

the local level; after all, the local people know what is best for them. There is not one police officer earmarked in their plan. There is not any program earmarked in their plan to put police officers on the street. And we have been seen in late 1968, with the Law Enforcement and Administration Agency, LEAA, how the money was squandered, was squandered or as someone said the other day, it reminds you of the pork of Christmas past, what they did with all that money. For every dollar that was spent in the late 1960's and early 1970's, 33 cents on every dollar went for administrative costs, overhead, bureaucrats. We did not see more police officers on the street.

What we are here trying to inform the American people is this unrestrained giving of money back without any conditions will repeat the problems we had in the late 1960's and the early 1970's, the abuses that went into the LEAA Program.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Let me just take you up on that point because you make a very valuable point. First of all, I think it is important to note that we come from respectively different parts of the Nation. I think it is a tragedy, again, if our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would pretend to think that this is a big-city problem or it is a big-State problem. What we are finding out is whatever the jurisdiction, the hamlet, a town, a country, the cops program that was passed in the 1994 omnibus crime bill went to seed—that's the heart of the matter.

□ 2010

It went into the places where maybe they had one officer in the town. In the city of Houston, obviously, we are constantly looking to find ways to improve the number of police-to-citizen relationship, to develop the relationship, but also to provide the protection. We needed as much as a smaller city in the State of Texas, or a county, or a hamlet, or a town, than may be in your fair State of Massachusetts.

The issue becomes how do you relate law enforcement to the 21st century; how do you prevent gang violence. What you do, as has been said by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN], is you get those officers who are in plain clothes, who are in the neighborhoods, who are in the schools, to now who the characters are, if you will.

At the same time, and I appreciate the gentleman's response, having served as a police officer for a number of years, you even get those local police officers to participate in Boys Club and Girls Club, and the Boy Scouts.

I have an urban Scouting program, for example, in the city of Houston. Many police officers are involved in that. There is PAL. When you have the officers in the neighborhood, they are able to go into the schools and go beyond the call of city, to a certain extent, and even begin to look these

youngsters in the eye and say, "That is not the gang you want to be in," of either gain their confidence and get information that truly helped to, if you will, break the crime cycle.

I think that is very important. This is not an issue that is an issue for large cities, large States, it is an issue of crime prevention for this particular Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate the gentleman's response about police involvement in those kinds of activities.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly very helpful, because it humanizes police officers. It is not just whether it is a police athletic league or teaching about DARE, DARE to keep the kids off drugs, a program that was developed in L.A., and it is taught nationwide, or whether it is seeing the police officer in the school.

When you put a human being—and it goes back to the community policing concept of building trust, confidence, and respect for law enforcement.

What are we doing here, as we were talking earlier tonight? In the bills that are pending before this floor right now, the Republican crime bill of taking back the streets, there is not one program earmarked to humanize the police, to even provide us one police. Instead, they want this massive block grant program.

What happened when we had it back in 1968? Did they form PAL? Did they put police officers in the schools? Here is an example of some of the things they did. The local people said, "We know what is best. Let us do it. We can do it better. We know what works in Houston, Marquette, Michigan, or Lowell MA."

Here is what they did. In 1968 a sheriff in Louisiana purchased a tank—a tank to combat crime. In another State, they used \$84,000 to buy an airplane—an airplane. The only value they got out of the airplane, other than to buzz the Governor around the State, was it had a very secret mission.

That airplane came to Washington, DC, picked up some Moon rocks, and went back to the State from whence it had come. That was the only law enforcement function of that airplane you could consider, because that must have been top security, picking up some Moon rocks, but \$84,000 went there.

Or how about one of the Southern States, which started a cadet program, a law enforcement cadet program to help out young people, as the gentleman suggests? Do you know what the cadet program was? Some \$117,000 was spent for that sheriff's family members and friends of his to have a job at the expense of taxpayers.

Or another city, they used \$200,000 in LEAA grants to buy property—to buy property. Another city used money to buy an unmarked car, so the mayor could drive around. This is the same type of program that they are telling us: "Take about \$10 billion, we will give it to the local communities. They

know what is best in fighting crime." Not one police officer.

Thirty-three percent, we have seen, back from the 1968 and seventies program, went to administrative costs, and what for? We did this before, for all of us who were here, but it happened before in 1968 and what was it used for? Tanks, airplanes, limousines, land. It goes on and on and on.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STUPAK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MEEHAN. I would like to point out, my colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], had talked about gang violence and what the difference is when the community police officers get into that community and learn that community.

When I was assistant district attorney in Middlesex County I got a call one afternoon. It was about 2:15 one afternoon, and the State Police informed me that a 15-year-old boy from Lowell, MA, had been shot in the head, a culmination of what was gang activity in the city of Lowell during that time period.

We had had an influx of Asian immigrants into the city, many of whom had been victims of crime, Asian crime on Asian crime, where the people, immigrants from other cultures who came from a culture where they did not necessarily trust authority and did not know what the role of the police department was, whose side the police department was really on.

It was very difficult for us in the DA's office to get witnesses of crime to participate and to tell us what happened in a crime, because they did not know whether to trust us or whether to trust the police, so they did not trust anyone.

In this murder of a 15-year-old boy, it was the culmination of months of gang activity in the city. People were keeping their sons and daughters home from Lowell high school.

We sent a district attorney up to the scene of that. The DA, Tom Reilly, who is a very innovative and hardworking DA, went up to the city. We instituted a priority prosecution program there.

We brought in people from the Asian community to the table of the mayor's office; we brought in the probation department that had the probation records of all the individuals involved. We brought in the school department, which could give us a perspective of who attended school, who did not, who the bad actors were, who the people were who were trying to get headed in the right direction.

We brought the police department to the table. We also brought the DA's office to the table, and the DA met on this task force every single week, every week. We identified over a period of time the 25 ring leaders of these gangs, the individuals who could not be rehabilitated, who had long criminal records, who the school department agreed, the probation department

agreed, the police department agreed had to go off and they had to go to prison for as long as we could get them there.

We were able to remove those 25 individuals and get them the toughest sentences we could. The question is, what do you do with the remaining individuals. If you do nothing, in 8 months or 9 months, you have 25 new individuals again ready to be prosecuted and removed from society.

However, we went a step further. The DA, Tom Reilly, established a community-based prosecution team where the police officers played a role in the community, and partnerships were formed in getting the police officers to understand the culture of many of the new immigrants.

We started to get cooperation, because they realized they could trust the prosecutor's office, they could trust the police department. The soccer leagues, the police department, just as the experience in Houston, the police department played a role there.

We had basketball leagues, and they are still going on today. Crime, Asian crime, the victims of crime decreased dramatically in that city.

I know that my colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY], is here, the vice chairman of the Democrat Caucus, a member of the Crime Task Force, and also a Member who has had, I know from conversations in committee work, many of these types of problems where you identify a problem, go in and do the cutting edge of what works, so I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut, [BARBARA KENNELLY.]

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK].

Mr. Speaker, I came down here this evening as I listened to this conversation and wanted to join in, and say that so many of us who are in public life, or who run for public office, and are in large legislative bodies, such as this House, work for long periods of time on legislation.

Sometimes we see the fruition of that legislation and sometimes we do not. It does not get out of committee or it comes to the floor and it does not go into law.

This year's crime bill was totally different. In this year's crime bill, we really addressed some serious needs in our community. The crime bill came forth. We had crime bills in other years, but this was a good crime bill. Many of this body get behind that crime bill.

What happened was that there was a pledge made by the President, the Attorney General, and Members of this body to put policemen on the streets of our local communities, on our city streets, on our town streets, and in our rural areas.

□ 2020

For me particularly it was an answer to a situation, and the gentlewoman

from Texas has spoken about it, and the gentleman from Massachusetts did. We had a troubled city, and we had the formation of a Federal task force, and we all know they can do great good. But we all know it takes a long time to get things done. We had an awful time with the gang situation in the summer 2 years ago where the State police had to come in, and the cost of that was very high to taxpayers, and they could only stay so long. But the problems continued.

We had, like so many cities have had, a terribly, terribly unfortunate situation happen. In fact, the thing that made me know I had to do something—I had to get involved and bring some hope—was a little girl riding in the back seat of a car on the way to see her grandmother, and she was killed, and it was a gang-related shooting, she died, and the community was terribly upset. That is only one example of what happens when these situations get out of control. And in this program, this crime package we had before us it said you could apply for additional policemen for your urban area, for your town, for your city, and that is exactly what we did; we did apply. I had the police chief of Hartford, CT, come down here, I had the mayor of the city come down here and meet with Attorney General Reno. She explained the program. We looked through the legislation and we realized this was tailor made for us. So exactly 5 months from when that crime bill passed, we now have grants that have 17,000 policemen across these United States, and in my own city there were 13 new additional policemen.

I cannot tell my colleagues the hope that that gave to people, saying we understand there is a problem. We know it is going to take time to address this situation. We are continuing to do it. We have still a Federal task force in there. The whole community has rallied around so that the community works with the local police and all sorts of things have happened that have been good. But it was that hope and that understanding that people care and that you could get additional policemen out on the streets.

Then earlier this week, and I am sure my colleagues all had the same situation, in my district six small towns each got one additional policeman, and they had applied through this particular piece of legislation. They applied and got this individual that will be on the streets of these small towns. And yes, the Federal taxpayers pay by sending their taxes in for 75 percent of these additional police, and the local community pays 25 percent.

But the application was one page, just one page, and you did not have to apply. Obviously six of my towns did apply and they each got one policeman.

Maybe for somebody who comes from New York City that is nothing. For somebody in a small town that is a big deal, and as I know the gentleman from Michigan understands because he was a

policeman and he knows the difference that one additional policeman can make in a small town.

Mr. STUPAK. If the gentleman will yield on that point, in the Cops Fast Program which was announced yesterday, where you mentioned you had six police officers and they said there was no need for extra police in this country, the statistics that stuck with us yesterday when we reviewed and announced these grants was Cops Fast, which for communities under 150,000, they could apply for one or two police officers or whatever their needs were on a one-page form, eight questions. They filled it out. It had to be in by January 1. They would make announcements in February. The forms were sent out in November.

Half, one-half of all cities under 150,000 people in this country applied to receive a police officer. One-half of all towns, cities, villages, townships under 150,000 applied for these police officers.

As of yesterday the announcement was made that the President and the Attorney General authorize 7,000 more police officers to go and spread out across this great Nation to help fight crime.

In my district, which is a very rural district in northern Michigan, and my largest city is 17,000, which I spoke of earlier, Marquette, they received a police officer. But in my communities throughout my massive district of 23,000 people we had 49 agencies apply and awarded police officers. So in the northern Michigan area we have 49 more police officers, thanks to this program. And whether it is a big city, and Detroit earlier with the Cops More got 96 police officers to do community policing.

So it works and the need is there. Fifty percent of all of the cities under 150,000 in this great Nation applied from Alaska, Florida, Michigan, Connecticut.

Mr. MEEHAN. When was the last time the gentleman saw a program where you could apply for a grant on one sheet, anyone could fill it out, any police department? Not only that, when is the last time the gentleman saw a Federal program produce results so quickly?

Mr. STUPAK. And what do they want to do?

Mrs. KENNELLY. They want to repeal it.

Mr. STUPAK. That is right; eight questions, one sheet. You did not have to hire a consultant or an expert in grants to write a grant. All you had to do was to fill out the form, and they want to repeal it.

Back in the 1970's with the LEAA Program, 33 cents of every dollar went for administrative costs, for the experts and the people to write the grants, and we do it on one page, and it is effective and it is efficient, it is fast and it does the job. It puts the money

in the police officers where they belong. And they want to do away with it. Why?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. The gentleman has a very good point if he will yield for just a moment. As I listened to the discussion, and let me applaud the gentleman from Massachusetts for his creative leadership as a district attorney. I think when we get into this discussion and we move away from the bipartisan spirit, which is what I am hearing from the gentlewoman from Connecticut, that towns and hamlets, and I imagine you could not tell me whether they had a Republican voting population or a Democratic voting population, but they were the far gambit of citizens across the Nation. I think we are going up the wrong road if we begin to separate victims from law enforcement and prevention.

The gentlewoman's detailing of a tragedy that occurred in her community reminded me of a tragedy in mine, as we can all indicate, and likewise the gentleman from Massachusetts, where youngsters were having a birthday party and enjoying a 13th birthday party, and tragically, in a drive-by shooting, gang-related, we lost a teenager. But that parent was so grateful for the police they had developed a relationship with, the officers that were close to the neighborhood, and close to the youngsters, because soon after the culprits, if you will, were immediately targeted because of those officers being close.

It is somewhat similar to the story of the gentleman from Massachusetts about people becoming more comfortable with the officers that they know and being able to bring them together in order to solve crime. And we have a very diverse city, Asians, Hispanics, African-Americans, and Africans, people from east India, a very diverse community, and we have been able to use this program to expand our police department to relate to some of the diverse communities and to be as creative as you have been in Massachusetts to solve crimes.

So I think the real question is, Is the proposed bill prepared to solve crime or is it something that wants to clearly respond to campaign pledges, because if it is on track to solve crimes, and they will listen to the real Americans in these hamlets and towns, in the large urban areas, former police officers, district attorneys, myself having served as a former municipal court judge, to say that it is very important that victims are helped. We do not want them to be victims, but the one thing we sure want to have happen is that that crime be solved, because it is a tragedy. How can you do it without more police officers?

Mr. MEEHAN. The gentlewoman is absolutely right. Someone coming into a district attorney's office with a family member who has been murdered, you do not ask if they are Democrat, Republican, or Independent, and anybody who is for fighting crime, any

Governor, whether it is Weld of Massachusetts, or a Republican district attorney in Suffolk, they support community policing and crime prevention because they know what crime is all about.

This should not be a partisan issue. We had bipartisan support for this bill when it passed, bipartisan support, and everyone stood up. I remember the debate on the floor of the House when I stood in the well and I challenged Members of this Congress who did not vote for this on the other side of the aisle that if they were really serious about fighting crime they ought to volunteer for 2 weeks in a district attorney's office in their districts anywhere in America, because all it takes is opening your eyes and going into one of those district attorney's offices, or a police department. And if you go in and find out what is happening with community policing programs, and what has happened in district attorneys' offices anywhere in America, you can never come back and vote to dismantle the program.

□ 2030

Mrs. KENNELLY. The gentlewoman from Texas, a new Member, just been here a short time this session, but that was such a thrill to see real legislation passed that has real results that people could focus on.

What happened was we identified a problem, and we found a solution, and it was additional policemen in the communities that needed it, and that happened. The results were tangible.

And now what we are seeing, I guess, is a real push to roll this program back, to end this program that has worked, something that you can look at, that you can see, and that you can know that your streets are going to be safer. And we are going to roll it back and say OK, never mind, even though it has worked, never mind, we are going to do some block granting and you can do whatever you want with the taxpayers' money, and maybe you can help your budget to be a better budget, but the point was not that. This was a crime bill last year. We found there was a need for additional policemen in communities. That was addressed. The policemen are now in the communities.

The grant system did work. Janet Reno, our Attorney General, put her whole self behind this, I tell the gentlewoman from Texas; it has been so wonderful to see, not only some bipartisanship, but to see the branches of Government working together, the President calling for this, the Attorney General putting herself and her staff, long hours, to make this work, making the program better as it went along, because this has been round upon round.

I know I see people who want to change it. Of course, this is a legislative body. We should have new legislation. We should have new ideas. But when you just get a good idea last year, and it is working, and everybody is able to say look, this is going to help

our communities, they say no, never mind.

So I just wanted to come down tonight and say it is working in my community. I really think the people of my district feel that their taxpayers' dollars are being well spent so that we can deal with the situation in our communities of crime which we wish we did not have but we have found a solution.

So I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for calling this special order, because it was a fine time in this country that we could pass legislation and address the needs of the people of this country. I am just really kind of surprised that we are now going to change our minds and do something different. I just hope we do not.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I am listening to you and listening to the intensity of your remarks about how much the communities gravitated to be able to have this opportunity and how much they responded to it.

I had the opportunity to meet with representatives from the International Chiefs of Police and, yes, I meet with the people that are not inside the city of Houston, which is the largest city in the State, but they were from Plano, TX, and Georgetown. They were training to go and meet with all the members of the delegation to simply say that in their respective communities it was important to get that one officer, and they were certainly concerned about this whole issue of dollars going without any direction to a large entity and whether or not you would ever get to this small community to be able to help them out on some of the things they needed, particularly in Houston.

I just wanted to finish on this point about neighborhood policing and the comfort level that communities develop. Minorities, inner-city neighborhoods are in extreme need, if you will, for that kind of relationship with their law enforcement community, and it has worked, and we have done the neighborhood policing or modification thereof or had the officers go into the community or have been able to get, as what happened in Texas, 349 Texas police departments would be allotted some \$20 million to fill 366 positions, when we have had those extra positions, we could then look to hiring individuals from diverse minority groups and backgrounds, women, and all of those helped to make a richly diverse and importantly contributing police department.

Because what it says is those people look like you and me and when they go into the neighborhood, it is such a difference, not only prevention and law enforcement but also in solving the crime. That is what you want to have happen, developing the trust and that is why I am flabbergasted as to why we would not continue a program like this.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Am I correct, the gentlewoman not only was a judge, but was also a city councilwoman?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Yes; I was.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Well, I think we have a bond here. Because where I learned about the success of the community policing, the cop on the beat, the neighborhood person being able to relate with the policeman who is protecting them, and they are paying their salaries, where all of that happened is right in our cities and our towns. I was a city councilwoman, and I always felt so good about community policing, and I am so delighted it has come into being in this crime package with the additional police. We will have to talk about our days in city hall.

But this is a program that city halls all across the United States are saying it works.

Mr. STUPAK. Not just city halls all the way across the United States, but the other day at the press conference when we announced the Cops Fast Program, you know, we were joined by representatives of the FOP, the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Association of Police Organizations, there was a member there from the International Association of Chiefs of Police, and they said this program works.

Do not go back to what we did in 1968 and the early 1970's with the law enforcement assistance agency, or administration. Let us not go back. Let us not go back. As Chief Vibrette said the other day when she was making an announcement, she said for too long from Washington, the Federal Government, in helping us fight crime was always one way, here is the way you do it, here is the way you do it, here is the way we do it; we always were told, we were always lectured, always preached.

Underneath the crime bill that currently exists, it is a two-way street. It is a partnership. You are giving us what we need, police officers to help fight crimes in our community. We have formed partnership for once, just like community policing is a partnership with the community in which it serves, and let us not go back to those days. You have provided us with the financial incentive on a one-page form. You do not even have to put down the criteria of your community policing, but just have a police officer there.

The purest form of prevention of crime is a police officer open and visible in that community.

Mr. MEEHAN. And when I hear the rhetoric back and forth and all of these theories that seem to come out of political polls, focus groups, here is the evidence that matters: This is community policing in one particular community that shows a dramatic decrease in crime. It happens to be one community, Lowell, MA, police officers in the communities cutting crime.

My colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], mentioned her own city of Houston and the various groups of minorities. Lowell, MA, was a melting pot. I mentioned the Asian community in Lowell who are the most recent immigrants to this city and how difficult it was for them

as victims of crime and how important our program was of community policing and priority prosecution, but the Irish settled in Lowell when we had a high French population in Lowell that settled there, Hispanics settled there. It has been a melting pot over a period of time. It is where the industrial revolution was born in this country, and it is always very, very important and critical that when a new group comes into the United States that they all have the communities, they have gone to form the partnership with law enforcement, with the schools, with the probation department. That is the only way that you can cut crime in an area, to form partnerships, to hear the rhetoric relative to the programs with boys' clubs and girls' clubs.

You know, in Phoenix when basketball courts and other recreational facilities were kept open late, juvenile crime dropped 55 percent. It works.

We have 13 new schools in Lowell, MA. Those schools are closed when school is over, beautiful new facilities, gymnasiums. And what do their kids have to do? They are on the streets. OK, that is how crime happens, kids hanging around the street.

We have all of these new schools, and we have an opportunity to put together programs. We have a police department that is willing to volunteer. We need to open these structures up. We need to have the type of programs that involve tough prosecution.

I mentioned the priority prosecution program. I am talking about identifying in this community 20 to 25 of the worst offenders and locking them up for as long as we could get them off the street, remove them.

With the challenge of real law enforcement and really fighting crime is what you do with everyone that is left. That is what it is all about. And anyone who has ever fought crime knows that, and I cannot believe that our friends on the other side of the aisle do not know it as well, and maybe they are hoping that this will die in the other body or the President will veto it and they will not have to mention it, or they can make adjustments and call it their crime bill.

It does not matter to me whether we call it a Democratic crime bill, a Republican crime bill, Clinton's crime bill, Janet Reno's crime bill. It is America's crime bill, and it works, and we should not be getting into partisan politics determining authorship or trying to tinker with the bill so that somebody else can take credit or there is an election coming down the road, and we have got to figure out how many seats for the Democrats and Republicans. All of that is nonsense. When we opened up, I made the point, and it is a very, very important point, fighting crime is serious business. It is really serious business. It is not partisan. It requires professionalism. It requires community involvement. This works.

The last think we need to do is kill the program. Community policing, prevention programs for boys' clubs and girls' clubs and opening of facilities; the worst think we could do is kill this program because of sheer partisan politics.

It is not in the interest of the country. I believe that any law enforcement official, anywhere these programs are working, would tell you the same thing. I mentioned Republicans, prominent Republicans, who are in law enforcement who support this program. Anyone who knows anything about these programs who have been involved, it does not matter whether independents or Republicans, they support these programs.

□ 2040

The last thing we need with America, frankly, looking at both political parties and saying, Please just give me programs that work, I don't want to hear that they are Democrat or Republican, I don't care if Clinton or Reno or somebody else did it. Let's get the job done and make or neighborhoods safe so we can improve our standards of living.

That is what this is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, clearly none of us is standing here this evening sharing our thoughts because it has happened in Massachusetts or it is happening in Michigan or in Texas. But it is something that is close to our hearts and our homes. Certainly, coming from Houston, a city that has already been postured, if you will, to receive some \$9 million on the Cops Ahead Program, to get 123 new officers. But what that translates to, as the gentleman has evidenced, is dealing with youngsters, where you can stop the tide of crime. We have done some of the things the gentleman has mentioned, we have kept city parks open late at night, we have had the good fortune to have police officers volunteer to do that. That has impacted those youngsters by keeping them off the streets. Now, maybe we are spending too much time looking at late-night comedy shows because there was a lot of humor around the program at midnight basketball. I am going to look the American people in the eye and I hope those who look at this politically will really tell the truth. I am not suggesting that all will adhere to the program midnight basketball, but do the know that the program had police officers' involvement, do they know that the individuals participating would have GED degrees or would get the GED's or would get parenting skills?

As the gentleman from Massachusetts said, do they know this is a business and it would be handled that way because of some of the guidelines that this particular program would put in place?

This bill was serious about crime prevention and putting police officers on the streets, the 1994 bill.

It was more serious than in H.R. 728, because what it did was it prepared smaller cities and towns and counties for keeping the police officers.

Mr. Speaker, I served on the National League of Cities board. We had all kinds of cities, 17,000 of them. The issue is, once we get them, how do you prepare so that we can continue to pay their salaries and pension? The bill that they have now our colleagues are supporting on the other side drops the money down and gives no preparation to these cities and towns on how to maintain these officers.

At least, under the program in 1994 you could hire the officers, there were creative ways, a basis upon which those jurisdictions would know how to keep them, even some creativity in using it in overtime.

So I am disappointed that we are not staying on the right path, if you will, that would take all these variables into consideration. I join you in pride of getting away from what party it is or whose President.

I am glad our President was at the forefront of this.

But to see what works for Houston, and I imagine across the country, in this direction it has worked and is working.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this 1-hour special order with my colleague from Massachusetts, and I commend him for bringing us together to speak on this important issue.

The COPS program as authorized in the Violent Crime Control Act of 1994, attempts to place 100,000 more cops on the street by the year 2000. The COPS program is broken down into three grant programs: Cops Fast, Cops Ahead, and Cops More. The crime bill's community policing hiring program provides \$8.8 billion in competitive grants for State and local law enforcement agencies to hire community policing officers and to implement community policing. Community policing is designed to complement traditional policing by forging effective, innovative crime prevention partnerships between law enforcement and the community.

These programs are already moving to make their marks on our communities. Just yesterday, President Clinton and Attorney General Reno announced \$434 million to help 6,600 law enforcement agencies hire 7,110 community police officers under the Cops Fast police hiring program. Of this, 349 Texas police departments will be allotted \$20,909,886 to fill 366 officer positions. Eighty police departments in the southern district of Texas will be allotted \$5,151,452 to fill 85 officer positions. Coupled with previous hiring grants, full awards under Cops Fast would bring the total number of new officers funded under President Clinton to 16,674 in communities across America. And under the Cops Ahead Program, Houston has been awarded \$9 million to fund positions for 123 new police officers. This amount will increase when applications for the Cops More Program receive consideration after the March deadline.

We cannot roll back these promises with the changes that are proposed in H.R. 728, the Law Enforcement Block Grant Act.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, President Bush certainly was a supporter of midnight basketball; so during that period of time it was not so much of a partisan issue.

I think if more people had the experience, those who served had the experience of watching a community, as I did, with 10, 12, 15 home invasions, rapes, robberies, home invasions over a very brief period of time, and watched the devastation that occasioned, and then watch a community-based prosecution program by the district attorney, Tom Riley, an effective district attorney, implemented in a community, and you watch home invasions dramatically decline, there is nothing more rewarding to a prosecutor, to a police officer, than to watch those home invasions develop the strategy that works and see them stop. There is nothing that could be more rewarding to any law enforcement professional but to see the results of professional law enforcement.

I cannot help but believe if more Members in this body, whether they be Democrat or Republican, had that experience and saw the devastation that crime causes firsthand when you are called to a home to see that devastation and to see the difference when you implement a community policing program that works, we would not be having this discussion here tonight.

I think we would all be better off, the country would be better off.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STUPAK. The reason why we are here tonight is because probably on Monday we will have a very critical vote, and it is a vote not just which side is going to win or prevail but whether America wins in keeping police officers on the street, where we need them, to keep community policing viable and working throughout this great Nation.

It is not who wins the most votes at the end of that vote on Monday, whether Democrats carry the day or Republicans carry the day; we want this country to carry the day by being safe in our homes, having more police officers available to them, and a crime bill that the taxpayers, really, are paying for, and then not going back to what happened in 1968. The whole issue here and the reason why we have been here throughout this week is not to allow the current crime bill that is proceeding on this floor, to be debated again tomorrow and again on Monday, to take the money we have available for community policing with 17,000 police officers authorized and we have 83,000 more, and we found a way to pay for it by cutting Federal employees.

So it is paid for in the crime trust fund, not to devastate that program, not to replace it with a program that has block grant after block grant with no guidelines and all the waste we saw in 1968 and in the 1970's. Let us keep

the program alive. We need the American people to help us get the message to their Representatives, whoever he or she may be, whether Democrat or Republican. I hope they call them tonight, tomorrow, and over the weekend and tell them to keep the cops program where it does the most good, on the streets, in our communities, whether you are a town of 17,000 or you are the size of Detroit or Houston or Lowell, whatever it is, that you have police officers.

We have responded, the need is there. As the cops fast program proceeded, half of the towns in this great Nation under 150,000 applied for police officers and were helped out.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, we are here because we need the help of the American people to keep cops on the street and not allow it to be devastated by the proposal that our friends on the other side of the aisle will bring to this body either tomorrow or Monday morning—Monday is when I believe the vote will take place. I believe the vote will take place on Monday.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I echo my colleague's remarks because this is important. As a freshman Member, having arrived here 2 years ago, oftentimes I voted away from my party leadership. In looking at the vote tallies since we have been here, I see more party discipline than I do looking at issues. I hope Members on the other side of the aisle will vote the issue and not party leadership because that is the only way we are going to save this bill.

I want to thank my colleague from Texas, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, for her eloquent and competent work in the Committee on the Judiciary on this bill and also her input tonight and throughout the session. As I said earlier, she is clearly one of the shining stars of this new Congress, and I appreciate her involvement as well as that of my colleague from Michigan, Mr. STUPAK.

---

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FROST (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for after 2 p.m. on Thursday, February 9 and the balance of the week, on account of illness in the family.

---

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WAIT of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ENGEL for 5 minutes, today.