

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.

That is the power to determine whether those moneys, not in the view of some bureaucrat in Washington but in the view of the elected officials and law enforcement officers in their community, should be spend on one program or another, prevention, law enforcement.

That, Mr. Speaker, is precisely, is precisely, Mr. Speaker, why the results of the election on November 8 were so profound. The will of the people has been heard. It was heard in the halls of the Committee on the Judiciary this week, and will indeed result, I hope, Mr. Speaker, in passage of these important crime measures in just a few days ahead.

SUPPORT THE CHILD RESPONSIBILITY ACT, MAKING BOTH PARENTS RESPONSIBLE FOR CHILD SUPPORT

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise tonight to speak about that critical aspect of the welfare reform that is overlooked by the Contract With America. I'm talking about child support.

The contract spells out the exact punishments for women on AFDC. Women under 18 will be ineligible for assistance if they have a child out of wedlock. Women will not receive additional benefits if they have another child while on welfare. Women will be forced off welfare after 2 years, whether or not they have found employment or completed a training program.

Is this a personal responsibility act, or a female punishment act? Not once is the responsibility of the father mentioned in the contract. In fact, the only mention of fathers denies public assistance to the child if paternity is not established. That is an astonishing oversight.

Today, as the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], has already pointed out, 63 percent of absent parents contribute no child support. Out of the \$48 billion which should be paid annually only \$14 billion is actually collected. Millions of families could escape welfare if only they received the owed child support.

The child support enforcement system in my State of Massachusetts is a model for successful collection. In the 1980's, then Governor Dukakis made child support payments a top priority. Governor Weld built on that foundation the toughest, most streamlined child support collection system in the country.

Massachusetts has been able to effectively garnish the wages, bank accounts, unemployment claims, and the lottery winnings of child support avoiders. In the last 6 months, these new laws have helped 4,000 families escape AFDC and saved Massachusetts \$38.5 million.

The Massachusetts system is effective because it is centralized and unempllicated. Only one office deals with child support payments, and there are no forms to fill out. But this system works best if the noncustodial parent lives and works within the Massachusetts border. If the parent has crossed State lines, the support order is unlikely to be paid.

We need a national system of child support. We need more cooperation and coordination between States. We need to create a national registry of child support orders.

Tougher child support enforcement is a concrete way to achieve personal responsibility of fathers for the children they conceive. Under the contract, fathers remain totally unaccountable, while mothers must sacrifice and are subjected to sometimes harsh reforms.

This is a clear double standard that I urge my colleagues in this Congress to rectify. Our support of the Child Responsibility Act would show that we believe both mothers and fathers should be held responsible for the economic well-being of their children.

OPPOSITION TO THE MEXICAN BAILOUT

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to once again voice my opposition to the Mexican bailout, and especially to the way in which it is being done.

I have frequently said that today we have a Federal Government that is of, by, and for the bureaucrats, instead of one that is of, by, and for the people. But even I did not realize how little control the people of this Nation now have over their own National Government.

Once again we see the arrogance, the elitism, the public be damned, Big Brother knows best attitude of the powerful people who run this Government.

Because of the overwhelming opposition of the American people to this Mexican bailout, the President did what has been described as an end run around Congress.

Apparently, he found that the votes were not there, even though the politically correct vote, the "anything to gain the approval of the national media vote" would have been to be for this bailout.

So the President and the big financial powers decided to come up with a plan that did not require congressional approval. This means that our Government is sending billions to Mexico even though everyone knows the vast majority of our people are opposed to it.

This is the most undemocratic—with a small "d"—thing I have seen during my slightly over 6 years in Congress. It flies in the face of the will of the American people.

Big Government liberals have long had the belief or philosophy that Gov-

ernment knows best—that the people really don't know how to run their own lives or spend their own money.

This latest action—sending this money to Mexico—is just another example of big government spending the people's money in a way that most Americans do not want. And boy are we talking money here—billions, with a "b."

A few weeks ago, through the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve, we provided \$9 billion of an \$18 billion package to prop up the peso. That wasn't enough.

Now, the President has announced he is taking \$20 billion from the Exchange Stabilization Fund, even though this money was designed to stabilize our own currency and even though it has never before been used to prop up the money of a foreign country.

Also, we are using \$20 billion of the \$25 billion in this fund, thus placing our own money in a less secure status.

In addition, Mexico will receive \$17.8 billion from the International Monetary Fund, the largest loan in the Fund's 50-year history. Who is the largest contributor to the IMF? The U.S. taxpayer of course.

Then we are sending \$10 billion more from the Bank for International Settlements.

Billions and billions and billions—and all this at a time when the Heritage Foundation says Mexico already owes us over \$70 billion that they cannot now and probably never will repay.

The big Wall Street and International investors bought Mexican bonds paying 25 and 30 percent interest rates. They certainly did not share their profits with U.S. taxpayers, but now they want us to protect them from losses for their foolish risks.

Even a liberal like A.M. Rosenthal, the New York Times columnist, has come out strongly against this deal.

Last Friday, he wrote:

Could it be that the administration had so enthusiastically promoted Mexico that it would have been terribly embarrassing—an election coming up and all—to disclose that Mexico "suddenly" could not go on backing up its pesos and bonds unless the United States offered heavy loans to bail out investors?

And then he wrote, while we were still talking about just \$40 billion in loan guarantees—instead of the more lavish deal we now have:

Economic aid is often justified, but not 40 billion dollars to a country whose mess was created by the cowardice of bureaucrats and the mistakes of investors, theirs and ours. Americans would be foolish—I am being exquisitely polite today—if they agreed to any loan before they found out which American and Mexican investors would be the big beneficiaries.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, our Federal Government has shown that only the rich, the powerful, the wealthy, and those who work for the Government truly benefit from Big Government.