough to pay salary, benefits, pensions and other costs, so the cities would have had to come up with a lot of upfront money many say they don't have.

So put aside the 100,000 figure, and the issue boils down to whether decisions about the expenditure of law enforcement dollars are best made locally or nationally. There's a lot of hypocrisy in the debate, with Republicans, who put all sorts of restrictions on the use of prison construction money, claiming that local authorities should be given complete discretion here, and Democrats citing horror stories about the misuse of Law Enforcement Assistance Act grants made to communities 20 years ago, when they were in control of Congress.

Our sense is that the world won't end if local authorities are given more flexibility. In some cities, like this one, the greatest need may not be additional police on the roster, but better equipment, specialized training or even midnight basketball. And if some towns don't have matching funds available, what's wrong with letting them use federal funds for less expensive but still effective programs rather than for costly hiring? It is true that any federal grants program ought to be monitored for abuse and that some spending—for the purchase of aircraft, for example, or even for research—could be prohibited. But if cities already have a drug court, as Washington does, and a fully staffed police force, what's wrong with using federal funds for social workers in juvenile detention facilities, or for improving computer systems to track parolees? "One hundred thousand cops" sounds good, but congressional failure to include that mandate is not worth a presidential veto.

IN SUPPORT OF THE HUMANITARIAN AID CORRIDOR ACT

(Mr. RADANOVICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act.

This bill would withhold assistance from any country that blocks the delivery of U.S. humanitarian assistance to another country.

Passage of this proposal would benefit directly situations such as that found in the Republic of Armenia. It is in our American interest to foster the great economic and political promise of Armenia by assuring a free flow of humanitarian assistance. Yet, Armenians are freezing and starving because Turkey has closed its borders to American assistance destined for landlocked Armenia.

The Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act would protect Armenia by making Turkey answerable for its acts. Turkey would have a choice: either bring to an end its blockade of humanitarian assistance for Armenia or lose its own foreign aid.

□ 1810

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the Chamber last Friday for rollcall No. 118 on H.R. 668. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted in the affirmative.

I ask that my statement appear in the RECORD immediately following the rollcall.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DIAZ-BALART addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

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

GOP FRESHMEN ANNOUNCE GOVERNMENT REFORM PLANS

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to take this opportunity to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for the approval of House bill 728, which will in fact give us the opportunity to increase the number of police officers on the street, as well as have those outstanding crime prevention programs that we want for each of their districts, whether it is town watch, the drug court, working with senior citizens and their protection, child protection, community policing. This will give, in the block grants, the opportunity for every single person to be involved in forward-thinking programs that will give maximum public safety.

Another important event took place in the Capitol which I wish to bring to the attention of all the Members.

Mr. Speaker, today at a press conference, I joined other freshman Republicans in an attempt to return the power of government back to the States and local governments. The freshman leaders are proposing the elimination of four Federal bureaucracies—the Departments of Commerce, Energy, Housing and Urban Development and Education. The proposal calls for the phasing out of these Departments, privatizing some of their duties and transferring important remaining duties to other Government agencies and the States.

This group of freshman Members of Congress has been meeting since the beginning of the 104th Congress to develop their reform proposals. Citizens across the country are crying out for an end to big Government meddling in every aspect of society. The proposal is step one in completing the agenda set forth by the people.

The time for talking about a smaller, more efficient Government has ended. Now is the time for action. Last November the people sent a message to Washington, DC—they want a smaller, less intrusive Government and we intend to give them just that.

While there are no specific pieces of legislation drafted at this point, four task forces have been formed to begin writing legislation to carry out the proposed reforms. The task force will examine consolidating some programs, privatizing others and eliminating those that can not be justified. The goal of the group is to submit legislation in the spring of 1995.

Created in 1965 to deal with the burgeoning urban city crisis, HUD and other Federal departments have since spent more than \$5 trillion in human assistance. Unfortunately, despite this spending, the Nation's urban problems are actually worse than they were in 1965.

With a total annual outlay approaching \$30 billion we need to make sure the truly needy are being helped. Despite its failures, HUD is one of the fastest growing departments in terms of discretionary spending with a 9 percent annual growth rate.