

death of their employer, Today the Ramspeck Act is a 55-year-old solution to a problem that no longer exists—namely the hiring and retention of congressional staff. I think we all agree that we have hard-working, dedicated staff, and this is in no way meant to denigrate them or the work they do. But to give any applicant for a Federal job such preferential treatment is wrong—and I hope my colleagues will join me in working to end this practice which smacks more of who you know than how good a job you can do.

#### THE CASE AGAINST BLOCK GRANTS FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, last year, Congress made a promise to put 100,000 new police officers on our streets. Today, Republicans are ready to break that promise. The Republican crime bill does not devote a single dollar for cops on the beat. Instead, it creates block grants to the States, which may sound like a good idea, but we have been down this road before.

The last time we tried a similar block grant program for law enforcement, States used the grant money to buy land, cars for politicians, jet planes, financial investments, and to pay for consultants.

By contrast, the crime bill we passed last year is already working to put more police in our neighborhoods. My hometown of New Haven, CT, has nine new officers on the beat, already.

Our local law enforcement, our mayors, our chiefs of police, and our sheriffs have all thanked us for the cops on the beat program. Members of Congress have a choice to make today. Will you stand with law enforcement, or will you stand with the practitioners of politics-as-usual? Stand with the cops, pass the Conyers-Schumer amendment.

#### SUPPORT URGED FOR THE NATIONAL SECURITY REVITALIZATION ACT

(Mr. CHAMBLISS asked and was given permission to address the House and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will take up H.R. 7, the National Security Revitalization Act. H.R. 7 represents a vital statement of priority and policy for the future of this Nation's military.

H.R. 7 offers a much needed policy redirection in the area of U.N. peacekeeping operations. Too many Americans have experienced the painful costs associated with the ever-expanding peacekeeping role of the United Nations.

This country has raised and trained the most effective military machine the world has ever known. And yet, how can we allow our sons and daughters to be put under inferior command and control?

H.R. 7 restricts the President's ability to subordinate U.S. troops to U.N. command and control by requiring Presidential certification of such an arrangement and by restricting the funding required for U.S. forces engaged in U.N. operations.

We owe it to our military men and women to pass H.R. 7 and resist weakening amendments.

#### BIPARTISAN SUPPORT FOR THE CRIME PACKAGE WELCOMED

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, while in my congressional district this past weekend, constituents expressed both their pleasure and astonishment that elected officials were able to keep a campaign promise. Citizens appreciate the swift and successful manner which the crime legislation has passed through the House.

People appreciate the bipartisan support the crime package has and will continue to receive. They overwhelmingly support the new crime bill which: First, Controls the endless number of death row appeals; second, extends the good-faith measure under the exclusionary rule; and third, ensures that convicts serve at least 85 percent of their sentence.

Today, we will debate the Local Government Block Grant Act which grants local communities greater control in the battle against crime.

I can assure you that law enforcement, as well as the taxpayer, appreciate this help to fight crime. The Contract With America is helping to rebuild the public's trust in Congress.

#### WORLD STILL THREATENED BY NUCLEAR WEAPONS, DEFENSE REVITALIZATION NEEDED

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

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, the big lie has been spread over the past few years across this country that the world is a safe place to live in now than it was 5 years ago. Well, the fact of the matter is there are as many nuclear weapons in Russia today as there were before the Soviet Union broke apart, and in China they have the second fastest growing economy in the 1980's in all of Asia, and they are using their new found economic power to rebuild their military machine.

In the next 5 years it has been estimated that countries will have an intermediate range missile capability to launch nuclear weapons across continents.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to take part in H.R. 7, a bill that not only will strengthen our national defense but finally take power away from the United Nations and return it where it belongs, back with the Armed Forces of the United States.

#### IN SUPPORT OF GIVING BLOCK GRANTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO FIGHT CRIME

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, if President Clinton needs any proof that his crime bill is misguided, he only needs to look out the window right here in Washington, DC, where the police chief has come out in support of the Republican idea to give block grants to local government. He knows the truth of what Republicans have been saying for years—that Washington simply does not have all the answers. This one-size-fits-all approach to crime control is completely wrong and contrary to whatever disinformation or misinformation we may have heard from the other side of the aisle.

It is a very simple system. The local communities get to use this money for one of four purposes—more cops, more equipment, police in schools, or prevention. So they get to use this for prevention programs as long as they have law enforcement officers involved in them. The DARE Program will not go away. In fact, it is the perfect program that could be used in this way. This is something that ought to be supported. Clearly, it is being attacked by the President for the wrong reasons, and all he has to do is listen to Chief Thomas in Washington.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 521

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 521.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 118 on passage of H.R. 668, the Criminal Alien Deportation Improvements Act, I was unable to be here due to travel constraints.

Had I been able to vote, I would have voted "yea."

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT LAW ENFORCEMENT BLOCK GRANTS ACT OF 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 79 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 79

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for

consideration of the bill (H.R. 728) to control crime by providing law enforcement block grants. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule for a period not to exceed ten hours. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1430

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 79 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 728, the Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants Act of 1995. This act authorizes a total of \$10 billion in direct block grants over 5 years to assist State and local governments in their fight against crime.

Specifically, the rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee. After general debate is completed, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule for a period of time not to exceed 10 hours.

The rule makes in order the Judiciary Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as the original bill for purpose of amendment, and the committee substitute shall be considered as read. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Once again, under this rule the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may give priority recognition to

those Members who have caused their amendments to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to their consideration.

Preprinting of amendments in the RECORD is not mandatory, Mr. Speaker, and no Member of this body will be denied the opportunity to offer his or her proposal during the time allocated under the rule for amending under the 5-minute rule.

The majority members of the Rules Committee recognize both the need for and the value of informed debate on important legislation such as the one we are about to consider today.

We strongly encourage Members to preprint their amendments in the future not only to receive priority status, but also to alert our colleagues as to the number and types of amendments that are likely to be offered on the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 79 brings to the floor of the House the last of six comprehensive measures reported by the Judiciary Committee to combat crime in the United States. H.R. 728 is an especially important piece of legislation because it gets at the heart of the Federal, State, and local partnership, which is needed to effectively reduce crime, and reduce the threat of crime, in our society.

Mr. Speaker, while the Federal Government loves to take a high profile in the fight against crime, the overwhelming majority of crime falls within the jurisdiction of State and local authorities. As a result, the real burden of fighting crime falls pre-eminently to States and localities.

The challenge for us then, Mr. Speaker, is to define our role in such a way that we can productively assist localities in fighting and preventing crime without getting in their way, in other words, without micromanaging, as we are prone to do.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government does have a role to play in keeping our cities and communities safe from crime, but any support from Washington, be it financial or otherwise, must not lose sight of the fact that communities across the United States face many different types of crime.

What works to fight crime in my own hometown of Glens Falls, NY, may be vastly different from what is proven to be effective in Columbus, OH, or Sanibel, FL.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who supported the unfunded relief bill so fervently, earlier this month, did so because we fear that the vital partnership between Federal, State, and local governments is terribly off-balance.

That partnership—that critical relationship—between America inside the beltway and outside the beltway, is being threatened by the arrogance of power in Washington which presumes that the Federal Government is the only source of good ideas and practical solutions.

Too often, Washington's one-size-fits-all approach to a problem, or even a perceived problem, stifles innovation, and chokes off creativity at the State and local levels. In so many instances, Washington is all too eager to impose its will when a local problem can be more effectively addressed by a local solution.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 728 is the common-sense solution to restoring balance to the Federal, State, and local effort to confront crime.

Unlike last year's crime bill, this legislation allows the Federal Government to fulfill its role in assisting local governments in their fight against crime, without prescribing the specific steps which must first be taken, in order to receive much-needed Federal assistance.

Very simply, it provides localities with the resources they need to respond to their unique crime situations with their own solutions—with no strings attached and no matching fund requirements, I might add.

Let me just point out to my colleagues that this bill does not hand over a blank check to our communities, for them to spend taxpayer dollars in any way they see fit. While H.R. 728 delivers maximum flexibility to local governments, it also requires accountability, and ensures that grant funds are being utilized to fight crime.

Mr. Speaker, the Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants Act represents a real and meaningful commitment by the Federal Government to assist localities in combating crime.

By supporting this rule Mr. Speaker, we bring to the floor of the House of Representatives the final installment in the new Republican majority's comprehensive anticrime strategy.

And in so doing, we give life to one more crucial element in our Contract With America—our commitment to making our cities and neighborhoods safer, and more prosperous.

I urge adoption of this rule, and urge my colleagues to support the underlying legislation so that local governments can have the freedom and flexibility they require to fight crime in their communities with their own unique solutions.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for yielding the customary one-half-hour debate time to me, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman explained, this resolution provides a rule with a 10-hour time limit for the consideration of H.R. 728, the Law Enforcement Block Grants Act of 1995.

While I shall not oppose the rule, we in the minority are concerned about the nature of the rule. It is not the type of rule the new majority continues to promise, especially for legislation as significant as H.R. 728, a piece of legislation that represent a dramatic shift in national policy.

The most significant restrictions that the Republicans on the Committee on Rules included in this rule is the 10-hour time limit on the amendment process. My colleagues should fully understand the implications of this restriction: The time limit is not applied to debate time only. It is instead a repeat of the device we first saw last week in considering another of the crime bills. This a restriction on all time, including the time required for voting itself.

This is, therefore, a constraint on debate during the amendment process and, in the opinion of this gentleman, an extremely objectionable restriction. Unfortunately, an attempt by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] to strike this time limit, was defeated by the Committee on Rules last week.

Mr. Speaker, we are disturbed about the nature of this rule. It is a continuation of the pattern we already have begun to detect in the majority's attempt to deliver the open rules it has long advocated and promised, but rules that turn out to be truly open in name only.

The majority claims to be providing open rules when the result is, in effect, a process that closes down and restricts debate during the amendment process.

We are aware of the fact that the majority wants to complete consideration of all of the bills included in its so-called Contract With America within the first 100 days. And I suspect they will be able to do so. But some of these bills are, in fact, very major, very serious pieces of legislation, which should not be rushed. The truth if the matter is that we have all year to consider these bills and, if necessary, we could take a few additional days beyond the 100 to consider them.

The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, Mr. HYDE, said in his testimony to the Committee on Rules that this is, the "most controversial of the six crime bills being presented to us by the majority party."

So all we are trying to suggest, Mr. Speaker, is there is a better way of doing this than what we seem to be currently embarked upon. We are suggesting respectfully that we start consideration of these bills under an open rule, with no restrictions on time. If the proceedings drag on too long, if dilatory tactics are apparently being used, then we can do what we usually do in such circumstances, get unanimous consent that further consideration of amendments to the bill be limited to some specific period of time.

□ 1440

Let us not start the process with time restraints that might not be necessary or, to the contrary, might well prevent the adequate consideration of major amendments to the bill.

The bill itself, Mr. Speaker, is very controversial, certainly the most controversial element in the Contract

With America crime package. It seeks to dismantle the core of the bipartisan crime bill enacted last year by eliminating the program to put an additional 100,000 State and local enforcement officers on the beat and by eliminating virtually all of the specific crime prevention programs in the new law.

In place of these carefully targeted programs, the bill would establish a new block grant program which is strikingly similar to the program administered by the law enforcement assistance administration, which was finally eliminated by the Reagan administration.

As our colleagues on the Committee on the Judiciary wrote in their dissenting views in the committee report on the bill, H.R. 728, the bill breaks the promise Congress made last year to the American people that we would put 100,000 new police on the streets to fight violent crime, and it also destroys the promise Congress made to our people when we approved carefully targeted crime prevention programs.

Unfortunately, H.R. 728 itself guarantees absolutely nothing in the way of increasing the number of police on our streets. It will actually cut spending for police and crime prevention. We are being asked to consider a bill that has a very real chance of wasting a good part of the \$10 billion cost of the bill to taxpayers with no specific goals up front and with no specific results to show in the end, and all in the name of flexibility. In fact, unlike the contract's bill on prison construction, which included very strong restrictions and requirements for use of the funds, this bill permits spending for categories so broad that there is no doubt that some grants will simply disappear into municipal budgets. That is exactly the history of the block grants program with the law enforcement assistance administration, which the Alabama State attorney general called "A politician's dream for the biggest pork barrel of them all." We are, all of us, confronted with some difficult choices in considering this bill. Most of us are all for local governments deciding what to do about crime or about education or about welfare, for that matter. But we are not all for voting on behalf of the taxpayers we represent to send money to other levels of government without knowing how it will be used. It is bad enough, it is often embarrassing, to find out sometimes that money we have voted for Federal programs has not been wisely spent, and it is worrisome and potentially irresponsible in the extreme to vote funds for local programs whose purposes are not even clearly set out in the legislation itself and whose use we will have very little control over.

Yes, in theory it is nice to give the responsibility to local levels of government, but it is we who are voting to make taxpayers' money available. And it is we who will and who ought to be

eventually held responsible, for the wise use of that money.

I am only suggesting that we may well be getting ourselves into a similar situation to the one in which we found ourselves with respect to the LEAA block grants which, as many Members will recall, we stopped funding a decade or so ago.

Mr. Speaker, the programs we enacted just last year have only begun to work. We should allow them to continue so that more police will be on the streets of our communities and more criminals are locked up.

To repeat, we shall not oppose this rule despite our continuing concerns about the use of the time limit on the amendment process.

I ask my colleagues to approve this resolution so that we may start consideration today of this important legislation and of the important amendments that would help correct its many provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I heard the word "pork barrel," the connotation that these local governments, these local police chiefs, these local sheriffs were going to spend this money in ways that were not important.

I would just like to read the part of the minority Democrat report on this bill before us. It says, "Proponents of this bill argue that these Federal dollars, taken from the taxes of hard-working Americans all over the land, should be showered back without meaningful guidelines, all in the name of local control. We say," this is the Democrat minority, listen to this, Mr. Speaker, "We say that mindlessly obstinate and ideologically inspired mantra," let me repeat that, because I doubt if the people I represent back home would understand that kind of elitist verbiage, let me go back and read it for a minute, "should be showered back without meaningful guidelines, all in the name of local control. We say that mindlessly obstinate and ideologically inspired mantra will result at the end of 5 years in billions of dollars being thrown down a rat hole."

Now, who said that? This is signed by the gentlewoman from Michigan, JOHN CONYERS, the gentlewoman from Colorado, PATRICIA SCHROEDER, the gentleman from Rhode Island, JACK REED, the gentleman from New York, JERROLD NADLER, the gentleman from California, XAVIER BECERRA, the gentleman from North Carolina, MELVIN WATT, the gentleman from New York, CHARLES SCHUMER, the gentlewoman from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, the gentleman from Virginia, ROBERT C. SCOTT, and all but two, because one, I think, is a freshman, all of these but two, when they talk about money going down a rat hole, made the National Taxpayers Union's list of big

spenders. And I think they have made it for a number of years in a row.

For anyone to say that the local sheriffs and local police chiefs do not know best how to spend this money, believe me, they have been living inside this beltway too long. It is time they went home to outside the beltway.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], one of the most articulate and knowledgeable Members of this body. We are so fortunate to have the gentleman upstairs on the Committee on Rules; he is in the midst of his third career now. He was an Intelligence Agency officer for many years, he was a successful private sector policeman, and he now is one of the best Congressmen in Washington.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Glens Falls, NY, for that extraordinarily over generous introduction. I am petrified to say anything, lest it be disproved.

Mr. Speaker, what we have got in front of us is a modified open rule which actually has got a time limit on it, which is the only reason it is not a full open rule. It is a time limit of 10 hours of debate. The 10 hours of debate was thought to have been more than adequate by the Members who have brought this to the Committee on Rules for consideration, the type of rule we are bringing to the floor. And in fact, it was, I think requested pretty much by everybody, and we specifically asked if the chairman of the committee had an objection. He said, no, he felt it would be all right. So I think we are well within the spirit of an open rule, if not technically a full open rule, if it is modified.

We did have a lot of discussion, again, at the request of the chairman of the committee, and the ranking member. Excuse me, it was the ranking member who agreed that 10 hours would be enough as well as the chairman. And both the ranking member and the chairman themselves suggested that we have something like an hour and a half or so of general debate. Well, we had planned for an hour and a half but, in discussing this in the Committee on Rules, we brought that back to 60 minutes of general debate. Actually, on the motion of a member of the minority, because there was a feeling that we had taken care enough of the general debate in this and more time that way for amendments. And that seems a reasonable proposition.

So we have carved a rule here that has actually considered the time very, very carefully. And we think we have got one that gets as much time as we need focused on the areas that it needs to be, both in terms of general debate and in terms of amendments for all Members who come forward and deal well under the 5-minute rule. Once again, we have put in what we think is

the very helpful preprinting option. It is not a requirement. It is not a mandate. It merely allows every Member to tell us ahead of time what his or her amendment will look to the legislation. That allows Members to become acquainted with those amendments. It allows the proponents of those amendments to get some support for their amendments going. And frankly, I think it enhances the process of deliberation and helps us get better laws enacted when we understand what it is we are talking about. We have more time to digest them and we have the opportunity to ask questions of the proponents of these amendments that occur to us not at the last minute but through a deliberative process, after having reviewed what amendments might come forward.

Basically, I think it is better government.

I want to speak just for one second to the bill itself. In the Committee on Rules, we had some concerns from the ranking membership side on behalf of the ranking member about accountability. Are we somehow or other dodging accountability by going to these community development grants? And the answer, in my view, as member of local government, having graduated from local government to the Congress, if that is the right term, is that I do not think there was less accountability at the local level. I think that there was more accountability at the local level.

It is very simple. That is where the front lines are. When someone is down there and they are at municipal meetings or their country commission-type meetings, or state meetings, they generally have more people directly interested in the audience looking at them, eyeball to eyeball, and giving them their opinions, usually rather unrestrained.

□ 1450

Mr. Speaker, I think I can honestly say I do not remember times when there is more interest in the agenda at the local level than when the sheriff is doing his annual budget, or when the police departments are doing their annual budgets in the municipalities. Those are the times when the scrutiny really happens. That is when you get the really impassioned testimony about crime, or need for more police on the street, or need for specific programs tailored to the individual requirements of the community, not the one-size-fits all mandates from the Federal Government which are so wasteful and so often so off target.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the question, the shibboleth that somehow there is no accountability in this program is not a valid observation. I would report further on that, Mr. Speaker, that in fact we have put in some safeguards to make sure there are report-back systems, there are monitoring systems, and, indeed, there is some built-in accountability and scru-

tiny under the legislation that has been proposed.

The other thing that I think needs to be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, is that we sometimes have mischaracterized what is going to happen, it seems, in this bill, that somehow or other all the police are going to no longer be on the beat. I have heard all kinds of hyperbole and exaggeration. That could not be further from the truth. What is going to happen is that locals who have a direct first-hand confrontational day-to-day existence with the criminal element are going to be able to take resources which they desperately need and put them right where they need to deal with the criminal element. I think that makes a lot of sense. I think it is a much better, more straightforward deal than saying, "We are going to give you a bunch of money to go out and hire some policemen for a few years, and then we are going to take the money away from you. Then you are on your own." You have created a false expectation, you have created a serious problem, a level that the local governments cannot sustain, and the only recourse they have is either to retire those policemen, those law enforcement officers, or to raise taxes, by and large.

We saw it with the CETA program. We saw it loud and clear. I was in local government at the time and I know we got left hanging out there. I am afraid that is what would happen if we did not fix this bill as we propose to do under this legislation.

I, for one, Mr. Speaker, feel this is a decided improvement. While we have given it a great rule, so we will have plenty of debate on this and the other subjects that are certainly worth debating. I hope that, when all is said and done, that not only do we have the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] not opposing the rule, we appreciate his support, but we also have him not opposing the legislation. We will wait to see how the debate comes out.

I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding time to me.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Greensboro, NC [Mr. COBLE] who is not only a member of the Committee on the Judiciary but is also a member of the Subcommittee on Crime, and one of the very articulate members of this subcommittee.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] for his courtesy. I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken very infrequently during this 104th session of the Congress, but I have done a powerful lot of listening. I think this must be, Mr. Speaker, probably the most loquacious legislative body in the world. A lot of my colleagues, and good friends thought they might be, I think they find complete ecstasy in the

sound of their own voices. I, conversely, do not particularly like the sound of my voice, as evidenced by my previous reticence, so I will be brief today.

Mr. Speaker, I want to direct attention to section 11 of H.R. 728, and specifically to the advisory board and what constitutes membership thereof. Under the present prescription of the bill, members to the advisory board must be representatives from police or sheriffs, No. 1; a local prosecutor, No. 2; a local court, No. 3; the public school system, No. 4; and a local community organization, charitable or otherwise.

In that fifth category, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be advisable for someone subsequently to seriously consider the input of the various parks and recreation departments throughout the country. To begin with, parks and recreation officials serve an essential component of any crime reduction strategy, as well as being uniquely cast in their respective communities to be able to attract the generated assistance from the private sector, financial and otherwise. The reason I emphasize this second feature, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that every program that surfaces necessarily has to be sanctioned, endorsed, subsidized by the Federal Government, which, of course, means subsidized by taxpayers.

I met last week with officials from parks and recreation facilities throughout the country, and perhaps other Members did as well, and they are vitally interested in this.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, as the day advances, I would say to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], who has replaced the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], I may want to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Florida to indicate the importance of the input of parks and recreation, and perhaps maybe have language or a statement of the managers in conference to emphasize and to illustrate the significance of the input that would be felt if parks and recreation officials are to be considered.

I realized that they are not precluded under the present bill, but neither are they specifically identified, Mr. Speaker. Having said all that, Mr. Speaker, and again, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] for his kindness, I hope that parks and recreation people, who do contribute very obviously to reducing crime, will get more than a fair shake as we finalize this bill.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I will say that Members may not hear from me again for some time to come, but I assure the Members I will be listening.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

(Mr. VOLKMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to ask for a record vote on the rule before us, but I was very tempted to do so, because this is not an open rule.

It is interesting to me that the majority now considers a rule that lets some amendments come up and not others as an open rule. This rule requires all amendments that have not been taken up by the House within the time limit of 10 hours, they are no good. Members cannot bring them up. That is a closed rule, Mr. Speaker. That is not an open rule.

It is interesting to me, Mr. Speaker, that, I think it is today, even Roll Call has caught it. Roll Call even points out that the Republicans are not doing what they said they would do in the Contract With America. They said "We will have an open rule." They said we would be able to offer our amendments. Now, lo and behold, they are not doing it on this bill, and they did not do it on a previous bill.

Why are they not doing it on this bill? It is very obvious to me why they are not. If Members read this dog, and that is what it is, or a turkey, that is a better description, maybe, of it, we will find that the gentleman that earlier talked about this rule and the bill, they were talking about how our police chiefs and how our sheriffs back home were going to be able to get this money and use it to fight crime.

Mr. Speaker, Members had better read the bill. This means the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE], when he was talking on the rule about all the debate that is going on in the House and all the things he is hearing and everything, I suggest to the gentleman from North Carolina, he had better start reading the bills. He could spend time a lot better.

When Members read this bill, there are several things in it that I do not believe anybody has really talked about yet. I hope we discuss it in this 10 hours.

One is, a sheriff does not get to get the money. The police chief does not get to get the money. It is a unit of local government that gets the money.

Now, what input does the police chief or sheriff have in it? Each unit of local government has to have an advisory committee to the local government, and they have to have at least one hearing, and they have to have a meeting.

There is the sheriff there or the chief of police, and there is also a prosecuting attorney, there is a judge, and anybody else that the local government wants to put on it. There are a whole bunch of people. They can put 50 people on it if they want to, and there is one law enforcement official on there.

□ 1500

They are going to make a recommendation to the unit of local government. Well, after they make their recommendation, what can they recommend? Well, they can recommend

whatever their imagination can dream about that would help with law enforcement and fighting crime, because there is no limit. I want everybody to read right here on page 2 of the bill: "Amount paid to a unit of local government in this section shall be used by the unit for reducing crime"—that is a limit, has to be for reducing crime—"and improving public safety." That is all. As long as it is reducing crime or to improve public safety.

I can tell you back in my district, folks, that we have some people with imagination. Right now we probably need some courthouses fixed up and we do not have the funds for it. Maybe we can get some money to fix up the courthouses, especially where the prisoners might be kept. That could help reduce crime and combat crime. Or maybe we cannot get a new limousine under this bill but we can get a new chief of police car because that is not in the budget and they do not have the money to buy it but we can get him a new car. That can be a Cadillac, or maybe just a Chrysler Fifth Avenue, not quite a Cadillac. It will not be a limousine.

How about the prosecuting attorney back home—that is what we call them, we do not call them district attorneys, maybe you do—but some of them may need new secretaries. They may need, say, an assistant prosecutor, and that is not in the budget, it is not supplanting funds, so we are going to hire some new secretaries and we are going to hire some other people. And maybe need some new equipment in there and get some new equipment in there and get some new equipment.

For those of you who have a lake or two in your State, I am sure you can get some boats on that lake to help fight those people going around in those boats that are drunk. That is combating crime. Is driving a boat while drunk now a crime? It is in some States, quite a few. You can get yourself a nice boat, as long as it is not a yacht under this.

Use your imagination, folks if this bill ever becomes law. Use your imagination, because the only restriction is it has to so-called be reducing crime and improving public safety.

What did that do under the old program that we got rid of because of all the pork and all the abuses in it? Well, back then some people thought that a tank was a good thing to have, to use a tank to reduce crime. The director's office, different people, same office, said that was fine to reduce crime. You need a tank down there, I think it was in Louisiana. They need that tank.

I know we are prohibiting yachts, but we are not prohibiting any kind of boats. We are prohibiting limousines, but not every good car has to be a limousine. That means I could buy, how about a Jag? Yes, that is not a limousine. My police chief needs a Jag. That is what this one will do. That is what you are going to do under this.

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

Mr. VOLKMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding. It has been fascinating listening to the statement that my friend the gentleman from Hannibal has gone through here. In fact, the only thing that I could conclude is that those local elected officials who are going to be purchasing Jaguars, boats on lakes, additional secretaries for their prosecuting attorneys' offices are no longer accountable to the same people who sent us up here.

The only thing I can conclude is that there is in fact no desire on the part of local elected officials to respond to the pressing needs of crime that exist within their jurisdictions. Am I correct in concluding that?

Mr. VOLKMER. Oh, no, no, we are going to take care of those, too. I am just saying you do not restrict these other things. You do not restrict them at all.

You are saying as long as you are doing it to stop crime or, I will use your exact words again that are in the bill, right there at page 2.

Mr. DREIER. If my friend would further yield, I will tell him exactly what we are trying to say.

Mr. VOLKMER. All it has to be is reducing crime and improving public safety. That is it.

Mr. DREIER. If my friend would yield on that point, what we are trying to say is very simply that we believe, my State being 3,000 miles to the west of here, that the people who are on the front line are better equipped to make those decisions rather than those of us 3,000 miles away. It is not nearly the distance to Missouri, but obviously we are in a position where we are convinced that those local elected officials should have the opportunity to make those decisions for themselves rather than our dictating to them exactly what should be done.

I just met a few minutes ago with the mayor of Fresno, CA, who told me that he felt very strongly that the opportunity to have the choice made right there in Fresno rather than in Washington, DC, will go a long way toward dealing with the crime problem that they have.

I suspect that in the Show-Me State, they are going to be much better off making the decision for themselves rather than having us in fact dictate it to them. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. VOLKMER. I disagree. I do not think we have to dictate it.

Mr. DREIER. That is exactly what the status quo does.

Mr. VOLKMER. But I do think you can tighten the purposes up quite a bit more and narrow them quite a bit more than you have done.

What we have attempted to do and some of us feel that one of the major items facing this Nation, especially in our major metropolitan areas, is the

fact that they cannot afford the police that they need. They cannot afford the police that we need.

So you take the police away. You say, "Well, you can have an option," but you reduce the amount that can be used totally from the present law into this, what can be used for police, if every bit of this money in your bill was used for the police.

Mr. DREIER. We are not taking away the police.

Mr. VOLKMER. The biggest thing we can do you help undo, and you leave it open. The gentleman says, "They're not going to do those things."

Well, who bought the tank? Who bought the tank? The tank was bought by law enforcement people under the old LEAA grant. You are saying they will never do that again, they will never do anything like that? No?

Well, gentlemen, you should have been here back in the 1970's and early 1980's.

Mr. DREIER. I think my friend knows it is a new day and I suspect the local elected officials will not be doing that.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I think this will be the first time I have ever debated on the House floor about the content of a rule. The Committee on Rules is one of those committees that is stacked pretty heavily in favor of the majority and generally when they decide on a procedural matter and that matter comes to the floor, it just kind of goes right through on a partisan vote. So in some respects it is kind of banging your head against the wall to come and speak.

I am not speaking generally on the content of this rule today but only on one particular aspect of it that I think my colleagues and the American public need to be aware of.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for 10 hours of debate, they say. What they do not say very loudly is that included in that 10 hours is voting time. I think the American people need to understand what that means, because if there is a recorded vote on the floor of the House, every recorded vote takes 15 minutes. Under the Speaker's policy announced earlier he has extended that recorded vote to 17 minutes. So that if there are 10 votes, 10 amendments on this bill, then that is 2½ hours gone to voting on those amendments. If there are 20 amendments on this bill, that is 5 hours gone just in the time that it takes to vote on those amendments. So we are left not within 10 hours, as the majority would have the American public believe, but then we would be left with half of that time because all the rest of the time would be spent in the voting process, not in the debate process.

Mr. Speaker, I am on the Committee on the Judiciary, and I will tell you that we had over 20 amendments being offered in the Committee on the Judiciary on this bill. In that body, we do not even have one-tenth of the membership of the House of Representatives. There are 435 Members of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I just want my colleagues to do the basic arithmetic on this. If 2 percent of the Members of this House have a sufficient interest in this important bill to come and offer an amendment, that is over 10 votes, or approximately 10 votes.

□ 1510

If 5 percent of the 435 Members of this House have a sufficient interest in this important bill to want to offer an amendment, then we have already used up more than half of the 10 hours of debate time simply on the voting process.

So, my objection to the rule does not really have to do so much with the 10 hours, but the allocation of that 10 hours or a substantial part of it simply to the voting process.

And I will tell Members that last week we got to the point just to keep Members from offering amendments that they had on a bill, that they started asking for votes so that Members would not even have the time left to offer the amendments because the voting time would take up more time than the debate time.

America, that is no way to run a democracy. That is no way to run a democracy. We ought to at least have time to debate these issues. This is an issue, this is a bill that the President of the United States indicated over the weekend he has a personal interest in, a political interest in. So we know it is going to be a heavily debated issue, and yet we will spend our time walking back and forth and using up our time in the voting process.

I think we ought to defeat this rule and let us have some real debate in this House.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has 10 minutes remaining and the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN] has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of my friend whether he has any remaining speakers?

Mr. BEILENSEN. We do not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DREIER. I would like to make some closing remarks myself.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I will close by saying I appreciate very much and strongly support the comments made by our friend, the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include therein extraneous material.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this issue is one that many have said is the most controversial of the six crime measures that we are scheduled to consider and I have a difficult time understanding why this is the most controversial of the measures that have been considered, and I say that for several reasons. We have had this ongoing discussion here about the issue of local control, and the role that people will play at the local level in making determinations as to how the resources through this block grant program will be expended.

It seems to me that everyone, Democrat and Republican alike, needs to recognize that at the local level people who are on the front line dealing with issues of crime are much better equipped than we are here in Washington, DC, to deal with that.

Last year we had an extraordinarily vigorous debate on the President's crime bill which came forward. We all know that there was at the very end a compromise that was struck and some Republicans supported it, and during that time last fall as we were proceeding with this and the President stood regularly with cadres of police officers behind him at press conferences, I received calls from local elected officials in the Los Angeles area urging me to support the President's crime bill. The main reason they did was that there was a guarantee as far as they were concerned that they would get 100,000 police officers on the street, who would dramatically turn the corner on the very serious crime problems that we face in our communities.

One of those city officials happened to be the city manager of the city of Monrovia which is in the San Gabriel Valley part of the area I am pleased to represent. He is a registered Democrat. He and I engaged in a very spirited discussion on the issue of the crime bill and he told me that the only responsible thing that I could do was support that crime bill last year.

Well, I did not for a number of reasons, I think the most important of which was that we all concluded that we would not get 100,000 police officers on the street.

I got a letter that came just a couple of days ago, the end of last week from Rod Gould who is city manager of Monrovia, again a registered Democrat and one who wanted me to support that crime bill last year, and we had debated it. I will include this entire letter in the RECORD. But I would like to share one paragraph from this letter Mr. Speaker.

It says, "You and I have had several talks about the merits/demerits of the 1994 crime bill." He finally came to the conclusion we were right and he said,

"You correctly pointed out that this \$30 billion bill would not put nearly 100,000 police officers on the streets of America." He said, "The City of Monrovia strongly supports the idea of combining the major portions of the bill into block grants for cities to allocate as they see fit to officers, equipment, training, jails or social services. This approach has worked well for years in the area of community development, and it would be welcomed by municipalities across the country."

Mr. Speaker, I include that entire letter at this point in the RECORD.

The letter referred to is as follows:

CITY OF MONROVIA,  
OFFICE OF THE CITY MANAGER,  
Monrovia, CA, February 6, 1995.

Hon. DAVID DREIER,  
Covina, CA.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DREIER: I have been meaning to write and add my congratulations to you on your remarkable rise in authority and responsibility since last November. I have had the pleasure of tracking your progress in the papers and on CSPAN. You are to be commended for your tireless effort to streamline Congressional operations. Your leadership of the House debate on unfunded mandates made us all cheer. You have given your district in the San Gabriel Valley a powerful voice on the hill, and all Americans benefit from your undaunting attempts to reduce fraud and waste in government.

The Monrovia City Council is firmly on record as opposing further federal and state unfunded mandates. We are currently grappling with the open-ended stormwater requirements under the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). Any assistance you could give us in ratcheting this regulation back a few notches would be most appreciated by all cities.

You and I have had several talks about the merits/demerits of the 1994 Crime Bill. You correctly pointed out that this \$30 billion bill would not put nearly 100,000 police officers on the streets of America. The City of Monrovia strongly supports the idea of combining the major portions of the bill into block grants for cities to allocate as they see fit to officers, equipment, training, jails, or social services. This approach has worked well for years in the area of community development, and it would be welcome by municipalities across the country.

Thanks again for your ongoing concern and interest in local matters as you shape national policy and the federal governing structure.

Sincerely,

ROD GOULD,  
City Manager.

That is the reason that I find it difficult to believe that this is the most controversial crime measure of the six that we are considering, because across this country we are finding a strong level of support from local officials.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, that quotation simply was from the gentleman's own chairperson, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], who said in his view this was the most controversial of the bills. It was not we who said

it; it was your own chairman who said so.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for pointing that out and I disagree with the chairman of the committee. I guess that was concluded because of the fact that controversy existed in the Committee on the Judiciary when debate proceeded.

All I am saying is that the controversy probably did not come from the chairman of the committee, it probably emerged from members of the Committee on the Judiciary who believe very strongly that Federal control on this issue would be more important than local control, and I believe that is why Chairman HYDE concluded it was controversial.

All I am saying is I am hard pressed to see why it is a controversial issue. And the reason I say it is that these messages have come through very clearly. Again, Jim Patterson, the mayor of Fresno, CA, was in my office about 1 hour ago and he talked about how important it is for us to move ahead with this block grant concept. And I hope very much that the controversy that existed in the Committee on the Judiciary will not exist here because I believe Members on both sides of the aisle, as I said, this Democrat city manager from Monrovia believes this is an important thing for us to pursue, and I hope very much that we can.

This is an amendment process which allows for open debate. To call this a closed rule, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] did I believe is really totally inaccurate because we will be operating with this 10-hour limitation under the 5-minute rule.

□ 1520

We are simply putting an outside time limit on the consideration for amendments. Any amendment that a Member has to offer that is germane will be able to be considered, and a Member can stand up and simply make that proposal here.

So we are proceeding with a very fair and balanced procedure, and I hope that we can bring about what people at the local level believe is necessary for them to turn the corner on this serious crime bill that we have.

I urge support of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I am trying to understand what I think is the complicated parliamentary situation that we are in now. If the Chair

will bear with me, I have a series of inquiries.

Mr. Speaker, is it correct to say that whenever a committee reports a bill, the rules of the House require the report to include a detailed analytical statement as to whether that bill may have an inflationary impact on prices and costs in our Nation's economy?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire further whether the rules of the House provide a general exception for reports from the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The answer is no. They do not.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, continuing my parliamentary inquiry, do the rules of the House permit the Committee on Rules to report a special order waiving the inflation impact requirement?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Further, Mr. Speaker, am I correct in saying, however, that the rules reported from the Committee on Rules and adopted just now by the House did not waive the inflation impact requirement?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Continuing my inquiry, if I may, the report on a block grant bill from the Committee on the Judiciary, House Report 104-24, does not discuss whether the block grant bill will have an inflationary impact on the Nation's economy. There is a section titled "Inflationary Impact Statement" on page 20 of the printed report. That section discusses the inflationary impact of the proposed constitutional amendment to balance the budget and, in fact, by the way, claims the balanced budget amendment will have no significant impact on the U.S. economy. Truly, Mr. President, this section in the entire report does not comply with the rules of the House, specifically clause 2(l)(4) of rule XI. Am I correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The report does appear to refer to another measure.

Mr. BEILENSEN. I do not intend to press the point of order. I am only trying to understand the parliamentary situation.

Am I correct to say that, because the Committee on the Judiciary violated the rules of the House and did not provide to the American people an explanation of the potential inflationary impact of the block grant bill, and because the Committee on Rules did not waive the requirement, because of this, could any Member now raise a point of order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If such a point of order were raised, the Chair would rule on that point of order at that time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, if then the point of order were raised and it were ruled by the Speaker to be in

order, what would be the effect of that point of order? Would it delay the consideration of the block grant bill until either the Committee on the Judiciary fixed the defect in its report in a supplemental report or the Committee on Rules reported another rule waiving the requirement?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill would be recommitted if the point of order were sustained. The Committee on Rules could report out a new rule dealing with the point of order.

Mr. BEILENSEN. I thank the Chair for his responses. I will conclude my inquiries, if I may, sir, by asking whether this is a unique or even unusual parliamentary situation? Because it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that so far in the 104th Congress, we are in this situation on almost every rule we have considered. On the unfunded mandates bill, a parliamentary inquiry established the committee report was defective, and the rule had not waived the point of order. On the balanced budget joint resolution, the rule, as reported, also failed to include the proper waivers to cover another defective report. When we pointed this out, the rule was amended on the floor. The rule on the Taos Pueblo Indian land transfer bill also did not waive the necessary points of order to fix a defective report. In addition, the rule did not allow for instructions in the motion to recommit, violating clause 4(b), rule XI. The point of order on the rule was not pressed when the majority agreed to amend the rule on the floor, and the rule on the Butte County land conveyance bill did not contain the waiver made necessary because the bill was reported out of the Committee on Resources without a quorum being present.

Here again, we are having passed a rule that failed to waive the necessary points of order to protect a defective report.

I thank the Chair for giving us the opportunity to ask these questions and will not press any potential point of order that may be available to us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman for his observations.

Pursuant to House Resolution 79 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 728.

□ 1525

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 728) to control crime by providing law enforcement block grants, with Mr. GUNDERSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCOLLUM] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gen-

tleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCOLLUM].

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume simply to make the point initially that what we are dealing with here today is a bill which will consolidate two programs that were passed in the last Congress under one local community block grant system for \$10 billion.

Those programs were the President's Cops on the Street Program and the so-called prevention programs that were allocated in categorical grants last year. In both of those combined together, there was a total of about \$16 billion of a \$30 billion crime bill that passed this Congress and became law.

This bill would as I said, consolidate the prevention programs and the Cops on the Streets Program into a single community block grant program in the tune of \$10 billion to let the local communities decide for themselves how to spend the money that they receive under this block grant proposal, rather than having the Federal Government tell it.

I was very disappointed to hear the President's radio address this past Saturday in which he said should this bill go to his desk, if I heard him correctly, he would veto it, because he felt it would undermine or destroy the Cops on the Streets Program.

This is especially disappointing, because I recognize what I hope he will in time come to recognize, and that is there are thousands of high crime rate communities around this country, who will not be taking advantage and not be able to take advantage of the President's Cops on the Streets Program that is now law, because they simply cannot afford to do so, and there are also thousands of communities that will not find the so-called prevention grant programs that are spelled out by last year's bill, those kinds of programs which they can utilize and they will never apply for those programs.

Consequently, the only way to remedy that defect is by passing the bill that is before us today, H.R. 728, and getting the President somehow convinced to let it become law or sign it into law or have enough Members to override his veto, because it is only if we do that that we will provide the maximum flexibility to the communities, the cities and counties of this country, to decide on their own what they want to do with this money, whether that is hire a new cop or whether that is to pay overtime for police or whether that is to buy a new police car or whether that is to extend the prevention program of their choice, whether that prevention program is one that is labeled in one of those previous grant programs or not in order to reduce crime in those communities.

Mr. Chairman, with that in mind, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr.



HYDE], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, if the gentleman is prepared to give an opening statement here at this point.

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], chairman of the Crime Subcommittee. I will not take much time to explain the details. I would rather he would.

But I just want to say I as quoted as saying this is the most controversial bill. I want to make it clear that it ought not to be the most controversial bill, but it was treated as such in the Committee on the Judiciary by the furor of the resistance of the minority party in transferring any authority away from Washington, where apparently all wisdom resides, out to local communities.

This bill illustrates the philosophical difference between the two parties. Everybody wants to stop crime. Everybody is interested in doing something about the crime problem. But there we diverge. The Democratic Party thinks and acts and believes that Washington, DC, the Federal Government, must dictate down to the most minute detail how these funds are going to be spent, because Daddy knows best. That is a philosophical commitment they have had on welfare and almost every issue—that wisdom trickles down, if you will, one of their favorite phrases, when we talk about economics—from Washington to the local communities.

□ 1530

On the other hand, it is our belief, the Republican belief, that local governments know best, that government is best which is closest to the people, which understands the problems that are indeed local.

Somebody said once, a famous person, a famous Speaker of this House, "All politics are local." Well, a lot of crimefighting is local. People in Boise, ID, have different problems and different needs than people in New York City or Bangor, ME, or Pensacola, FL. We have a very diverse country. We have diverse communities, and each has different needs.

I was—I do not want to say shocked—but I was saddened to hear local government maligned on this floor earlier today, and even by the President, who assumes from the beginning that this is going to be pork, that local government officials are not concerned about local circumstances and fighting crime and adding to public safety.

It is our belief that local government officials are honorable people, they have been elected by their constituents, who live very close to them. They want to fight crime, and they can do it more effectively because they have superior knowledge. They are on the scene.

Now, it may well be that certain communities need after-school sports

programs, tutoring programs, neighborhood watch programs; to put more police in the schools, put metal detectors in the schools, put better weapons in the hands of their police, put more prosecutors in the courtrooms, build boot camps for first-time offenders, build drug courts, put more communities at ease by having community policing.

There is an infinite variety of remedies that can be applied to this exacerbating problem, but let us trust the local people to do it.

So, to assume in the beginning that they cannot handle it, that they are going to waste it profligately, on pork, is an insult, really. It demeans public officials in the myriad, thousands of cities and towns around this country.

We believe that the best government is closest to the people and most responsive to their needs. That ought not to be too tough to understand, but it is indeed a defining issue, one more defining issue between the Democratic Party and the Republican Party.

We trust local government, and I can assure you there are safeguards in this bill, advisory councils which involve the people. That is a great phrase, "We the People." I suggest that these advisory councils that will be looking at this money and looking at how it is spent will be composed of people in the community, law enforcement, education, municipal officials. And, they will see that the money, which, after all, are tax dollars and collected from the same long-suffering taxpayer; whether the money goes to the State or to the Federal Government, it is the same money, is wisely spent.

And so to assume in the beginning it is going to be wasted or spent for pork does a great disservice to local governments across this country.

I guess not only do we think Washington does not always know best, but we have more faith and trust in local government officials than does the minority party.

This is an important bill, a significant bill. It is going to help fight crime. It is going to give the flexibility to local government to meet their situations.

The mayor of New York, I was present in a room when he said, "I don't want any more policemen, I need technical help." That may be true in many areas. So let us let them decide, let them spend the money. We will be watching, the community groups will be watching, the advisory councils. If they misstep, it will not go ignored or unacknowledged, and it will be corrected.

So I am proud of this bill, I am proud of the work that the gentleman from Florida, BILL MCCOLLUM, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, the gentleman from New Mexico, Mr. SCHIFF, and everybody on our committee has done, and I hope it gets the support of a majority of this House.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strenuous opposition to the measure before us.

Before I get into some other remarks, let me just respond about the new-found trust that the majority party has in local government. We trust local government as well. As a matter of fact, we not only trust them, we listen to them. And when we listen to them, we listen to the policemen that they say we do not trust, the policemen that we are listening to in the Fraternal Order of Police, who say that the crime bill that divided out the prevention program from the Cops on the Beat Program was the way to go. The international Brotherhood of Police Officers, their chiefs and police officers, saw that the 1994 crime bill created a community police program of 100,000 policemen. That was what they wanted to do. The Major Cities Chiefs representatives, we just talked to them only an hour ago, and they again are here urging that we turn down this proposal that the Republican majority has dreamed up.

The National Association of Police Officials, police organizations, with Bob Colley, a 30-year police officer from Detroit, are all testifying 100 percent on behalf of the 1994 crime bill: namely a return to community police as a separate program and not put it into a block grant with prevention, so that we may not end up with the Hobson's choice of either prevention or police.

The National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Officers are strongly in support of the modification that we will shortly offer to keep 100,000 community police in a separate position. This shows we do not just trust our local government, we hear them and we trust them and listen to them and then act on that premise.

So the police officers organizations—and they represent the rank-and-file policemen and police chiefs—are for the proposal which we will shortly offer to restore 100,000 policemen in a separate program. The Sheriffs Association, the National Sheriffs Association, have our support, the Police Executive, the Police Executives Research Forum, has our support, former police chief Hubert Williams, of the Police Foundation, has our support.

There are eight police organizations, foundations, brotherhoods, all supporting the plan that we will shortly bring to restore the fundamental provisions in the 1994 crime bill that will create 100,000 community policemen. Funds for 17,000 new police have already been certified by the Attorney General and will shortly be on the beat, if they are not already.

Now, the Republican majority has replaced a prevention and COPS Program that we know works, with a 1970-style revenue sharing program that we know

has failed. That is why we are not supporting it. We had that experience. It did not work. This is the pork program that we do not want to have put into law.

Why are we doing this? The 1994 bill is only a few months old, it is working fine; let us continue and not create the incredible confusion that will result from having to pull it. The Republican program is \$10 billion worth of pork, and it will end up, I predict, in getting very few cops, very little for prevention programs, no guarantees for crime reduction, no money for the programs that mayors and community leaders tell us are needed to reduce crime, no accountability.

Mr. Chairman, this is a \$10 billion taxpayer giveaway that we are being asked to support; the formlessness of the block grant program is begging to be abused. We know the program will fail, because of our experience with the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration Program, which did not work 35 years ago.

The Members of this body should make no mistake, this block grant formula is nearly identical to the failure structure of the 1970's program. And what did it bring us?

□ 1540

Well, at one university a \$300,000 study to assess the need for a looseleaf encyclopedia on law enforcement; in one State, the purchase of aircraft used by the Governor and his family primarily for traveling. In another area, a national accounting firm was paid \$27,000 for a government manual that we later found already existed.

Mr. Chairman, it is a boon for consultants who, by the way, got one-third of the funds according to these surveys.

We have boondoggle after boondoggle that makes us know that the police chiefs, the Fraternal Order of Police Officers, the foundations, organizations, are all correct. We need to return to a separate category of community police, and that is what we propose to do.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to, first of all, respond to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] on these comments about all these police organizations supporting last year's version and not supporting ours. We can all get down here and have litanies of who supports what and who does not. I do not know what good that does, but I can say that it is a split decision at this point if we add up who is and who is not on the list of them. For example, the National Association of Chiefs of Police strongly support our block grant approach as opposed to last year's cops on the street version, and that is also true of the Law Enforcement Alliance of America, it is true of the Memphis Police Association, the Southern States Police Benevolent As-

sociation, the American Federation of Police, the Police Superior Officers Association in Trenton, NJ; we have any number of individual lodges of the Fraternal Order of Police, though maybe their national office wants to go, and the board of directors, the other way; the Oklahoma Sheriffs Association.

I have right here in front of me a copy of a newspaper article recently where the chief of police right here in Washington, DC, says that he much prefers the version that we are going to offer because the city of Washington, DC, does not have the money or the ability to take advantage of the Cops in the Streets Program the way that the President has put it forward, but they could take advantage, and get some new police and some support for their police in this city of ours right here that we all know has such a very high crime rate, and the list goes on and on.

I do not think the debate today ought to be over how many police support which program. I think the debate should be on the merits of what is the better position, and I think clearly we have the better position. There are always going to be some communities that benefit more by this than others do. My own city of Orlando, FL, while its police chief and mayor strongly support our block grant program as a growth city, we are going to hire more police officers anyway and obviously get an advantage out of the President's proposal because he is saying, look, we will pay 75 percent of the first \$20,000 or \$25,000 each year for 3 years of hiring a new police officer, whereas another community, which was not, maybe, going to plan to hire them, like the city of Orlando, that finds that to be a very beneficial thing because it helps pay something they were going to pay for anyway. Somebody else would not find that to be the case, and in many communities, thousands of communities around the country were not planning to hire police, who now find themselves in the position of having to look at this in the cold, hard light of day and the dollars they have available, and they clearly cannot afford to do that.

We are going to hear a lot more about that over time. Let me describe briefly what H.R. 728, the Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grant Act of 1995, does.

Mr. Chairman, it is the last of six crime bills I introduced in connection with the Republicans' Contract With America. In many ways, it represents the central differences between the policies of last year's crime bill and the policies of the new Congress, and, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] our chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, said a few minutes ago, in many ways it represents succinctly the differences in political philosophy between Democrats who controlled this Congress for 40 consecutive years and the new Republican-controlled majority. Republicans gen-

erally believe in government which governs best governs least. We believe in limited Federal Government. We believe government closest to the people, in the case that we are talking about here today, the cities and the counties of our Nation, are the best government for making decisions, and in this case that is precisely what this bill does. It delegates to those cities and communities around this Nation the decision-making authority to decide how best to fight crime in their communities, either with more cops, or prevention or whatever.

Last year's bill said Washington knows best when it comes to fighting crime. Local governments were offered more police, so long as they agreed to pay most of the costs for those additional police and to use them for community policing. Last year's bill also said that America needed billions of dollars in crime prevention spending, but only the kind of crime prevention that a liberal-controlled Congress favored. Well, Mr. Chairman, the American people, in poll after poll and at the ballot box, stated clearly their objection with that kind of so-called crime fighting strategy.

H.R. 728 before us today takes the opposite approach. It says that Washington does not know best when it comes to fighting crime. It says that local governments are capable of determining what their needs truly are. It recognizes that better than 90 percent of all crime is local and not Federal. It says that the President's cops project, created in the heat of presidential politics, is not beyond question, and that, if it is what America's localities actually desire, they will prove it when they spend their block grants that they get under this bill.

Mr. Chairman, there is a role for the Federal Government to assist the States in the fight against crime. But such assistance must appreciate that the problems vary from State to State and community to community. We must avoid a one-size-fits-all approach, even as we reject micromanagement. Support from Washington cannot come at the expense of flexibility.

H.R. 728 leaves to local governments the decision regarding what their funding priorities should be. It neither requires that funds be spent on police officers, nor on prevention programs, it leaves that decision to local governments, which understand their crime problems far better than we do. Under H.R. 728, localities can fund police on the beat, or prevention activities, or anything in between. The act simply requires that those funds be used to reduce crime and improve public safety.

At the same time, the act ensures that there will be fiscal and programmatic accountability as the funds are utilized. The opponents of local control argue that this act will become another LEAA. They cite horror stories from the 1970's when the Federal Government gave money go the States

which was then passed along to local recipients. But a fair and thoughtful examination of this bill that is before us today, should lead any unbiased observer to see that this is a new day and a new approach.

Under section 103, units of local government must submit an application which ensures that a local advisory board has been established and has reviewed the application. The advisory board's membership must include a representative from the local police department or sheriff's office, the local prosecutor's office, the court system, a local community group active in crime prevention, and a representative of the local public school system. This advisory board is an important way to ensure that a range of views are considered as localities' grant applications are being completed. The advisory board will further ensure a healthy dose of public scrutiny during the application process.

Section 103 also includes fiscal and accounting requirements to ensure that grant funds are properly managed. Moreover, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, will be offering an amendment later today, to set aside up to \$60 million each year for oversight and accountability activities. There are many other differences between this initiative and the days of LEAA, and we will highlight those differences as the debate on this bill continues.

H.R. 728 repeals title I of the 1994 Crime Act, the public safety and policing section, and replaces it with a block grant program to provide funds directly to units of local government to assist them in their efforts to improve public safety. The use of grant funds includes, but is not limited to hiring, training, and equipping law enforcement officers and support personnel; enhancing school safety, and establishing crime prevention programs.

It is important to note that units of local government may use funds under section 101 for purposes other than those specifically identified, so long as they are used to reduce crime and improve public safety. The act provides maximum flexibility to localities while ensuring that funds are used to fight crime.

The act requires that grant funds supplement and not supplant State or local funds and there will be an amendment to the act to add a 10 percent match requirement to further assure that only the most worthy programs are supported by the block grants.

The bill authorizes a total of \$10 billion for the block grants over 5 years, with \$2 billion to be distributed in each of fiscal years 1996 through 2000. Units of local government can apply for funds each fiscal year. The formula for determining grant amounts is straight forward. It directs funds where they are most needed by taking into account the severity of crime and the population of a locality. Having examined the alternatives, I believe that the cur-

rent formula is the most equitable method of distributing resources, and that it keeps funding anomalies to a minimum.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 728 is precisely what the voters demanded on November 8. The majority of Americans said, "We want less government control coming out of Washington." They said, "We want government policymaking to be closer to the people where it will be more accountable to the taxpayers."

□ 1550

Finally they said that we do not want anymore expensive, unrealistic, pork programs coming out of Washington.

H.R. 728 meets those demands. It provides resources for localities to respond to their unique crime problems with their own unique solutions. Make no mistake, this bill will provide more money with greater flexibility to the vast majority of localities throughout America than last year's crime bill.

Also for those who might be concerned with what happens to the cops the President handing out money to some communities who can afford them in this fiscal year, they are protected and their funding for the full 3 years is also protected so they do not lose the opportunity for getting more police or the police that they have already gained. Some have said that we have obliterated that, and that is not true.

Mr. Chairman, the Local Government Law Enforcement Act of 1995 is an important way for the Federal Government to assist localities in dealing with crime without getting in their way. It is a rejection of the Washington-knows-best mindset that gave us the 1994 crime bill, and it provides far more resources for the counties, cities, and towns of America to develop home-grown solutions to their unique crime problems.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I think that this crime bill is a very, very interesting issue, and for anyone watching this, it must be very confusing to hear one side saying one thing and the other side saying, "No, that's not right, it's just the opposite."

So where is the truth? I must say that I just came from a press conference where the Federal Order of Police, the International Brotherhood of Police Officers, the major city chiefs, the National Organization of Police Officers, the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, the National Sheriffs Association, the Police Executive Research Forum, and the Police Foundation had representa-

tives there saying that in order to retain the police that we got under last year's bill, we really should stand firm and vote against the one today.

I know we just heard the opposite, so what do we believe and where do we go? Not only that, but why is it so important to sort all of this out?

First of all, I tend to believe the people who are in the field, the police officers. Having been on the Armed Services Committee, I found the biggest mistake we have always made year after year is that we never talk to the people who are out there trying to implement the stuff; we only talk to the people here in Washington who are trying to sell the stuff.

Yes, there may be a few local cities that do not agree, but the tremendous ground swell across the country is that they prefer last year's bill which targets police officers. And then we hear people say in answer to that, "Well, why should Washington say that? Why shouldn't it be up to the localities?"

Well, one of the reasons it is not up to the localities totally is because this is a partnership and because really the localities are supposed to be taking care of crime anyway, and the only reason the Federal Government got into this is that the localities felt they were totally overwhelmed. So if the localities felt they were overwhelmed by crime and violence in their neighborhoods and in their cities and they said to the Federal Government, "Please, please send resources," and since we all know the Federal Government does not have a lot of extra resources to send, because we would do much better to do debt-sharing than revenue sharing, and not only is there the threat of crime but there is the threat of the debt, we would be very stupid to send money out with no strings attached. So if we are going to send it out, we felt we ought to be prioritizing what it had to be spent for and put it into things that people agreed upon were the most concrete and realistic approach. And the No. 1 thing everyone seems to constantly agree upon is that we need more police officers, that if we see community policing, that is when crime rates go down; if we see more police out there so that they are not under the strain and stress of overwork or whatever, we see crime rates go down. The cities tell us they cannot get more police because it is so costly. So that is why we targeted the money, and that is why they say we need to continue targeting this money. I think that is very important.

Now, most localities would spend the money very well if we did not tell them that. Many of them would probably hire cops, but there would be some that would not. That was our lesson of LEAA, and as we all know, they say those who do not learn from history are condemned to repeat it.

So the prior bill does not totally micromanage in any way, shape or form, but it does say, "If you want

Federal dollars, then you are going to get more police." I think that is critical.

There are other parts in this bill that I think we lost out on, and that I find to be very sad. One is community schools. We all know the saying that it takes a village to raise a child. Well, in most of our villages, everything has collapsed except the schools. The community schools grant under the prior bill was one that we had more applications for than anything else. People understand that. The schools are there. It makes sense to utilize them in a much broader sense. It certainly makes a lot more sense to do that than go to orphanages, for heaven's sake. If we can utilize these on a full-day basis or an evening basis or weekend basis to help lift young people up rather than just focus on locking young people up, it makes a big difference. So that community schooling item would be gone if we do not pass this through. In other words, the interest last year was to bring everything to the table and see what the things are that we really need, because we in the Federal Government are not sitting around here awash in surpluses, for heaven's sake. Yet crime is foremost on people's minds. If we are going to send this money to localities, we should put some constraints on it, not micromanage, but put constraints around it, and I think they have done a very good job of coming up with one-page forms that people have to fill out. That is all there is to it. It is not complex, but we want to make sure that when we spend the money, we get police officers, or that when money is spent, community skills are rebuilding so that they lock something into that community. And we want to make sure that the Federal tax dollars are being spent in ways that we know are very effective crime-fighting ways.

There is no better way to fight crime than with police. I think that is why most police officers in this country have been very supportive of the prior crime bill, and I think that is also why people have been supportive of the prior prevention balance that was put in there.

So I urge the Members to try to listen to this debate and ask, what would you do? If you were representing the Federal Government and you were representing a Treasury awash in red ink and you are now going to share some of this money with communities because they say they are under siege, do you not think some direction should be given? Should it be totally to "go and spend it well. We know you won't mess up?"

Most of them will not, but some will, and if they will, we will all get condemned and people one more time will not believe that the Federal Government can do anything well.

I thought last year's bill was the perfect balance, or as perfect a balance, I guess, as one could have. I would just

hope that we can leave that in place because I think to take any of the strings off, to cut the strings off and say, "Here it is" at a time when we have such debts would be something most people would be a little leery of and would say, "Why don't you just keep the money in Washington, then, and deal with the threat of debt rather than the threat of crime?"

I think this makes sense, and I would hope the Members would proceed on that basis and support the bill as we know it and as it is going forward, since police officers find that it is working very well.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], a member of the committee.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 728.

Last Saturday President Clinton in his weekly radio address came out strongly opposed to this bill, saying that it would do away with the commitment that he and Congress made on the 100,000 cops on the beat that were promised in last year's crime bill. Unfortunately, the President is sorely misinformed on how much money is available in his own crime bill, and I believe he ought to apologize to the American people for spreading such misinformation around.

□ 1600

Let us look at the numbers in last year's crime bill and what is proposed in H.R. 728, and the American people will see that H.R. 728 has the potential of putting more cops on the beat than the crime bill that President Clinton signed into law last year.

Last year's crime bill provides \$8.8 billion for community policing over a 6-year period. That is \$1.47 billion a year. If the President says that that will pay for 100,000 police on the beat, that means that there is an average Federal payment of \$14,700 per police officer.

The average cost of a police officer is about \$70,000 a year, including the training and equipment expenses, as well as the expenses of hiring a new employee. That means that only about 21 percent of the total commitment of 100,000 cops on the beat will end up being funded by the Federal Government. So 21,000 cops is in the Democrat crime bill, which is a far cry from the 100,000 that the President and the supporters of last year's crime bill are claiming.

If you put it another way, if you subtract the Federal funding of the \$8.8 billion from what it would cost to put 100,000 cops on the beat, the local communities will have to come up with \$33 billion more in property tax revenue in order to put that number of police officers on the beat.

So the numbers that the President talked about simply do not add up, and I think that he and those who are using the 100,000 number ought to withdraw those claims quite promptly, because

the money from the Federal Government simply is not there.

Now, with all of these figures on the table, why is H.R. 728 a better approach? First, it increases the block grant for police to a potential of \$10 billion over 5 years. It takes away the strings that local governments have to put property taxpayers' money into paying for some of those expenses. The \$10 billion a year is on the assumption that the local communities would spend all of the Federal money on more police and none of it on prevention programs, such as midnight basketball and prisoner self-esteem.

Second, it is the local communities that decide how this money should be spent. What is true in New York City and what the needs are in Detroit is not necessarily what the needs are in Menomonee Falls, WI, or Orlando, FL, or some districts that are completely rural.

The beauty of block grants is that each community makes that determination for itself following a review of the advisory committee that was outlined by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM].

Now, I think that the advisory committee and the types of public hearings that have to be held before the actual expenditures are made is the perfect check against money being wasted by local government. But even if it is, that determination can be made by the voters in each local jurisdiction when they go to vote to reelect their mayors or town chairmen and their council members, because come election time, the mayor that has fettered away Federal law enforcement funds on things that do not make any sense at all would be hard pressed to explain to the voters of his or her community why the decision was made.

So that accountability and that responsibility to the voters of a particular community is the best check against the dissipation of the Federal funds to things that are not effective that there is.

Let us face it: Press and public scrutiny of government decisions at all levels of government is much stronger now than it was during the terrible years of the LEAA. I want to put my faith in local government. This whole question and this whole debate is a question of money and a question of control. I think that local government will do a much better job in spending this money wisely than keeping the control in Washington and the U.S. Department of Justice.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Chairman, I represent a city in my First Congressional District in Connecticut, a city that has very many exciting things about it. But like many cities in this modern day, we have some terrible problems.

Two years ago the problems really became much worse. We had the invasion of three different gangs, and the people in our town became very worried, not only worried, they became frightened. We had drive-by shootings; we had car hijackings. We had situations where people were thought to be somebody else and got shot.

Understandably our citizens remained disturbed, and people like myself who pretend to have some answers and hold ourselves out as elected officials who should be able to help, were equally disturbed. I really wondered what to do next. How could I help?

But something very positive happened and that was the crime bill we passed last year.

There were three things in that crime bill that held out hope to the people of my city. The first thing was additional cops. In that bill the cop program provided additional police for city streets. We had done other things. The Governor had sent in the State police, but that was so expensive it could only last a little while. We had a Federal crime task force, very needed, still going on, but people could not see these results quickly. They could see additional police in the streets.

The second thing that the crime bill did was it allowed preventive programs. Anybody who understands what was happening could see that these gangs are made up of very young individuals, and if we did not have alternative activities for these young individuals, they would go into the gangs.

So these preventive programs endorsed by everybody in law enforcement could be part of a solution to fight gang violence. We should keep those preventive programs so there is hope for the next generation. These activities not only included group sports but activities that help young people to stay in school and resist peer pressure.

The third thing we had in last year's bill was the concept of community policing. You have additional police, and where do you put those additional police? You put them on the streets of the individual neighborhoods. You put them where people can see them. You put them where people can talk to them. They get to know the neighborhood, the neighbors get to know them. When crime occurs everyone including the police know what is happening.

Mr. Chairman, the bill we passed last year was a good bill. I think we should keep that bill. It gives people hope that gang violence can be addressed and our cities can survive as safe places in which to live.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF], a member of the committee.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this weekend the President of the United States said, obviously referring to this bill, H.R. 728, that he would oppose, perhaps veto,

any bill that would jeopardize the number of police officers that would have been provided to communities under the bill that was passed last year.

I have two responses. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that this bill could provide even more police officers than were provided in the last crime bill. The fact of the matter is that this bill offers total flexibility between police programs and prevention programs to the communities, unlike the highly structured bill that was passed last year.

If the issue is police officers, then communities are free to use all of the money under H.R. 728 for the sole purpose of hiring police officers. This will generate more police officers than could ever be provided under the bill that we passed last year.

I think the real issue, and this is my second point, is not the number of police officers; it is micromanagement. In the crime bill as we passed it last year, for the police programs, for the prevention programs, are paragraph after paragraph and page after page of how to run your communities if you want to apply for these grants, and that is really the issue here. The crime bill passed last year sought to micromanage from the Congress and from the Federal Justice Department how communities are running their activities.

We recognize that a large share of fighting violent crime is at the local level, and therefore we tell the local governments use the funds as you think best, and you do not have to fill out a long application to Washington explaining to them in advance how you are going to set up programs that you think benefit your communities first. That is why, Mr. Chairman, the House should pass H.R. 728.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let me just say that this last part of the crime bill is probably the most important part of the crime bill that is before us, and it will determine, without any doubt, whether there is real balance in the bill. We have done the prisons part of the bill already. Many of us are worried even though we stand for the proposition that there ought to be tougher and increased sentencing, that the money will not go there and do it.

Now we have the same type of worry from the opposite end on these parts of the bill, because the block grant proposal that is part of H.R. 3 is unfortunately so wide open that just about anything can happen. Read the language and you will see that the money can be spent on anything at all.

□ 1610

If we stand for one thing in this crime bill, if we stood for one thing in 1994 and should stand for one thing in 1995, it is, no matter what else happens, there ought to be 100,000 new cops patrolling the streets. Cops are good for prevention and for punishment. In the whole crime bill last year, there were

many on the left who objected to the prevention parts. There were many on the right who objected to the punishment parts. There were many on the right who objected to the prevention parts. But no one objected to the cops. And yet the Republican proposal in one fell swoop says, there may be 100,000 cops or there may not be 100,000 cops. That is their basic problem.

Similarly, the Republican proposal has no guarantee of any type of prevention or of all types of prevention. The block grant is so wide that unlike the crime bill that is now law, money could go to the wildest and craziest prevention schemes. My colleagues, the basic problem with the proposal is that when we give a block grant, we are never certain where the money ends up. Some of it ends up in worthy purposes, but much of it is either wasted or spent on purposes the Congress, the taxpayers never, never envisioned. So there is a serious problem.

Tomorrow morning I will be offering an amendment that guarantees the 100,000 cops, along with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS]. That amendment will probably be the most important amendment in terms of crime fighting that any Member of this body will vote on for this entire Congress. This evening we will have some amendments that talk about keeping the prevention programs and some of the specific prevention programs, like drug courts and community schools that make a great deal of sense.

But the bottom line is this, my colleagues, do we want prisons and police and prevention or do we want pork? Because all the cries of last year that there could be pork in the crime bill will be hollow cries if this amendment is not agreed to and if the bill passes. Because there is no antipork provisions in this bill. We tried to put them in. We tried to put certain limitations without imposing mandates on the localities. But they are not there.

Is it any wonder that every major police organization supports the Schumer-Conyers amendment? None at all. Because, again, they know the money will go to police. And the police are what the American people need above all.

In conclusion, I would say to my colleagues, do not march in lockstep. The contract is doing pretty well. We have passed a lot of provisions, but we know that it is a lot better to guarantee the police than let local government spend it on sometimes good purposes but sometimes misused purposes.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI].

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Let me say that I stand here in this well as a Republican Member that worked in support of the crime bill that was passed by Congress last year. I thought it was a good crime bill. I

stand here today, Mr. Chairman, because I believe this is a much better crime bill.

When we talk about the law enforcement block grant sections that are under discussion today and will be voted on through today and tomorrow, I believe that that local discretion that we give our municipal leaders and our police commissioners is vitally important.

Let us be honest about things. In many cities such as my own, our mayor came and said that this money would not be used under the old crime bill to hire one additional police officer for the city of New York. Because after 5 years, when the Federal subsidy ran out, he, we, simply could not afford to continue that funding. Instead, he would use it as was allowed by the—

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. MOLINARI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, is the gentlewoman aware of the provisions that the mayor of our city fought for for permanent computers, permanent replacement that would keep cops on the beat long after the 5 years?

Ms. MOLINARI. Absolutely.

Mr. SCHUMER. Then, how can the gentlewoman say that New York, that her city, my city, the city we love, would not get cops after 5 years? The very provisions we wrote in the bill would make sure that they get cops for all the years this computer system is working.

Ms. MOLINARI. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I think that is a bit misleading to the American public who believes that under the crime bill passed last year that the city of New York would be able to go out and in fact bring on more police officers to the city of New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. That is exactly what will happen under last year's crime bill, according to the mayor.

Ms. MOLINARI. What it does is, it frees up the police officers. It does not add new police officers. Let me just say that the mayor of the city of New York has that very same discretion to utilize those funds to accomplish the very same purpose and, more importantly, additional purposes.

Something that was left out of last year's crime bill, in terms of the allowable uses of funding for officers such as the city of New York, would be that police officers who can be hired and trained now could be used to enhance school security measures and establishing crime prevention programs that may include things like citizen patrol program, sexual assault and domestic violence programs, programs intended to prevent juvenile crime, using our existing police officers to expand their abilities to deal with the growing and different trends of crimes in our streets and particularly in the city of New York.

I think this is a very valuable allowable use of crime prevention funds that

will enable our police officers, maybe not to add an additional person, although I do not think last year's crime bill will have added an additional person, but to allow those police officers to accomplish their jobs in a much more professional and dedicated manner.

I offer my wholehearted support to these improvements made in this particular area of the crime bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I would ask the gentlewoman, is she aware of the provisions in the existing crime bill?

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, yes, I am.

Mr. SCHUMER. Could they not do all of the things the gentlewoman talked about?

Ms. MOLINARI. I think that is debatable.

Mr. SCHUMER. Why? What is debatable about it?

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the language in last year's crime bill does not specify that we have a better opportunity of getting these grants if we can put forth a program that shows, for example, that this money would be used toward training police officers in domestic and sexual abuse.

Mr. SCHUMER. The gentlewoman is absolutely unfortunately correct. Specific provisions in last year's crime bill that the mayor of New York City sought would allow training of police officers and other types of things.

Ms. MOLINARI. The exact language is the grants may be used to procure equipment, technical or support systems or pay overtime.

Mr. SCHUMER. Exactly, that is in last year's bill as well as this year's bill.

Ms. MOLINARI. That was in last year's bill. That does not extend to this year's bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. It does, indeed, because this year's bill is even broader. It could be spent on those purposes. Would not the gentlewoman admit if New York City would not want to spend an additional nickel on police of any sorts, that that would be permissible under the present proposal, but it would not be permissible under the present law, last year's proposal; is that not correct?

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, I would submit that under this current crime bill, the city of New York has tremendous flexibility to deal with the problems that are affecting the city of New York. If my colleague will recall, our mayor stood here and said midnight basketball is a valuable prevention program. Many of the colleagues from other areas—

Mr. SCHUMER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, what I would simply say here is, very simply, that our bill, and

I do not think the gentlewoman has contradicted this, despite what she is talking about, midnight basketball, our bill would allow the money to go for many police uses. The existing proposal would not require any money to go to police. It could well be that not a nickel would go to police. There in lies the difference.

Mr. Chairman, how much time does each side have?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] has 9 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT], a member of the committee and the subcommittee.

□ 1620

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, a lot of motivation has been ascribed to some Members of the minority as to the furor over this bill. I want to make it clear that my furor is focused on the cut of \$2.5 billion from prevention and police, where it can make the most difference in responding to the problem of crime. We have debated whether or not the local government or the Federal Government will decide how the money will be spent. We have had examples of local law enforcement block grants with LEAA, but I want to make it clear that my personal furor is over the \$2.5 billion that the communities will have less to deal with.

We have seen drug courts which operate at one-twentieth of the cost of other programs and result in an 80 percent reduction in crime. We will have less money for those programs. We have seen community policing, very effective in reducing crime. Police officers have been put on the street as a result of last year's bill. We will have less money to do that. Prevention programs, reducing crime, less money to do that. We have heard of some organizations supporting the bill. We have not heard whether or not they support the \$2.5 billion cut.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we would restore the \$2.5 billion so the communities will have more money with which to fight crime.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to join my colleagues in opposing H.R. 728, the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant Act, and in supporting the Conyers-Schumer substitute which will be debated later this evening. The streets of my district, the Third District of Connecticut, are safer today because of the 1994 crime bill. Streets are becoming safer across this country because we are putting more police officers on the beat.

Mr. Chairman, last weekend I met with local law enforcement officials

and mayors in my district. They reiterated their support for community policing, and they asked me, "Why are you unraveling this bill? It is working. Give it more of a chance to work." The 1994 crime bill was passed and signed into law just last August. It is not even into effect for 6 months. They regard this as a bill that has already provided funding for 32 additional officers in 10 municipalities in my communities. They were united in their support for the course of this landmark legislation, and the course it has charted. The 1994 crime bill struck the right balance between prisons, police, and prevention. The bill was tough on criminals, as it should be, but it also recognized that the best way to deal with crime was to prevent it from happening in the first place. That means more community policing, more cops on the beat.

The 1994 crime bill guarantees that 100,000 more police will be on our streets by the year 2000. The Republicans' bill does not guarantee that even one new police officer will be hired over the next 5 years. Without the kinds of guidelines that were included in the 1994 bill's block grant programs, there is no guaranty that State and local officials will ever spend any resources in support of community policing and cops on the beat.

My police chiefs reminded me of prior law enforcement block grant programs that did not have guidelines, the kind we are talking about in the 1994 bill. They told me that they saw spending on cars for politicians, airplanes, and cash for consultants; even, I might add, armored tanks. The Conyers-Schumer substitute would restore funding that the 1994 crime bill promised the States and localities by putting back money into the Cops on the Beat Program. This was a promise that was made to the American public. I urge my colleagues to support our police and our communities by keeping our commitment to the cops, keeping our commitment to this program, programs that are making our streets safer, and the people who live in our communities feel more safe. Take a stand in support of our cities, our police, and our youth, Mr. Chairman, and support the Conyers-Schumer substitute.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, would the Chair advise me how much time remains on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT] has 4½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would advise the other side that we have no other speakers other than myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] has the right to close, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT] would then be recognized, if he seeks recognition.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, let me speak for a minute or two about what this debate and this bill is not about, and then talk a little bit about what it is about.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard in this debate that this is about whether the local government has control of this situation or whether the Federal Government has control of the funds. I think the debate that we will engage in shortly, Mr. Chairman, as we try to amend this bill, is about what will be effective in the crime-fighting context.

If we really think about it, Mr. Chairman, I have never seen any local government official or State government official who would refuse funding from the Federal Government, whether it has some strings attached to it or whether it has no strings attached to it.

If we ask a local government official "Would you rather have money that does not give you any guidance about how to use it," they will say "Give me the money." If we ask that same local government official "Would you take some money that gives you some guidance about how to use it," they will say "Give us the money. We need the money because we have a crime-fighting problem."

Therefore, the real issue here is not about whether we give the money to the local government, with some constraints or guidance, or no constraints and guidance. It is about having some mechanism for accountability.

Mr. Chairman, the real issue, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] has indicated during the course of this debate is whether we are going to have some programs that are dedicated to prevention and some programs that are dedicated to putting additional police officers on the street.

By knocking down the wall between the prevention programs and the police programs and saying we are just going to give you block grants, not only do we give more discretion to the local officials, and they will love it and say "Thank you; we do not want you to tell us anything about how we should use these funds," but what we are also doing is eliminating the opportunity we have for accountability for those funds at our level.

Mr. Chairman, it is our responsibility to build in some accountability in this process. My point, Mr. Chairman, is that we should have had in the last crime bill and we should have in this bill a process for evaluating and forcing local government officials, or if we retain last year's programs in place, the Federal Government, to have an evaluation process.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] is recognized for 1 minute.

(Mr. CONYERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1630

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, if I have ever seen a piece of legislation that might be a candidate for a veto, I think the block grant is it. I think replacing 100,000 policemen on the street and a prevention program that works versus a \$10 billion giveaway with no guarantees that takes \$2.5 billion out of prevention is the wrong way to go and is likely to run into great difficulty with the Clinton administration.

The amendment that I am going to offer with my colleague from New York and many other Members supporting would effectively strike the block grant program, replace it with the bipartisan police and prevention package that we had in the last bill and won the support of Governors, mayors and, yes, law enforcement officials at the local level.

So rather than cutting the authorized amount to \$10 billion, it would fully authorize the two packages at \$12.5 billion.

Mr. Chairman, if I've ever seen a candidate for a veto, this block grant is it. It replaces 100,000 cops on the street and prevention programs that work, with a \$10 billion giveaway that has no guarantees to cut crime.

Our amendment would effectively strike the block grant, and replace it with the bipartisan cops and prevention package, that has won support among Governors, mayors, law enforcement officers. Rather than cutting the authorized amount to \$10 billion, it would fully authorize the two packages at \$12.5 billion.

Mr. Chairman, interestingly after all is said and done in this debate, three things remain clear:

First, the Republican majority has not told us how this block grant differs from LEAA in the 1970's. What specific guarantees exist in the text of this bill to ensure against the enormous waste we experienced with LEAA?

Second, not only has the Republican majority refused to tell us how this differs from the failure of LEAA, it has refused to identify any experience that is more compelling than the date of the authorized prevention programs. They have not responded to the empirical data—such as the California study, the data on drug courts, or early childhood intervention—all of which show us the promise of these programs;

Third, the Republican block grant will not guarantee a single new police officer. Our amendment here will guarantee the promise of both 100,000 new cops and smart programs that ultimately reduce tax expenditures rather than waste them.

This is a choice between making every American safer by putting 20 percent more police on our streets—or putting every American's pocketbook at risk with a 100-percent federally funded giveaway of \$10 billion. A choice of a prevention package written on the past 20 years of experience at the local level, or a block grant that failed 20 years ago. Let's

not go back to failed polices of the past. Let's move forward in the 1990's with programs that we know will work.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the debate that we are now commenced in that will run over the better part of 10 hours today and tomorrow is offering the most striking difference to the American people between the two parties that we have had in a long time on the floor of the House.

Republicans basically believe in limited government, believe in a local block grant program for the crime prevention and the police opportunities that we have to fight crime, and the Democrats have always believed in the Federal Government knows best and that is what was in their crime bill last year.

We have a real opportunity to make a difference here when we vote on the local crime bill programs that we are offering out here in the next day or two. What is good for New Brunswick, GA, is not the same as what is good for Sacramento, CA or Madison, WI. The local communities know best. They should make that decision. That is what this debate is all about. We are going to decide that out here. I trust when it is all said and done, this Congress will give the right to the local communities to fight crime as they see fit, to make the decision of whether they want a new cop or whether they want a prevention program and to make sure that every community with a high crime rate in this country can participate and not exclude some as the present law does.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express numerous concerns about H.R. 728. At the outset I would like to commend the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. CONYERS, and the gentleman from New York, Mr. SCHUMER, for their efforts over the last week to improve these so-called crime bills that our Republican colleagues have brought to the floor. They have raised many important issues which have not been given proper consideration by the other side in their rush to bring bill after bill to the floor in order to meet an arbitrary 100-day deadline.

H.R. 728 is the final blow to the most comprehensive crime fighting legislation ever passed by Congress. The Crime Bill struck a smart balance between punishment and prevention. It had the support of police, local officials, Governors, community leaders, teachers, recreation directors, and many others across the country. Most importantly, it responded to the calls of the American people for safer neighborhoods by establishing a grant program to put 100,000 new police officers on our streets. Thanks to Herculean efforts by the Justice Department, funds have already been directed to thousands of communities, large and small, to hire approximately 17,000 new police. Importantly, these officers will be involved in community policing. Community policing has been proven successful over and over again in reducing crime and improving relations between law enforcement personnel and residents. Almost nothing works

better to deter crime than having officers highly visible in the community.

I say almost nothing because stopping crime from ever occurring works better than anything else to make our communities safe. By taking steps to address the root cause of crime—drug abuse, lack of educational and economic opportunity, and the decline of the family—we can prevent it from occurring in the first place. The Crime Bill took this proactive approach by allocating a small portion of the funds available to local communities for a wide range of worthwhile initiatives. Funds would be available for education, job training, anti-gang programs, drug treatment and after school and summer activities. Importantly, the bill did not impose solutions or program designs on communities. Instead, it provided broad discretion to communities to develop programs to meet their particular circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 728 will change all of this. It guts the prevention side of crime fighting, the proactive side, to fund more prisons and police, the reactive side. Of the \$5 billion previously allocated to prevention, this bill shifts \$2.5 billion to build more prisons according to a formula established by legislation passed by the House last week. Unfortunately, few states meet the requirements to receive funding and some estimate that states will have to spend \$60 billion on prison construction so that they can incarcerate prisoners long enough to qualify for assistance down the road. For my colleagues who are concerned about unfunded mandates, alarm bells should be going off.

The remaining \$2.5 billion will go into a new program relating to police officers. Unfortunately for the American people, this new program takes several steps backwards. First, it does not require that new officers to be engaged in community policing and may not result in 100,000 new police being put on the street. People want officers out of their cars and the station house and onto the streets of their neighborhoods. Communities which utilize community policing have seen their crime rates go down and relations between the police and residents dramatically improve. The Crime Bill encouraged this effective policy nationwide.

Virtually every major police organization in the country is opposed to altering the provisions of the Crime Bill relating to cops on the beat. The National Association of Police Organizations, the Law Enforcement Steering Committee, the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Sheriffs Association and the Police Executive Research Forum all strongly support the current program. Many of these groups are concerned that the provisions of H.R. 728 will not put 100,000 new police on our streets. I fail to see why the House would want to pass a bill which our law enforcement professionals say will undermine our efforts to put additional cops on the street. This is just another example of the unintended consequences of certain Republican policies which are not being provided careful scrutiny in committee.

I am also troubled by the fact this legislation eliminates the requirement that local communities pay part of the costs of hiring additional officers or buying new equipment. Law enforcement is a local function. Virtually no one in this chamber would argue that the Federal Government should begin paying for local police. Assistance in the Crime Bill is designed

to provide a rapid infusion of new officers to meet the challenges of violent crime. The Federal Government agreed to pay the vast majority of the costs, but asked local communities to make an investment as well. It only makes sense to ask communities to make a commitment to the safety of their residents. With a voluntary program, it makes even more sense to ask participants to pay part of the cost.

The need for a local contribution is more acute in light of efforts to pass a balanced budget amendment. I would like my Republican colleagues to explain how they plan to balance the budget by developing voluntary programs designed to meet profoundly local needs that don't require the local entity to put up any money? I know it is politically expedient to eliminate the local contribution. However, from a public policy and a budgetary standpoint, the things that should matter the most around here, this makes no sense. The Crime Bill struck a balance in this area, a balance which this bill destroys.

Finally, by eliminating support for prevention, I believe this bill will actually undermine efforts to substantially reduce crime in this country and drive up the costs of law enforcement. During debate on the Crime Bill last year, we all heard from communities across the Nation which have experienced substantial reductions in criminal activity when they set up after school programs, anti-gang initiatives, or provided job training to young people. Crime went down because kids had constructive things to do with their time and they were being given opportunities to do better in school or to learn a new skill that will help them get a good job down the road. Communities plagued by gang violence worked to combat it with programs to educate youngsters about the negative side of gangs and the list goes on and on. The bottomline is that communities are getting real results with prevention programs, results they aren't getting by sending more people to prison.

Prevention makes sense for several reasons. First, it is proactive, it works to reduce crime before it ever occurs, before the police have to be called and before someone goes to prison. The most effective way to make our communities safe is to stop crime in the first place. Second, prevention is probably the most cost-effective way to reduce crime. A community can invest \$25,000 in an anti-gang initiative which can serve countless young people. On the other hand, it costs about the same amount to incarcerate a single violent criminal for one year. We get a much greater return on the first \$25,000 than we do on the second. For people who want the Government to spend the American taxpayers' money wisely, nothing makes more sense than investing in prevention.

Mr. Chairman, this bill takes a giant step back in the fight against crime. It does not guarantee that 100,000 new police will be put on the streets, it does not stress community policing, and it repeals what I believe are the most cost-effective crime fighting programs. Major law enforcement organizations and our Nation's mayors and other elected officials have strong concerns about this bill. Moreover, it puts political expedience before good public policy by funneling billions to localities without requiring them to make an investment as well. I urge my colleagues to defeat this measure and preserve the existing cops on



the beat program as well as badly needed prevention initiatives.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 728. During the last session, the Democratic-led Congress passed a crime bill riddled with problems and weaknesses. Most notably, it would have spent billions of dollars on questionable social spending disguised as crime prevention.

The crime bill also placed so many conditions on local governments to receive Federal funds to hire more police that many could not even afford to apply for these funds.

To make matters worse, it assumed that all police departments needed or wanted to hire more police, ignoring the reality that many strongly felt that they could use the money in more effective and efficient ways—such as modernizing outdated equipment and hiring civilian office workers to move desk cops out on the streets.

Last year, I tried to offer an amendment to give local law enforcement flexibility to use these grants for these other important purposes—only to be rejected by the Rules Committee.

H.R. 728 addresses both problems. It authorizes \$10 billion of block grants over 5 years for law enforcement, replacing the police and crime prevention sections of the crime bill.

These grants can be used, among other things, to hire new officers, purchase equipment and technology directly related to law enforcement, pay overtime to current officers, enhance school security and establish citizen neighborhood watch programs. In other words, the \$4 billion in mandated social spending in the crime bill are gone and police departments now have the flexibility to spend Federal funds as they see fit.

After all, they are the ones on the front lines in the war on crime and certainly know better than Washington bureaucrats how to more effectively combat our crime problem.

Mr. Chairman, I am also very pleased that H.R. 728 preserves the Violence Against Women Act provisions in last year's crime bill.

This section created Federal penalties for interstate stalking or domestic abuse, strengthened existing Federal penalties for repeat sexual offenders and required restitution to victims in Federal sex offense cases. In addition, it created a civil rights violation for violent crimes motivated by gender, allowing victims of such crimes to sue for damages or court-ordered injunctions.

The act also authorized \$1.6 billion over 6 years for programs to fight violence against women.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 728—in combination with the other crime bills passed by the House during the past week—is a vast improvement on last year's crime bill and I urge my colleagues' support of this legislation.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, we all recall last year's unfounded cries by the GOP that the 1994 crime bill was loaded with pork. Well, I've got news for you and the American people watching this debate today. H.R. 728, the Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants Act, is the true oinker. This thing squeals so loud, you'd think we were considering a farm bill instead of a crime bill.

Last year, the body made a commitment to the American people that we would tackle their concerns about crime with a targeted, smart, understanding approach and we did just that. Unfortunately, my Republican colleagues have decided to ditch this approach in

the name of political expediency and, ironically, have left a pigsty in their wake.

H.R. 728 is an absolute boondoggle. This legislation promises a whole heck of a lot, but guarantees absolutely nothing but the potential for abuse: \$10 billion of taxpayer funds will be shuttled to States and localities for the broad, general purpose of reducing crime and improving public safety with no specific goals up front and no indications that these funds will be spent responsibly.

Like the old Law Enforcement Assistance Administration grants that were plagued by mismanagement and fraud and finally terminated during the Reagan administration, grants under H.R. 728 could potentially go toward the purchase of so-called police patrol cars employed by high-ranking local officials for personal use, to support patronage jobs in law enforcement agencies, or to fund crime consultants whose only aim is to bilk the government.

My constituents strongly supported the addition of 100,000 officers to walk the streets, interacting in a positive way with average citizens and community leaders, strengthening the ties between law enforcement and localities, creating a safer environment in which our children can grow. Residents of several neighborhoods in my district in Chicago, such as North Lawndale and Austin, have been successful for some time now in organizing citizen partnerships with local authorities to tackle problems as they arise and ensure the continued vitality of the areas in which they work and live. In addition, suburbs in my district such as Maywood and Bellwood, IL, have worked diligently to create viable community policing programs and are in the process of starting these programs with the help of the 1994 crime bill.

H.R. 728 severely jeopardizes this progress. In fact, under this bill, there are no assurances that a single police officer will be hired.

Even more distressing is the fact that most all prevention moneys from last year's comprehensive crime legislation are gone, including the \$1.6 billion in long-awaited funds for the Local Partnership Act to grant cities the resources necessary to implement proven, cost-effective and much-needed health and educational crime prevention programs. Gone with that act is the 10-percent Federal set-aside I was able to include which would have provided localities across the Nation with the incentive to partner with small minority or women-owned businesses. I guess the GOP would rather build walls around some of the most disadvantaged areas of our cities and towns than provide relief and the hope of a successful future to hundreds of small enterprises and the neighborhoods in which they are located.

Also gone are the following: \$810 million in grants for a variety of after-school and summer programs for at-risk youth involving education, tutoring, and job preparation; \$626 million for up to 15 model programs intended to expand community services and new prevention strategies in high-crime, low-income areas; \$270 million for local community development corporations to implement vital economic revitalization projects such as those being undertaken on the West Side of Chicago, in my district, with the help of organizations like Bethel New Life, Inc.; and \$45 million in BATF gang prevention and education initiatives.

So as you can clearly see, we have before us a bill that substitutes uncertainty and irresponsibility for clarity and accountability. The American people have hardly called for such an extreme reversal.

Mr. Chairman, my Republican colleagues have rejected the common sense notion that giving individuals and families a greater stake in their communities, as we did in last year's crime legislation, is the best way to attack and deter lawlessness. They have rejected the belief that we need to provide hope and opportunity where there is little or none. They have rejected the fact that the threat of punishment and retribution neither prevents nor stops crime from occurring on its own. I strongly suggest we reject their irrational attempt to gut the 1994 crime bill. Vote "no" on H.R. 728.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. MOLINARI) having assumed the chair, Mr. GUNDERSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 728) to control crime by providing law enforcement block grants, had come to no resolution thereon.

---

#### SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

---

#### PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN COMMITTEES TO SIT DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Madam Speaker, I ask special leave that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule:

Government Reform and Oversight; the Judiciary; Science; Small Business; and Transportation and Infrastructure.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, I just wanted to make sure that all of this had been cleared. We have determined with our leadership that it has.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.