

We aren't proposing these cuts out of partisan hostility. In fact, we hope this will be a bipartisan effort. We propose these cuts because we can no longer afford well-meaning but failed programs and if you examine the sum result of the Departments of Energy, Commerce, Education and HUD, the record is one of failure.

Thomas Jefferson once said, "I place economy among the first and important \* \* \* virtues and public debt as the greatest dangers to be feared."

For fiscal 1994, the interest on the national debt was \$203 billion and, under the Clinton plan, will rise to \$309 billion in the year 2000—a 50-percent increase in interest payments. "Those kind of staggering statistics call for decisive measures such as the one we are proposing. We need to seek ways to empower people and make them less dependent on Government. We must be dramatic and brave if we are to stop mortgaging our children's future."

□ 1815

#### AMENDMENT TO H.R. 728, BLOCK GRANTS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, just a few minutes ago, some of our colleagues might have found a moment of joy and excitement. I unfortunately took a different perspective. I said I was angry when I came to the House floor to talk about our children and to talk about those who on their way home from school are solicited by gang members and called upon to join their gang, a gang of violence, homicide, burglary, theft and other criminal acts. I am angry for our children who likewise go into these gangs and are made to do gang initiation rites which have caused the loss of a little one thrown out of the window of a housing development by some young gang members. And, yes, at a birthday party in my city where they did not finish the party to blow out the candles, they called an ambulance to take a lifeless body. Yet we could vote for H.R. 728 and not include in it the kind of response that we needed to prevent gang violence, to teach our children that there is a better way.

Mr. Speaker, escalating violence against and by children and youth is no coincidence. It is the cumulative and convergent manifestation of a range of serious and too-long-neglected problems: Epidemic child and family poverty, increasing economic inequality, a lack of understanding of racial differences, pervasive drug and alcohol abuse, violence in our homes, and popular culture and growing numbers of out-of-wedlock births and divorces. Without question, these are problems that need to be addressed. Unfortunately, though, the piece of legislation

that we have before us that was just voted on, H.R. 728, does more to contribute to these problems than it does to help them.

Many of my Republican colleagues do not see crime prevention measures as realistic tools for combating the increase of youthful violence. In fact, they cited some 200 programs. I do not know what they are talking about, when H.R. 728 repeals all of the programs that we have that would deal with gang violence and resistance to gangs. We cannot, however, ignore the numbers that show us the frightening increase in youthful criminal perpetration and victimization. We have not valued millions of our children's lives and so they do not value ours in a society in which they have no social or economic stake, no role models, no one to come and share with them the values of this Nation. Their neglect, abuse, and marginalization by many of their caretakers, schools, communities, and our Nation turn them first to and against each other in gangs and then, yes, against a society that would rather imprison them than educate them.

This legislation that I proposed would continue to provide funding for various crime prevention programs for at-risk youth which educate our children against violence and gang violence. Both our children and our communities need these prevention programs to provide alternatives to crime. Specifically my amendment would have set aside a portion of the block grant funding for each year for the three youth crime prevention programs. Why not our children? Urban recreation grants, gang resistance and education training, and residential educational programs for at-risk youth. These programs provide children with positive alternatives, skills, hope, and a safe place just to be children.

Contrary to our arguments, the GREAT Program [gang resistance and education training program] was not created by last year's crime bill and it is not a grant program. It is a cooperative agreement that has been funded previously by Congress and needed the extra added funding to succeed.

To further contribute to the success of the program, the agency involved puts substantial resources of its own in training as well as provides community financial assistance in operating the program. As a result, over 400,000 children will have been exposed to gang resistance education.

A National Institute of Justice-sponsored survey of metropolitan police departments in the 79 largest U.S. cities showed that in the spring of 1992 all but 7 were troubled by gangs, as were all but 5 departments in the 43 smaller cities. In the 110 jurisdictions reporting gangs, the survey found that over the previous 12-month period, there were 249,324 gang members, 4,881 gangs, 46,000 gang-related crimes, and a staggering 1,072 gang-related homicides.

Does that keep our neighborhoods safe? Does that protect our children, our seniors in the neighborhood?

Gang-related violence is growing. The police commissioner of Boston said the GREAT Program is great. There are many programs that will support our young people, the urban recreation programs, to keep them in parks after late hours.

I say, Mr. Speaker, are we supporting our children? If we are, then we need to put prevention, police, and prisons. We need to ensure that our children find a better way.

#### REVIEWING REPUBLICAN CONTRACT

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot about the Contract With America, often from Republicans, but often from the other side of the aisle as well and most of it is criticism. I do not see a solid alternative from them at this point now that we are in our third month almost of being in session.

The contract actually asks for very specific things and attempts to address neglected parts of our society and our Government which have not been running well in the past 15, 20, or 40 years, however you want to count.

Part of the contract was to pass a balanced budget amendment and line-item veto. This has been done. Another part of it was to stop the unfunded mandate practice of the Federal Government to require local cities and county governments to do certain things but not have us pay for it, and they in turn have to turn around and tax their own constituents, which is basically a tax increase that we are giving people through the back door.

The other thing we have been trying to and we have had a debate on it last week and this week was to put the criminal justice system, to focus on the criminal and protect the victim and protect society and not treat the criminal like one more special interest group.

It seems in the course of the debate that many people have been saying, oh, you've got to do this for the criminal and you have to look out for him and her and their best interests and so forth. We have had that. That is what we have got now. It is time to lock people up who commit crimes. It is time to give them swift punishment. It is time for them to serve an adequate amount of their sentence, preferably 100 percent of the time but maybe 80 or 90 percent. Currently the average criminal serves 35 percent of his or her sentence. As a consequence, our police officers are arresting people not for the second or third time but for the ninth, 10th, and 11th time. I would hate to be a police officer going out on the streets that they are supposed to protect and

face people who you have already arrested 10 or 12 times. But that is the situation we are in.

This program also cuts out a lot of Federal bureaucratic jobs. There again that is a constituency that some people want to protect but I think most people in America want to see a reduction in the bureaucracy. The way it does this is give block grants back to the States.

We hear so much about the 100,000 police officers that the President's program allegedly handles. But, in fact, for most it only pays for 25 percent. After that, the municipality is stuck with the cost for these additional police officers.

What our program says is, "Look. You may want to put money into the police officers but you may need new communications equipment, you may need new police cars, and if you do, we want to give you that option, because we here in Washington don't have the answer for every 39,000 of the cities across America." We feel that people on the local level know better. We have passed that today.

It will go to the Senate, it will have further debate, they will amend the bill, it will come back to us, as will some of the other bills in the Contract With America, but we are working to fulfill our commitment with the American people.

We are going to start next on welfare reform and national security prohibiting American soldiers from being under U.N. command.

□ 1825

Refining our military so that it is not too expensive, not wasting money but effective and able to meet the challenges of the world.

There are a lot of things in our Contract With America, things like legal reform, helping senior citizens by letting them stay in the workplace longer and not having to penalize them on their Social Security. There is also family reinforcement, \$500 per child tax credit. These things will help make America great again.

But in addition to this, Mr. Speaker, we are not stopping with the contract. We are going into the appropriations process. The President's recently introduced budget adds another \$1 trillion to a \$4.8 trillion debt. We cannot afford that. Already the third largest expenditure on the national budget is the interest on the national debt. It is about \$20 billion each and every month, and that is money that is gone forever. We need to reduce the deficit so that we do not year after year continue to add to the size of the debt.

I will say quickly it is a Democrat and a Republican problem. It got there that way. And I will say that many of the items in the contract, as I hope our budget ideas will be worthy of bipartisan support, because we need to do this together as Democrats and Republicans so that we can represent the best interests of America.

#### REPUBLICAN DEFENSE CHOICES—A PRESCRIPTION FOR DISASTER

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

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening as a member of the International Relations Committee and as a mother of a small child. Throughout our lives, we are confronted with tough choices. As a Member of this body, I am constantly faced with tough choices.

The Republicans came up with a program that included their tough choices. The Contract With America is a political platform of tough choices. I respect that they presented us a program of tough choices. I just happen to vehemently disagree with the choices that they've made.

When I sit down in my car, before I start the engine, I check my side mirrors and my rear-view mirror. But when I set out on the road, I'd better have my eyes fixed on what is in front of me. Or else, my experience on the road could be a disaster for me and for everyone else trying to share the road with me.

Well, that's kinda like what the Republicans have done with H.R. 7, now H.R. 872, the national security plank of the Republican contract.

They've made some tough choices, but I must stop right here and say that their choices could be disaster for the world.

Yes, they strapped in their seatbelts, but they want to take us backward, not forward. They have revved up the engine, stepped on the gas, but the car is in reverse. And they're looking at the world from the rear-view mirror.

This is a prescription for disaster.

The Republicans are rushing, as a part of their contract, to penalize the poor, discriminate against legal immigrants, pander to the rich, and—what brings me here this evening—through the National Security part of the contract, they add insult to injury by also asking this House to invest scarce dollars in yesterday's boondoggle.

The Republicans have chosen to look through the rear-view mirror—as if blinded by the light of the future—they chose to look behind instead.

Why in the world do we need to go back to star wars? We have already spent \$36 billion on missile defense, \$20 billion more are in the works. Isn't that enough? And they don't even define the threat, anyway.

This is the same party that says that Government is too big. This is the same party that says that kids don't deserve to eat subsidized lunch in school; that pregnant women don't need to have subsidized nutrition so that they can give birth to healthy babies. This is the same party that said that we don't have enough money to put 100,000 cops on the streets, but Government spending for an elaborate and controversial missile defense in space is OK.

Rather than asking for money for star wars, the Republicans could have asked for money to clean up the contaminated bases that coexist with our communities.

Rather than asking for star wars, the Republicans could have looked at ways that we could constructively engage with the rest of the world through multilateralism and collective security.

And, finally, they could have looked at promising weapons systems that bear more relation to the type of defense we need for our future, based on a forward looking projection of U.S. global interests and the U.S. global threat. Instead, the Republicans have jerked their knees so far into the past that this bill, just like many of the other contract bills, just flat out lacks credibility.

Tomorrow, we will debate the so-called National Security Revitalization Act. The choices will be made perfectly clear.

We can go back to yesterday's boondoggle and revive star wars, but only at a critical cost.

This bill does not provide for us a forward-looking vision of the world and the U.S. role in it.

This bill does not provide us with a rationale of a cooperative relationship with the rest of the world.

Unfortunately, this bill does not even leave jingoism behind.

And finally, this bill just makes some bad choices for the millions of moms like me who care about the world and the country that we leave for our children.

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

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

#### IN DEFENSE OF THE DAVIS-BACON ACT

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in favor of a bill that has saved money for U.S. taxpayers and has expanded economic opportunity for millions of Americans. In short, a bill that has been the key for securing the American dream for thousands of working families for more than 60 years.

I join a long, bipartisan list of supporters who have come out in favor of this act. In fact, the original sponsors were two Republicans. The President who signed the bill into law was a Republican. And since its birth, Republicans including Ronald Reagan have supported this act.