

[From Investor's Business Daily, June 19, 1995]

CLINTON'S REAL RECORD ON CRIME  
(By John A. Barnes)

President Clinton's high-profile demand for an anti-terrorism bill has no doubt beefed up his image as "tough on crime."

Indeed, he has made co-opting the crime issue—traditionally a Republican preserve—a high priority for his administration and his party.

To that end, he pushed hard to pass last year's widely attacked crime bill, which the president bragged would add 100,000 new police officers to the streets. (The law is being rewritten by the new Republican Congress.)

But Clinton's "tough on crime" posturing has not been backed up by money for federal law enforcement since he took office.

In listing his priorities for funding, he repeatedly has sought to withdraw resources from the sharp end of federal law enforcement—the FBI, the DEA, U.S. attorneys' offices—while transferring funds to such areas as antitrust law, child abuse and civil rights.

For instance, 320 new FBI agents were trained in 1992 at the FBI's Academy, the last full year of the Bush administration. But not a single new agent graduated from the academy in 1993.

And Clinton asked for no new funding for new agents in his fiscal 1995 budget either, the first one for which he had a full year to prepare. Congress has approved around 600 new agents for this year.

In that same fiscal 1995 budget, Clinton forecast dropping the number of full-time equivalent FBI positions by 854, from 21,568 in 1993 to 20,714 by 1995, including a reduction of 436 special agents. The 1994 number was 21,034.

The argument could be made, of course, that with the winding down of the Cold War, the FBI no longer needs as many agents to fight domestic spying as it once did. And several hundred agents have been transferred from such work to more conventional law enforcement duties.

One would think that moving agents from espionage work to fighting more conventional street crime, however, would mean an increase in mid-career retraining. But that doesn't appear to be the case.

The number of agents receiving such training at the FBI academy has fallen sharply, from 14,741 in 1992 to 2,677 in 1994. The number of state and local police officers receiving training at the academy has likewise seen a sharp drop, from 7,395 in 1992 to 3,710 in 1994.

The Cold War may be over, but the war on drugs has not let up, and the cuts have been felt just as keenly at the Drug Enforcement Administration as at the FBI.

In 1992, 347 new DEA special agents underwent training. Like the FBI, that number fell to zero in 1993. The Clinton administration's fiscal 1995 budget forecast training no new DEA agents in 1994 or 1995 either.

The number of special agents fell by 123 between 1992 and 1994 and total DEA personnel was slated under the Clinton budget to fall from 6,149 in 1993 to 5,388 in 1995. The number in 1994 was 5,450.

DEA arrests fell from 7,878 in the last full year under Bush to 5,279 in 1994. Drug-related arrests made in cooperation with overseas law enforcement fell from 1,856 in 1992 to 1,522 in 1994.

Clandestine drug labs seized by specially trained DEA teams fell from 335 in 1992 to 272 in 1994.

Laboratory exhibits analyzed by DEA lab technicians in 1994 totaled 37,667, down from 41,225 two years earlier.

Forensic chemists trained by the DEA fell from 20 in 1992 to zero in 1994.

"Diversion" specialists—who investigate the diversion of prescription drugs from the licit to the illicit market—undergoing training fell from 40 in 1992 to none in 1994.

New DEA intelligence specialists, 140 of whom were trained in 1992, dropped to exactly zero in 1994.

The Interagency Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Forces have seen their budgets stagnate, meaning they have been reduced in real terms after inflation has been taken into account. Total spending on these task forces was \$390.3 million in 1992. That outlay dropped to \$387.4 million in 1993 and then to \$385.2 million in 1994.

#### DROPPING PROSECUTIONS

Not surprisingly, given this withdrawal of resources, narcotics prosecutions have fallen 25% in just those two years, from 6,936 to 5,177.

And all this is taking place at a time when the University of Michigan's 1994 High School Drug Survey shows that drug use among adolescents has climbed in the last two years, coming after the end of the Reagan-Bush era's "Just Say No" campaign. Marijuana use has doubled among eighth-graders, jumped two-thirds among 10th graders and one-third among 12th graders.

The Drug Abuse Warning Network of the National Institutes of Health has reported that emergency room admissions for cocaine-related emergencies rose 8% in 1993 and those for heroin are up 31%.

#### ANTI-DRUG PROGRAMS

At the same time, the Justice Department's funding for anti-drug-abuse programs has been cut back. From \$497.5 million in the last year of the Bush administration, the program was reduced to \$474.5 million in 1994.

"There's no question they've de-emphasized drug enforcement," said conservative legal analyst Bruce Fein. "I'm not sure if you could call the change dramatic, but it is noticeable."

Despite all the publicity given the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms for its ill-fated raids in Waco, Texas, and in Idaho, the number of federal prosecutions for firearms-related violations has also fallen consistently under Clinton. There were 3,917 such prosecutions in 1992, a number that fell to 3,636 in 1993 and then 3,113 in 1994, a 20.5% fall.

At the same time, Clinton has been adding to the number of crimes on the federal statute books. In last year's crime bill, for instance, the following became federal crimes for the first time: murder by a federal prisoner or federal prison escapee; drive-by shootings; murder of a state or local police officer assisting in a federal investigation; use of a weapon of "mass destruction" resulting in death.

But it hasn't been all cutting at the Clinton Justice Department. Some programs have received large increases in funding and clearly have Clinton's approval.

One is the antitrust division, presided over by Ann Bingaman, wife of Sen. Jeff Bingaman, D-N.M.

In the fiscal 1995 budget, the president asked to have its net outlays increased from \$40.2 million to \$50.8 million, a better than 20% increase. The actual outlays, as is almost always the case, turned out to be less than the requested figure, \$47.3 million.

This division's major triumph recently was forcing Microsoft Corp.—one of the country's most successful companies—to give up its effort to merge with Intuit Inc., the leading publisher of personal finance software.

In addition, the unit announced it was looking into Microsoft's planned on-line service for possible antitrust problems.

Appropriations for programs that help victims of child abuse, a particular favorite of

Attorney General Janet Reno, more than tripled during the first two years under Clinton, rising from barely \$2 million in Bush's last year to \$7.5 million in 1994.

Interestingly, missing children—which was the alarm bell issue of a decade ago—is apparently no longer "hot." From just over \$10 million in 1993, the budget for this program was cut back to \$6.6 million a year later.

Yet the budget for "conflict resolution programs" in the department's Community Relations Service was increased from \$9.1 million in 1992 to \$9.3 million a year later to \$9.6 million in 1994.

The Justice Department is also now responsible for enforcing the Violence Against Women Act, which was a part of the 1994 Clinton crime bill.

The president's speech March 21 at the opening of the department's new office to enforce the act reflects Clinton's view of law enforcement well.

The president reeled off a stream of statistics supposedly showing that crime against women was soaring.

The president claimed that rapes were increasing three times faster than the overall crime rate. "Domestic violence," the president declared, was the "No. 1 health risk" to women between the ages of 15 and 44, "a bigger threat than cancer or car accidents."

But his numbers do not accord with government data or academic research in the area. Sociologists Dwayne Smith and Ellen Kuchta, writing in *Social Science Quarterly*, concluded there is no evidence that crimes against women are increasing faster than the overall crime rate and that, if anything, the rate seems to have decreased somewhat.

The study that supposedly showed domestic violence to be the "No. 1 threat" to young and middle-aged women was done in a single hospital emergency room in a high-crime neighborhood in inner-city Philadelphia. It counted street crime victims as well as victims of domestic violence.

#### CIVIL RIGHTS ACTIONS

The civil rights unit of Justice has received a 20% increase in funding under Clinton. Under Deval Patrick, the unit has become one of the busiest and highest profile agencies in government.

Patrick has specialized in using threats of civil rights lawsuits—and attendant bad publicity—to reach "consent decrees" with banks to loan more money to blacks and other minorities. This despite the fact that the proof of intentional discrimination by such institutions is sketchy at best.

The administration has engaged in plenty of other questionable law enforcement.

The Housing and Urban Development Department, for instance, has sought to bulldoze opposition to plans to place criminal halfway houses and drug rehabilitation centers in middleclass neighborhoods by threatening opponents with civil rights violations.

#### BUDGET RESOLUTION AGREEMENT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I was pleased to join last night with Speaker GINGRICH and the chairmen of the Budget Committees, Senator DOMENICI and Congressman KASICH, in announcing an agreement between the Senate and House on the budget resolution—a monumental budget which will balance our Nation's books for the first time in more than a quarter of a century. As we said last night, this agreement is another historic step in bringing the Federal budget into balance in 7 years by slowing the growth of Government

spending, by making Government leaner, more efficient and more cost-effective.

This budget finally turns off the out-of-control big government spending machine, and puts us on a responsible path to prosperity America can rely on well into the next century.

While we ratchet down the deficit to zero by the year 2002, we also provide for \$245 billion in long overdue tax relief, putting more money in the pockets of American families and providing incentives for savings, economic growth and job creation. Importantly, this budget takes action to preserve, improve, and protect Medicare, while permitting Medicare and Medicaid spending to increase dramatically in the next 7 years. Furthermore, this budget does not touch Social Security, and it maintains our commitment to national security second to none.

The American people have been drowning in a sea of red ink, and this budget provides the liferaft they have been waiting for. Now, I know our opponents will try to deflate that liferaft with their sharp partisan darts and routine scare tactics, but the American people will not be fooled. They know the status quo is no longer acceptable, and they know leadership means making tough decisions.

Mr. President, this agreement reflects the product of countless hours of hard work, and on the Senate side, that effort has been led by my friend from New Mexico, Senator DOMENICI. The taxpayers of America are fortunate to have Senator DOMENICI on their side. He has done a remarkable job leading this historic effort, and I look forward to continuing to work with him to ensure enactment of the balanced budget. I would also like to commend our Senate Republican conferees for their crucial role in forging this agreement: Senators LOTT, BROWN, GRASSLEY, GORTON, GREGG, and NICKLES.

I think the icing on the cake would be if the President of the United States would announce his public support for a constitutional amendment for a balanced budget.

We are just one vote short in the Senate. I am certain the President of the United States could find that one vote with the six Senators who voted against the balanced budget this year, when they voted for it last year on the Democratic side.

Mr. President, I look forward to bringing this balanced budget conference report to the floor next week. We hope it will be no later than Thursday, but it could be on Friday. By statute, there are 10 hours of debate, and we will complete action on the budget resolution next week.

#### BAD NEWS FOR BOSNIA

Mr. DOLE. Finally, Mr. President, I have made a number of statements over the past couple of years on Bosnia. I keep thinking maybe someday there will be some good news about

Bosnia; that people who do not really focus on it very much—Democrats, Republicans, it is not a partisan issue—maybe there is some good news that people might feel good about if they watch TV or listen to the radio or watch television.

But I am afraid there is more bad news on the Bosnian fronts.

First, word leaked out of a letter from Boutros Boutros-Ghali's Special Envoy, Yasushi Akashi, to Radovan Karadzic, the Bosnian Serbs' militant leader, intended to assure the Bosnian Serbs that despite the deployment of the European Rapid Reaction Force [RRF], the United Nations would continue business as usual in Bosnia.

I have obtained a copy of that letter. I would note that the letter is addressed to H.E. Dr. Radovan Karadzic—the H.E. stands for His Excellency—a term usually reserved for dignitaries and government officials, not alleged war criminals.

The letter reads, and I quote:

I wish to assure you that these theatre reserve forces will operate under the existing United Nations peace-keeping rules of engagement and will not in any way change the essential peace-keeping nature of the UNPROFOR mission. While the reserves will enhance UNPROFOR's security, the understanding and cooperation of the parties themselves will be the best guarantor of the force's continued effectiveness as an impartial force. The United Nations, troop contributing states and the Security Council have all recognized that the reserve force cannot and will not be a substitute for a political process aimed at an overall peaceful settlement of the Bosnian conflict.

Once again, Yasushi Akashi did what he does best as the United Nations' appeaser on the front lines: delivers good news to the Serbs, and bad news to the Bosnians.

This morning, we read that the French held secret negotiations with the Serbs—in Pale and in the ethnically cleansed city of Zvornik. Reportedly, the French promised that in return for the release of the U.N. hostages, NATO would not conduct any further airstrikes on Serb positions. A lot of people suspected that and maybe this now makes it a fact.

Mr. President, the message is crystal clear: The United Nations has abandoned its mandate of protecting the so-called safe areas and intends to continue to bend to the will of the Serbs. And, it has done so not in the Security Council through a vote, but in back rooms with Serb militants whom French President Jacques Chirac publicly called "Terrorists."

When President Chirac met with congressional leaders he called for an end to the humiliation of the peacekeepers. In my view, letting war criminals blackmail the leaders of the Western World is humiliating—and an absolute outrage.

This brings us to the matter of the rapid reaction force, which is intended by the British and French to protect the U.N. forces in Bosnia. From these reports it is obvious that the rapid re-

action force will not change the way UNPROFOR conducts its business. In other words, UNPROFOR will not do the job it was tasked to do by the Security Council in numerous resolutions—whether or not the rapid reaction force is deployed. In fact, the rapid reaction force appears designed to protect UNPROFOR so that it can continue not doing its job.

And this brings us finally to the question of why the United States should subsidize the rapid reaction force, let alone the entire UNPROFOR operation. We know that the taxpayer's dollars are being dumped in a big black hole because international leaders do not have the courage to do what is right and what is smart—and that is to withdraw the U.N. forces and lift the arms embargo on Bosnia. Can we in good conscience continue to appropriate funds for such a failure?

Well, the administration appears committed to this massive multilateral mess. In today's New York Times, administration officials were cited as considering the use of funds designated for humanitarian aid to pay for a U.S. contribution of about \$100 million to the rapid reaction force. While there are budgetary reasons such a shift would be difficult, congressional opposition would likely be strong. The fact that anyone in the administration is thinking along these lines is shocking. People in Sarajevo and elsewhere in Bosnia are hungry—they cannot eat European pride. Furthermore, virtually the only effective United States activity in Bosnia and Herzegovina has been the provision of emergency humanitarian assistance.

Mr. President, the U.N. operation in Bosnia is in a meltdown. Now is the time to cut our losses, not sink more resources into a failed investment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent a letter I referred to be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.N. PEACE FORCES HEADQUARTERS,  
Zagreb, June 19, 1995.

DR. RADOVAN KARADZIC,  
*Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Former Yugoslavia.*

DEAR DR. KARADZIC: I wish to inform you that the Security Council has recently reviewed the latest report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of the mandate of UNPROFOR. On 16 June 1995, it adopted resolution 998 (1995), a copy of which is attached for your information. This resolution covers a number of different issues, including the status of the safe areas, and makes provision for the establishment of a rapid reaction capacity to enable UNPROFOR to carry out its mandate in a secure and safe environment.

Despite the recent intensification in hostilities, the United Nations and troop contributors remain committed to the continued presence of UNPROFOR in order to alleviate the suffering of all the people of Bosnia, and to facilitate the earliest possible end to hostilities through peaceful means. However, risks to UNPROFOR have increased dramatically and there has been a marked lack of respect by all sides with the