

their products will not be made by slave labor and that the rule of law will prevail. And that is a lesson they have learned in the last 8 months. They are not as head over heels in love with going into China doing business now. But we still have to fight for human rights, fight the fight to free Wei Jingsheng and his assistants and some hundreds, maybe thousands of political prisoners as well as the millions in the slave labor camps in China.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 2 AND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 4

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 2 and House Joint Resolution 4.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

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

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

#### COMMUNITY POLICING PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight and I will be joined by some of my colleagues on the Democratic side to talk about the community policing program and the proposal that will be before us later this week to do away with the community policing program and the 100,000 cops as the President has outlined in the past, in last year's crime bill.

So the special order tonight will deal with community policing commonly called cops on the beat or Clinton cops.

Today at a press conference there were representatives from police organizations all over the country, mostly the FOP and the National Association of Police Organizations which represent most of the rank-and-file police officers in the country.

They spoke articulately of the need to get police officers on the street.

The program has been a win-win situation not just for the police officers, not just for fighting crime but especially for the communities in which they serve.

Last night in this Chamber we spoke, a number of us, about community policing, how you need to restore the trust, confidence and faith in the police with the specific area they serve in order to form a working partnership,

working in concert to help with community policing, to combat the crime elements that they face in their communities.

□ 1940

The gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER] was here, and he represents San Diego, and they had one of the first programs ever on community policing and the dramatic impact it had on crime in San Diego, and then there was the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN], Middlesex County, Lowell, MA, where he talked about his role as a district attorney to help to reduce crime.

Mr. Speaker and those folks who are listening to us, there is no one program that is going to solve crime. There is no one police agency in and of itself that can solve crime. We will never solve crime until the citizens we serve work hand in hand with the police officers who are there to help them. Fighting crime is more than just prisons, fighting crime is more than just putting a new law on the book, and it is even more than just police officers. There must be a partnership between the police, the citizens they represent, but most of all it is a responsibility for each and every one of us in this great country.

I would like to speak, if I may, about two programs tonight in my home State of Michigan; the COPS program, as it is called, in Marquette, MI, which is in northern Michigan and is a town of only 17,000 people. But the community policing program works in rural areas as well as in urban areas, but the COPS program was started back in 1990.

In its first 2 years of operation, Mr. Speaker, overall crime in my city dropped 23 percent. As the community police officers get progressively closer to the community in which he lives and serves, more and more citizens are coming forward to report incidents of crime. This is because a community and a community police officer have developed a special relationship that relates to more trust, more confidence, a greater willingness to become involved in the system.

I would like to share with my colleagues some other stories regarding the COPS program in Marquette, MI, because the program is often referred to as just Cops on the Beat. Well, more than just cops on the beat, they must interact with the communities.

A major problem area in Marquette centered around a 116-unit family public housing development the COPS program in Marquette County and Marquette city had developed in coordination with the city police and the public housing authority in an attempt to decrease the crime rates there at the public housing. A police officer, a public housing authority and residents there formed a partnership which was developed to reduce crime and maintain order. The program has lowered crime and has restored a sense of pride in that housing project.

A good example was back in 1991 and 1992, Halloween or Devil's Night, as it is called, with the first 2 years in which there were at least 26 fires, arson fires, per night in and around this housing project. But with the working with the local police departments, volunteers on patrol and CB radios, Mr. Speaker, we have gone on to deter this program, and last year not one arson complaint was answered during Halloween or Devil's Night.

Another one they did in Marquette was the adopt-a-park program, and it was to eliminate the drinking and drugs in a wooded area by the community, and again the COPS program opened up this community, identified the problem and patrolled the area.

Other achievements that COPS programs have helped out is bike registration, bicycle safety, child identification fingerprinting, bike patrols, court-referred workers to do community service work, anti-trespass programs, say no to drug crimes, community child watch program and others. Again the first year the COPS program, and there has been much criticism of the President's program, and you only have so much money. How are you going to pay for 100,000 cops?

Well, as you all know, it is a sharing program—75 percent of the costs of the police office for the first year is paid by the Federal Government, 25 percent is paid by locals. Second year it is a 50-50 match. That is how we can provide 100,000 police officers underneath the crime bill that was passed last year and that took effect as of October 1 this year.

There are 17 police departments in Michigan with COPS programs. The COPS programs throughout the State, the one in Marquette, was rated No. 1, but from a small city like Marquette of 17,000 people you can go on to city like Detroit, our largest city in Michigan.

The recently passed crime bill has awarded the Detroit Police Department 96 new police officers. These officers are currently attending the Detroit Metropolitan Police Academy and are being trained in community policing. Why community policing? Because we know that when police officers work with the folks in which they must serve, it is the greatest positive effect on reducing crime.

The community policing program in Detroit has conducted over 130 residential surveys, has installed security hardware for citizens, has organized over 50 blocks in the city streets into neighborhood watch programs and has increased and provided aggressive patrolling in high drug activity areas. It has created and maintained child safety and substance abuse programs and continues the youth programs to combat violent crime and drug related offenses.

I want to ask in the survey what was the most positive change in these areas just during the last 3 months. The

great majority of these residents responded and said, "It was community policing and a police keep-the-cops-on-the-streets program."

Now our friends on the other side of the aisle are going to tell us in the next few days, and probably on to Monday, that Members, that mayors and local elected officials, support this family and the Clinton COPS program, that they want to wider discretion, and let the locals determine what it is. But we believe, those of us on this side of the aisle, that what we will do is just buy more pork barrel projects that we saw in LEAA in the late 1960's and early 1970's, but as my mayor in Detroit, Mayor Dennis Archer, said, the time has come for us to stop throwing money at crime, but put it into law enforcement officials, and what they want is cops and not programs.

Mayor Archer believes that the President and the Congress got it right last year when we funded the police on the street program. People in Dennis Archer's city of Detroit, or whether it is up in my district in Marquette, want protection and the ability to walk their streets at night, and we know that the only way to do it is to continue funding for the 100,000 cops that currently exist with the cops on the beat program.

One of the most effective tools for law enforcement committees is about to become a casualty underneath the GOP crime bill. Those of us are here tonight, and many others who cannot be with us, intend to keep fighting to keep the 100,000 police officers on the street.

Underneath the GOP plan of block grants there is no guarantee that any police officers will be hired. There is no guarantee that the cops on the street program will be maintained. There is no program specifically earmarked for community policing.

Tomorrow I know the President will announce underneath a fast cops program that 49 more police officers have been awarded in my district alone, 250 in the State of Michigan. Marquette, with their program ready to run out, will be awarded another police officer. In the President's program, in the one that we are fighting to try to save, there is very little bureaucracy. In fact, in order to do a fast cop application, it is a one-page form. It is a program that began November 1, and here we are on February 7, 1995, just over 3 months, and they are already just in my State alone providing 250 police officers underneath the cops fast program.

It is a good program. It works. There is very little pork—there is no pork in it. There is very little administrative cost. My police agencies are very pleased with us and implore us to continue keeping this program.

One more word before I turn over to my good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN]:

Community policing and the cop on the street or cop on the beat, whatever

handle you want to put on it, is a program I strongly believe in, having been a police officer for many years myself. When I was in the Michigan legislature, I helped to write the community policing program in Michigan. It is a winner. It works. But it only works when we put police officers in touch with their local communities, and they work together to provide secure residents, secure neighborhoods, by getting the trust, the faith and confidence back in law enforcement.

With that I yield to my good friend from Massachusetts who comes from maybe a little different perspective, not being a police officer, but a district attorney in Lowell, MA.

□ 1950

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, let me first of all say to the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman STUPAK, I want to congratulate the gentleman for his efforts. One of the ways I think we are better able to articulate what we need to do in the fight against crime is to rely on the various experiences that the Members of Congress have. Certainly the gentleman's experience, 12 years as a police officer, is a very, very important experience and one that I hope that our colleagues will pay attention to as we debate this bill offer the coming days.

I wanted to comment first of all, the gentleman mentioned the one-page application. Because he was a police officer, the gentleman is aware that oftentimes police departments across the country express concern in dealing with the Federal Government because of bureaucracy in the past. But the gentleman has indicated a one-page sheet is all a police department had to fill out. I would imagine that the gentleman has gotten some favorable responses from the police departments in his district, as I did.

Mr. STUPAK. In the first round of the Clinton cops program, we did receive four sheriffs in one of my larger growing areas, two in Grand Traverse County, one in the city of Escanaba, and another in the California Kalkaska sheriff's department. All these individuals related to me once we submitted our application, there was some phone calls and verifications, and that was it. They sent in a voucher periodically, certifying the individual is working for that department. They sent in an invoice based upon their cost to the local department. The Federal Government then pays 75 percent. It was one of these programs that was so simple, they were so surprised at the reduction in paperwork, that the Federal Government not only did it right but did it extremely efficiently, quickly, and responded to their needs.

Mr. MEEHAN. I do not remember any time the Federal Government undertook such a major project, putting 100,000 police officers on American streets, and did it so quickly without really any of the bureaucratic messes that have plagued other programs in the past.

Just this past September, President Clinton signed into law what I believe was the most comprehensive, smartest, toughest crime bill in the history of this country. This legislation, as the gentleman indicated, was the result of many years of hard work from law enforcement professions. When I listened to the debate and the rhetoric in the Congress, I cannot help but think that we would be better off if we had more Members of Congress with some of the experiences in law enforcement. It would help kind of frame what this debate ought to be about.

It seems to me any law to put more police officers on the streets is very, very important, particularly this community policing, which is really the cutting edge of law enforcement.

We have an Attorney General now, Janet Reno, who is a lot different from previous Attorneys General in that she has been in the front line of the fight against crime. It is not often when we have been able to point to an Attorney General that has ever prosecuted a case, that ever has managed a criminal law enforcement agency, that has ever had to put prosecutors out to a homicide scene.

As I listen to the rhetoric in the Congress, it is very, very clear that there are very, very few Members of Congress who have had that experience in the frontlines of the fight against crime. And this crime bill, with 100,000 police officers, is without question working everywhere in America.

I want to mention my home city of Lowell and community-based prosecution. When I first became the first assistant DA in Middlesex County, by the way, it is one of the largest counties in the country, we had 13,000 criminal cases per year that came into that office.

It was my responsibility under the district attorney when there was a homicide anywhere in Middlesex County to have to respond to a beeper from the State police to get to a homicide scene to begin the investigation. The first five homicides in the county, three of them were in the city of Lowell. It is an area that has suffered through a very, very difficult time in terms of crime. Since the passage of the initiatives from this Attorney General and this administration, they have formed community partnerships, which are the hallmark of community oriented policing.

During the last year Lowell has opened up several neighborhood precinct departments in several neighborhoods. They put together something called Team Lowell that involves the community, the probation departments, the police department, and the school departments, working together to identify career criminals and identify those who are the repeat offenders.

They have also put together a community response team, with inspection services. They have closed down more

than 150 buildings in 1994 which were identified as drug houses. That is what the front line of fighting crime is all about. They have established flag football leagues, where the police officers are volunteering their time to work in these leagues to get kids headed in the right direction.

As I listen to the debate and I anticipate the debate on this bill, I am very concerned because the Republican alternative will not put 100,000 new police officers on the street.

Mr. STUPAK. I know the gentleman has been working on the crime task force with myself and many others, and you have been deeply involved in this. Do you know how many police officers will be allocated or earmarked under the Republican crime bill we are debating this week?

Mr. MEEHAN. There will be absolutely zero earmarked. What they are attempting to do is put money into block grants and send them to communities, and hope that those communities use the money correctly, and hope that those communities are on the cutting edge of community policing. So there is no guarantee there will be any police officers as a result of this crime bill.

Let me also say in regard to that, as I watch and try to figure out how in the world we could have passed a crime bill initiative like this, it has only been given four months to work, and all of a sudden there are new proposals coming forward. I see stories where it shows there are political polls that have been conducted to come up with this data, focus groups where they bring in citizens and figure out what citizens are thinking or what the buzz words are. And it really bothers me, because the fight against crime is serious business. It requires a level of professionalism. It requires looking beyond political polls and focus groups and looking at hard data of what works and what does not.

That is what this bill is all about. Community policing works. It works anywhere where it is instituted in America properly.

In my city of Lowell we have 13 city police officers that undertook a program of community policing, where we got those police officers in the community, learned who was who in the community, identified those worse offenders, those people who should be made a priority, and made them a priority in the criminal justice system. It worked with the majority of the other people to get the trust.

The gentleman told a story at one of the task force meetings of what happens and where you get information. You more likely get information riding in the neighborhood from a kid riding a bicycle, assuming that police office has the credibility. That is what happens under community policing.

It is interesting to me, because there was a press conference in the city of Lowell last week; the police chief wanted to have a press conference and

show what happened in the city of Lowell as a result of the community policing efforts.

The report is out, and I got a copy of that report this week, that shows the number of assaults, burglary, larceny, and car thefts. In 1994 they have changed dramatically. For example, burglaries are down 34 percent in the city of Lowell as a result of community policing; residential burglaries, down 32 percent; business burglaries, down 41 percent; larcenies, down 23 percent; car thefts, down 20 percent.

Now, a lot of Members will not want to make determinations of how they going to vote based on this, because it is hard data from a police chief in a community that is making community policing work.

You see, this is not a political poll. It is not a focus group. It is not anything that necessarily sounds good. It is not something that has anything to do with authorship of a crime bill. It is just cold, hard facts of what is working in Lowell, MA. And it is community policing. All of these categories, crime is down significantly, and the police chief of that community says the reason it is down is because of the fact that they have instituted the community policing program there.

This is how we should be determining what we do in the crime bill, what is working and what is not. That is what fighting crime is all about. I know in your experiences you have had experiences where some things work and some things do not. Once we know what works, we have to put it into the form of legislation that gets the job done.

□ 2000

Community policing gets the job done.

Mr. STUPAK. It is not just what works; there has to be a commitment, a commitment so the resources will be there.

Back in 1978, 1979, when I was in the Michigan State Police, one of the first community policing pilot programs in the Nation was in northern Michigan. If I can go back up to Marquette County, it is a very large county. There it is very sparsely populated at some point and other points it has, like I said, my largest city of 17,000. But there are these three townships. We call them the tri-townships, which was sort of struck away from the center of population, sort of extreme end of the county. They had a rampant crime rate going on, based upon the number of people there.

The factors we looked at, back in 1978 and 1979, is population density, the number of crimes committed, and the number of juveniles who live in that area. Then when we went in there, we identified these three townships. We asked the township boards, one of the most local forms of government, if they would be willing to share in a community policing program and would they put up a police officer and some resources and the Federal Gov-

ernment would provide them with a State trooper to go in and to coordinate it and work out of homes and live in the communities.

Well, in less than 2 years, they reduced the crime rate by 70 percent. They were solving burglaries and safe jobs 5, 6, 7 years old already. But once the community realized that it was their police officer and it was them that were involved in this fight against crime, they knew that when they called that police officer and if their house was broken into, the police officer who responded would be the same police officer that followed up the investigation, who would be the same police officer that went to the prosecutor's office. It would be the same police officer would be there in court with them, that trust relationship developed and we were able to solve crime in this very sparsely populated, tri-township area of Marquette County. That was back in 1978-79.

When they left, when the trooper left in 2 years, tri-township still has a police department. They are still involved in community policing. And they still have been able to keep the crime rate at a very low rate, even up in northern Michigan.

So community policing does work.

You mentioned Lowell and your Team Lowell. In Detroit, with the 96 police officers they received underneath the Clinton Cops Program, they called their team or the program CLEAN, which is the initials for Community Law Enforcement And Neighborhood Teams.

So CLEAN in Detroit really symbolizes what we want. We want the community working with law enforcement who are in neighborhoods working together to help solve the crime problems. If it can work in Detroit, MI, or tri-township in northern Michigan, it can work anywhere in this country.

And it is one program that, yes, we need police and, yes, we need the public working with us, but we need some leadership and some financial resources from the Federal Government. And that should be our role. Not to tell them what squad car to buy or to buy this radio, but you set up your community policing program. We will give you the incentives. We will provide you, and it is up front, it says right on our application, 75 percent the first year, 50/50 the second year. The 75/25 match with Federal paying 25 the third year and the fourth year hopefully you are financially able to then provide the program itself.

And as you pointed out, correctly pointed out, here we are 3 months later, just over 3 months, arguing for the life of a program which everyone has said works.

How do Members go back to their local communities and say, that cop that was walking the beat, that was providing you that extra bit of security, that person you trusted, the person you had confidence in is going to

be terminated because we have just terminated the program. Because remember, we are talking about the same pot of money here.

When the crime bill was passed last year, I did not support all the aspects of the crime bill. In fact, I, even in the House, I voted for it. And in the final conference committee, because of what happened to the Byrne grants and some other crime labs, I was not pleased with it. I did not support it.

But the point is, there was \$30 billion that was what we always centered around, \$30 billion over 5 years which is going to be paid for by reducing the number of Federal employees that would go into the crime trust fund so the money would be there.

And the Republican proposal right now is \$30 billion. But instead of having police officers on the street, what they want to do, they want to go to these block grants and they want to shift it to prisons. We will never fight crime if we merely throw everyone in prisons. We do not have enough prisons.

And the fallacy with the argument further is, you can provide money for the brick and mortar, but what about the costs for the security officers, the corrections officers, the administration of those prisons.

In northern Michigan, we had two prisons, one in Baraga, a maximum security prison, which Michigan went on a prison building spree in the 1980's, and we built these prisons. For 2 years, Baraga maximum security prison sat empty because the State did not have the money for the correction officers or for the administrative cost, operational costs of that prison. We had a juvenile detention center. We built a juvenile detention facility so young people that had to be incarcerated could still stay closer to their families. The closest one for northern Michigan was some 400 miles away, and it was built in Escanaba, my hometown. Again, when I was back in the State legislature, we got that program put in. That was 1989.

It just opened this year, excuse me, July 1994. So it has been built, it has been sitting empty because we did not have the money to maintain it. And now Michigan is on another prison building spree, Newberry regional site is going to be built, again up in my district. But how long will that last? They are going to use some Federal money to clean it up, build it up but, again, nowhere in either bill, the Republican proposal, is there any money for the administration, for the correction officers of these prisons.

Mr. MEEHAN. That is an interesting point. We are going to commit extra moneys, we are going to take money out of other sections of the bill and give it to build still more prisons without even having—we talk about local mandates, how people, once these prisons are constructed—who is going to pay for them? The local communities

and the States are going to have to try to pay for them.

You are right, many of them do not have the money to pay for them. It is interesting, I had gone back to the D.A.'s office during the congressional break, and they had listened to a lot of debate on the crime bill. And they said, "Boy, we disagree with much of rhetoric that we heard. And it sounded like you guys were really getting a lot of rhetoric about getting tough on crime."

Ninety to 95 percent of all crimes in this country are enforced, prosecuted on the local and State level. And I have been amused by the debate in the Congress about getting tough on crime, and we are going to require so many of this and so many of that. And the truth of the matter is, all this bill is about is giving local prosecutors, local police departments some help. And no bill has ever given this much help in the history of the Congress to local communities in hiring more police officers and actually putting them on the street.

The other thing that I think is unfortunate is this bill passed with bipartisan support. This is not something that just Democrats should support or just Republicans should support. Anyone who has been in law enforcement, whether they are Democrat or Republican, support community policing.

Governor Bill Weld from Massachusetts, a Republican, a prominent Republican, strongly supports community policing. And guess what, he is a former Federal prosecutor. He knows a little bit about what law enforcement is really all about. He also supports, strongly supports the basketball programs that were part of that bill. Guess what? He is a law enforcement official.

Ralph Martin, a Republican district attorney of Suffolk County, strongly supports community policing money. So the truth is anyone that knows anything about what works in law enforcement in this country and what does not work strongly supports community policing.

So here we are, it seems to me, having this partisan debate back and forth. I have to believe it is all about authorship. It is all about, you have some of the same Republicans who supported this bill now apparently are going to go along with making some changes so it now can be a Republican crime bill rather than a Democratic crime bill. We need a crime bill. We do not need it to be Democratic. We do not need it to be Republican. This issue transcends partisan politics.

I wish that we could take the expertise that is available. If there is some tinkering that needs to be done, let us make some changes. But not wholesale changes that may result in my hometown community of Lowell, MA not being able to put together the type of community policing programs that work, that is making the quality of real people's lives better day in and day out because as a police officer in

the communities that knows that community, making sure that burglaries, larcenies, and car thefts, businesses are safer, all are going down by anywhere from 20 to 41 percent.

□ 2010

Those are the facts. Unfortunately, too often in the debate around here, the facts are secondary. It is all sound bites, political polls: "We don't want to know what law enforcement professionals say. What we want to do is what we think will make either the President look bad, the Democrats look bad, or somebody else look good." It is a foolish way to attempt to fight crime, and it is really unfortunate if we take a step backward, rather than forward, when we have a program that is working.

It is interesting that I talked about an urban area in Massachusetts, Lowell, MA, where it is working effectively, and you cited examples of rural areas where community policing is working effectively. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that is what this debate ought to be all about.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, the other point that should be made in community policing, nowhere in the bill that was passed last fall do they tell you how to do community policing. What may work in Marquette, MI, in our 116-unit public housing unit, may not work in Lowell, MA.

But what we have said is, this concept of community policing is flexible. It transcends party lines, it transcends neighborhoods, and what it must do is, you must tell us what works in your community, put forth your proposal, and we promise you that we have 100,000 new police officers that we would be willing to put forth and assist you in that concept.

So the creativity that we need to fight crime is there. The only thing we ask is to develop a program where the community can work with the police and build on friendship, trust, and confidence in each other to fight crime.

As we said earlier, I know you have alluded to it and I stated earlier, in order to fight crime it is everyone's responsibility, everyone in this Chamber, everyone who is listening to us tonight. It is our responsibility to help the police officers.

When I went to a crime scene as a State trooper, whether it was an automobile accident, a breaking-and-entering, or a murder case, whatever it might have been, I knew nothing when I got there until I stepped out of my car. I could rely on my sight, my five senses, but I had to rely on the community, witnesses, possible witnesses, to fill in the blanks for me or to create that puzzle, and when the puzzle is complete, hopefully then we could apprehend a perpetrator.

So we always had community policing in a sort of effort. The difference about this program is that being the police officer working a small community, hopefully I will know them on a

first name basis, we will have a chance to have communications in a more friendlier, relaxed atmosphere, as opposed to a conversation during the height of a crime or a criminal investigation.

Because when I pull up in my squad car they would not know who I was, and I did not know who they were, so two strangers or three or four strangers were supposed to solve a crime. But if we have three or four friends trying to solve a crime, the results are much greater.

Mr. Speaker, that is why community policing is such a valuable tool. It has been around for a few years. What has always kept policing down is the cost. It is expensive to assign a police officer to a couple of townships, and he takes his car home with him every night. It is not parked at the station.

He has certain needs which require a little bit more than probably a police officer who switches cars at every shift, and trades off with equipment, because each individual is a police officer and almost a police station in and of himself. His office is his home or his office is his car or her car. It requires a degree of help. What this program offers them is, we will make a 3-year commitment if they will commit to a community policing program that will work in their communities.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the other thing that is interesting, and I thank the gentleman, when we had the crime debate in August just before the recess, it became frustrating for me listening to the rhetoric of many Members of Congress who had never been in a district attorney's office, had never been police officers, and really had very little experience, real life experience, in crime, in fighting crime.

I challenge Members of Congress to take some time during their recess to go into a district attorney's office and volunteer, whether it be volunteer to work with attorneys on cases, whether it be to volunteer with victim witness advocates, who have to take the victims of crime and let them know what their rights are and help them through the criminal justice process, which is so intimidating to many victims, particularly victims of domestic violence, who really are victims twice, once to the original abuse, and twice when they have to go through a court system that frankly is not equipped to deal with the devastating problem that is permeating American society.

But I challenge Members, and I have talked to Members to see whether any had the time to go into a district attorney's office, or to go into a police department and learn what the front lines of the fight against crime is really all about. I cannot help but believe if more Members had been willing to do that, to really find out what is happening in district attorney's offices across this country, in attorney generals' offices across this country, in police departments, whether they be urban police departments, whether they be county police departments or suburban

or rural police departments, it would certainly help the tenor of the debate here if we can begin to debate real, professional crime tactics, real, professional crime opportunities that we have around this country, rather than to listen to the bantering back and forth based on, as I say, a focus group, a political poll, what sounds good, what might make the President look bad, what they might be able to embarrass the Attorney General with, partisan politics, back and forth.

It is amazing. This is not a partisan issue; this is serious business. I feel very strongly that efforts to kill this community policing program are not in the interests of the communities that we represent, the communities clear across America.

It is really important that we stay the course and let this program work. Four months, 4 months, and we are talking about dismantling a program that I have shown very persuasive evidence tonight that is working, not only in Lowell, MA. It is working all over the country.

To take partisan politics to defeat this is something that disturbs me greatly. I hope that the debate on this will be a debate based on the merits of the argument. I oftentimes would break with my own party's leadership in the last 2 years, and boy, oh, boy, talk about party discipline this year, march step-by-step, go to the left, go to the right.

I hope that we can have a legitimate debate about the community policing program in this country, because it would be great for America, it would be great for law enforcement in this country, and I think in the long run it would dramatically increase standards of living by lowering the crime rate all over this country.

I thank the gentleman for his efforts on the Crime Task Force. I look forward to working with him over the next several days, and well into next week. I don't know how long we will get to debate the community policing program. It seems we are going to spend more time up front debating the first few days of the various victims' issues, which I think there is a broad agreement on.

There is nothing wrong with, as I say, making minor adjustments to the bill. We spent half a day, three-quarters of a day, debating something that we all agree on, that we all agree on, but it seems when we get down to the end of this debate on community policing and prevention programs that are working, it looks like we are going to be a little squeezed for time, because we are going to be running out of time. I am not sure whose birthday it is, but we have to get it done on Tuesday, so there is not going to be a whole lot of time.

I would hope that we could get a discussion based on the merits of the arguments over the next few days, and your experience as a police officer for 12 years has been invaluable to our task force, invaluable to the Members

of Congress who are looking at this issue objectively, trying to find professional solutions to what many Americans feel is the No. 1 problem facing this country, crime.

So thank you for your efforts, and thank you for putting together this special order. I look forward to working with you.

Mr. STUPAK. I thank the gentleman for not only joining me tonight, but also last night, along with the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN], and others who came out.

The purpose for doing these special orders or 5 minutes, as you can see, the Chamber is practically empty, is for the benefit of our viewing audience. It is our hope that they will call their Members and urge them to support the community policing program.

This debate will probably start, I think, Thursday, and then go into Friday and possibly Monday.

□ 2020

So time is of the essence. We are on this fast track legislation.

Many people throughout my district, and as I speak out more and more on community policing and 1,000 police officers, the cops on the street program, most people are not aware that the proposal that will be presented later this week is to kill this program, so we need help from the public to call their Representative and tell them to keep this program, keep the police officers on the street. We need police. We need prevention and not just the prisons and pork that are going to be offered by the other side.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on my special order of today, a tribute to Ronald Reagan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. HANSEN). Is there objection the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### A TRIBUTE TO RONALD REAGAN

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I take this special order tonight to pay tribute to a great American, the greatest American that I have ever known, and that is President Ronald Reagan. As you know, I had intended to hold this event last night as a birthday present for the former President, but the House was occupied on an even better birthday present, passage of the line item veto. And what better birthday present