

NOT VOTING—9

Boswell Jackson (IL) Reyes
 Butterfield Kingston Smith (TX)
 Campbell Lungren, Daniel
 Gingrey (GA) E.

□ 1617

Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. HARMAN and Mr. ENGEL changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GREEN ENERGY EDUCATION ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 957, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 957.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 6, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 199]

YEAS—411

Abercrombie Buyer Dicks
 Ackerman Calvert Dingell
 Aderholt Camp Doggett
 Adler (NJ) Cantor Donnelly (IN)
 Akin Cao Doyle
 Alexander Capito Dreier
 Altmire Capps Driehaus
 Andrews Capuano Duncan
 Arcuri Cardoza Edwards (MD)
 Austria Carnahan Edwards (TX)
 Baca Carney Ehlers
 Bachmann Carson (IN) Ellison
 Bachus Carter Ellsworth
 Baird Cassidy Emerson
 Baldwin Castle Engel
 Barrett (SC) Castor (FL) Eshoo
 Barrow Chaffetz Etheridge
 Bartlett Chandler Fallin
 Barton (TX) Childers Farr
 Bean Clarke Fattah
 Becerra Clay Filner
 Berkley Cleaver Fleming
 Berman Clyburn Forbes
 Berry Coble Fortenberry
 Biggert Coffman (CO) Foster
 Bilbray Cohen Foxx
 Bilirakis Cole Frank (MA)
 Bishop (GA) Conaway Franks (AZ)
 Bishop (NY) Connolly (VA) Frelinghuysen
 Bishop (UT) Conyers Fudge
 Blackburn Cooper Gallegly
 Blumenauer Costa Garrett (NJ)
 Blunt Costello Gerlach
 Boccieri Courtney Giffords
 Boehner Crenshaw Gohmert
 Bonner Crowley Gonzalez
 Bono Mack Cuellar Goodlatte
 Boozman Culberson Gordon (TN)
 Boren Cummings Graves
 Boucher Dahlkemper Grayson
 Boustany Davis (AL) Green, Al
 Boyd Davis (CA) Green, Gene
 Brady (PA) Davis (IL) Griffith
 Brady (TX) Davis (KY) Grijalva
 Braley (IA) Davis (TN) Guthrie
 Bright Deal (GA) DeFazio
 Brown (SC) DeFazio Gutierrez
 Brown, Corrine DeGette Hall (NY)
 Brown-Waite, Delahunt Hall (TX)
 Ginny DeLauro Halvorson
 Buchanan Dent Hare
 Burgess Diaz-Balart, L. Harman
 Burton (IN) Diaz-Balart, M. Harper

Hastings (FL) McCaul Ryan (WI)
 Hastings (WA) McCollum Salazar
 Heinrich McCotter Sanchez, Linda
 Heller McGovern T.
 Hensarling McHenry Sanchez, Loretta
 Herger McHugh Sarbanes
 Herseth Sandlin McIntyre Scalise
 Hill McKeon Schakowsky
 Himes McMahan Schauer
 Hinchey McMorris Schiff
 Hinojosa Rodgers Schmidt
 Hirono McNeerney Schock
 Hodes Meeke (FL) Schrader
 Hoekstra Meeke (NY) Schwartz
 Holden Melancon Scott (GA)
 Holt Mica Scott (VA)
 Honda Michaud Sensenbrenner
 Hoyer Miller (FL) Serrano
 Hunter Miller (MI) Sessions
 Inglis Miller (NC) Sestak
 Inslee Miller, Gary Shea-Porter
 Israel Miller, George Sherman
 Issa Minnick Shimkus
 Jackson-Lee Mitchell Shuler
 (TX) Mollohan Shuster
 Jenkins Moore (KS) Simpson
 Johnson (GA) Moore (WI) Sires
 Johnson (IL) Moran (KS) Skelton
 Johnson, E. B. Moran (VA) Slaughter
 Johnson, Sam Murphy (CT) Smith (NE)
 Jones Murphy, Patrick Smith (NJ)
 Jordan (OH) Murphy, Tim Smith (WA)
 Kagen Murtha Snyder
 Kanjorski Myrick Souder
 Kaptur Nadler (NY) Space
 Kennedy Napolitano Speier
 Kildee Neal (MA) Spratt
 Kilpatrick (MI) Neugebauer Stark
 Kilroy Nunes Stearns
 Kind Nye Stupak
 King (IA) Oberstar Sullivan
 King (NY) Obey Sutton
 Kirk Olson Tanner
 Kirkpatrick (AZ) Olver Tauscher
 Kissell Ortiz Taylor
 Klein (FL) Pallone Teague
 Kline (MN) Pascrell Terry
 Kosmas Pastor (AZ) Thompson (CA)
 Kratochvil Paulsen Thompson (MS)
 Kucinich Payne Thompson (PA)
 Lamborn Pence Thornberry
 Lance Perlmutter Tiahrt
 Langevin Perriello Tiberi
 Larsen (WA) Peters Tierney
 Larson (CT) Latham Duncan
 Latham Peterson Titus
 LaTourette Pingree (ME) Petri
 Latta Pitts Tonko
 Lee (CA) Platts Towns
 Lee (NY) Poe (TX) Tsongas
 Levin Polis (CO) Turner
 Lewis (CA) Pomeroy Upton
 Lewis (GA) Posey Van Hollen
 Linder Price (GA) Velázquez
 Lipinski Price (NC) Visclosky
 LoBiondo Putnam Walden
 Loeb sack Quigley Walz
 Lofgren, Zoe Rahall Wamp
 Lowey Rangel Wasserman
 Lucas Rehberg Schultz
 Luetkemeyer Reichert Waters
 Lujan Lujan Rodriguez Watson
 Lummis Rodriguez Watt
 Mack Rogers (AL) Waxman
 Maffei Rogers (KY) Weiner
 Maloney Rogers (MI) Welch
 Manzullo Rohrabacher Westmoreland
 Marchant Rooney Wexler
 Markey (CO) Ros-Lehtinen Whitfield
 Markey (MA) Roskam Wilson (OH)
 Marshall Ross Wilson (SC)
 Massa Rothman (NJ) Wittman
 Matheson Roybal-Allard Wolf
 Matsui Royce Woolsey
 McCarthy (CA) Ruppersberger Wu
 McCarthy (NY) Ryan (OH) Yarmuth
 Young (FL)

NAYS—6

Broun (GA) McClintock Shadegg
 Flake Paul Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—15

Boswell Kingston Reyes
 Butterfield Lungren, Daniel Roe (TN)
 Campbell E. Rush
 Gingrey (GA) Lynch Smith (TX)
 Higgins McDermott
 Jackson (IL) Radanovich

□ 1627

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. CON. RES. 13, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSTER). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on Senate Concurrent Resolution 13: Messrs. SPRATT, BOYD, Ms. DELAURO, Messrs. RYAN of Wisconsin, and HENSARLING.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken tomorrow.

COPS IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2009

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1139) to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to enhance the COPS ON THE BEAT grant program, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1139

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “COPS Improvements Act of 2009”.

SEC. 2. COPS GRANT IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1701 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a) GRANT AUTHORIZATION.—The Attorney General shall carry out grant programs under which the Attorney General makes grants to States, units of local government, Indian tribal governments, other public and private entities, multi-jurisdictional or regional consortia, and individuals for the purposes described in subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e). Grants under this subsection shall be awarded on a competitive basis.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking the subsection heading text and inserting “COMMUNITY POLICING AND CRIME PREVENTION GRANTS”;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “, to increase the number of officers deployed in community-oriented policing”;

(C) by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

“(4) award grants to pay for or train officers hired to perform intelligence, anti-terror, or homeland security duties.”;

(D) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

“(5) award grants to hire school resource officers and to establish school-based partnerships between local law enforcement agencies and local school systems to combat crime, gangs, drug activities, and other problems in and around elementary and secondary schools;”;

(E) by striking paragraph (9);

(F) by redesignating paragraphs (10) through (12) as paragraphs (9) through (11), respectively;

(G) by striking paragraph (13);

(H) by redesignating paragraphs (14) through (17) as paragraphs (12) through (15), respectively;

(I) in paragraph (14), as so redesignated, by striking “and” at the end;

(J) in paragraph (15), as so redesignated, by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(K) by adding at the end the following:

“(16) establish and implement innovative programs to reduce and prevent illegal drug manufacturing, distribution, and use, including the manufacturing, distribution, and use of methamphetamine;

“(17) hire and rehire civilian forensic analysts and laboratory personnel;

“(18) establish criminal gang enforcement task forces, consisting of members of Federal, State, and local law enforcement authorities (including Federal, State, and local prosecutors), for the coordinated investigation, disruption, apprehension, and prosecution of criminal gangs and offenders involved in local or multi-jurisdictional gang activities; and

“(19) award enhancing community policing and crime prevention grants that meet emerging law enforcement needs.”;

(3) by striking subsection (c);

(4) by striking subsections (h) and (i);

(5) by redesignating subsections (d) through (g) as subsections (f) through (i), respectively;

(6) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) TROOPS-TO-COPS PROGRAMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Grants made under subsection (a) may be used to hire former members of the Armed Forces to serve as career law enforcement officers for deployment in community-oriented policing, particularly in communities that are adversely affected by a recent military base closing.

“(2) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, ‘former member of the Armed Forces’ means a member of the Armed Forces of the United States who has been honorably discharged from the Armed Forces of the United States.

“(d) COMMUNITY PROSECUTORS PROGRAM.—The Attorney General may make grants under subsection (a) to pay for additional community prosecuting programs, including programs that assign prosecutors to—

“(1) handle cases from specific geographic areas; and

“(2) address counter-terrorism problems, specific violent crime problems (including intensive illegal gang, gun, and drug enforcement) and quality of life initiatives, and localized violent and other crime problems based on needs identified by local law enforcement agencies, community organizations, and others.

“(e) TECHNOLOGY GRANTS.—The Attorney General may make grants under subsection (a) to develop and use new technologies (including interoperable communications technologies, modernized criminal record technology, and forensic technology) to assist State and local law enforcement agencies in reorienting the emphasis of their activities from reacting to crime to preventing crime and to train law enforcement officers to use such technologies.”;

(7) in subsection (f), as so redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “to States, units of local government, Indian tribal governments, and to other public and private entities.”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “define for State and local governments, and other public and private entities,” and inserting “establish”;

(C) in the first sentence of paragraph (3), by inserting “(including regional community policing institutes)” after “training centers or facilities”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) EXCLUSIVITY.—The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services shall be the exclusive component of the Department of Justice to perform the functions and activities specified in this part.”;

(8) in subsection (g), as so redesignated, by striking “may utilize any component”, and all that follows and inserting “shall use the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services of the Department of Justice in carrying out this part.”;

(9) in subsection (h), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking “subsection (a)” the first place that term appears and inserting “paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b)”;

(B) by striking “in each fiscal year pursuant to subsection (a)” and inserting “in each fiscal year for purposes described in paragraph (1) and (2) of subsection (b)”;

(10) in subsection (i), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking “the Federal share shall decrease from year to year for up to 5 years” and inserting “unless the Attorney General waives the non-Federal contribution requirement as described in the preceding sentence, the non-Federal share of the costs of hiring or rehiring such officers may be less than 25 percent of such costs for any year during the grant period, provided that the non-Federal share of such costs shall not be less than 25 percent in the aggregate for the entire grant period, but the State or local government should make an effort to increase the non-Federal share of such costs during the grant period”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The preceding sentences shall not apply with respect to any program, project, or activity provided by a grant made pursuant to subsection (b)(4).”; and

(11) by adding at the end the following:

“(j) RETENTION OF ADDITIONAL OFFICER POSITIONS.—For any grant under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (b) for hiring or rehiring career law enforcement officers, a grant recipient shall retain each additional law enforcement officer position created under that grant for not less than 12 months after the end of the period of that grant, unless the Attorney General waives, wholly or in part, the retention requirement of such grant.

“(k) TREATMENT OF GRANT FOR HIRING CIVILIAN FORENSIC ANALYSTS AND LABORATORY PERSONNEL.—A grant awarded under this section for hiring and rehiring of civilian forensic analysts and laboratory personnel (in accordance with paragraph (17) of subsection (b)) shall be subject to the same treatment, limitations, and renewal requirements under this part as grants awarded under this section for hiring and rehiring of career law enforcement personnel (in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b)).”

(b) APPLICATIONS.—Section 1702 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd-1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “, unless waived by the Attorney General” after “under this part shall”; and

(B) in paragraph (8), by striking “share of the cost” and all that follows and inserting “share of the costs during the grant period, how the applicant will maintain the increased hiring level of the law enforcement officers, and how the applicant will eventually assume responsibility for all of the costs for such officers.”; and

(2) by striking subsection (d).

(c) RENEWAL OF GRANTS.—Section 1703 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd-2) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 1703. RENEWAL OF GRANTS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), a grant made under this part may be

renewed, without limitations on the duration of such renewal, to provide additional funds if the Attorney General determines that the funds made available to the recipient were used in a manner required under an approved application and if the recipient can demonstrate significant progress in achieving the objectives of the initial application.

“(b) GRANTS FOR HIRING.—Grants made under this part for hiring or rehiring additional career law enforcement officers may be renewed for up to 5 years, except that the Attorney General may waive such 5-year limitation for good cause.

“(c) NO COST EXTENSIONS.—Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b), the Attorney General may extend a grant period, without limitations as to the duration of such extension, to provide additional time to complete the objectives of the initial grant award.”

(d) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Section 1704 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd-3) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “that would, in the absence of Federal funds received under this part, be made available from State or local sources” and inserting “that the Attorney General determines would, in the absence of Federal funds received under this part, be made available for the purpose of the grant under this part from State or local sources”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The preceding sentence shall not apply with respect to funds made available under this part by a grant made pursuant to subsection (a) for the purposes described in subsection (b)(4).”; and

(2) by striking subsection (c).

(e) STUDY OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS.—Section 1705 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd-4) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) STUDY OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall provide for a scientific study of the effectiveness of the programs, projects, and activities funded under this part in reducing crime. Such study shall include identified best practices for community policing that have demonstrated results for building and strengthening the relationship between police departments and the communities such departments serve.

“(2) STUDY.—The Attorney General shall select one or more institutions of higher education, including historically Black colleges and universities, to conduct the study described in paragraph (1).

“(3) REPORTS.—Not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of the COPS Improvements Act of 2009, the institution or institutions selected under paragraph (2) shall report the findings of the study described in paragraph (1) to the Attorney General. Not later than 30 days after the receipt of such report, the Attorney General shall report such findings to the appropriate committees of Congress, along with any recommendations the Attorney General may have relating to the effectiveness of the programs, projects, and activities funded under this part in reducing crime.”

(f) ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS.—Section 1706 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd-5) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “**REVOCATION OR SUSPENSION OF FUNDING**” and inserting “**ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS**”; and

(2) by striking “revoke or suspend” and all that follows and inserting “take any enforcement action available to the Department of Justice.”

(g) DEFINITIONS.—Section 1709(1) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd-8(1)) is amended by inserting “who is a sworn law enforcement officer” after “permanent basis”.

(h) *AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.*—Section 1001(a)(11) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3793(a)(11)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “1,047,119,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2009” and inserting “1,800,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2014”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “3 percent may be used for technical assistance under section 1701(d)” and inserting “5 percent may be used for technical assistance under section 1701(f)”; and

(B) by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: “Of the funds available for grants under part Q, not less than \$1,250,000,000 shall be used for grants for the purposes specified in section 1701(b), not more than \$200,000,000 shall be used for grants under section 1701(d), and not more than \$350,000,000 shall be used for grants under section 1701(e).”.

(i) *PURPOSES.*—Section 10002 of the Public Safety Partnership and Community Policing Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking “development” and inserting “use”; and

(2) in the matter following paragraph (4), by striking “for a period of 6 years”.

(j) *COPS PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 109(b) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3712h(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (1);

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively; and

(C) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated, by inserting “, except for the program under part Q of this title” before the period.

(2) *LAW ENFORCEMENT COMPUTER SYSTEMS.*—Section 107 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3712f) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) *EXCEPTION.*—This section shall not apply to any grant made under part Q of this title.”.

(k) *EFFECTIVE DATE.*—This section and the amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to grants awarded under part Q of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd et seq.) on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. REPORT BY INSPECTOR GENERAL REQUIRED.

(a) *REPORT.*—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall submit to Congress a report on the Public Safety and Community Policing (“COPS ON THE BEAT”) grant program authorized by part Q of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd et seq.), including the elements described in subsection (b).

(b) *ELEMENTS OF REPORT.*—The report submitted under subsection (a) shall include information on the following, with respect to the grant program described in such subsection:

(1) The effect of the program on the rate of violent crime, drug offenses, and other crimes.

(2) The degree to which State and local governments awarded a grant under the program contribute State and local funds, respectively, for law enforcement programs and activities.

(3) Any waste, fraud, or abuse within the program.

(c) *RANDOM SAMPLING REQUIRED.*—For purposes of subsection (a), the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall audit and review a random sampling of State and local law enforcement agencies. Such sampling shall include—

(1) law enforcement agencies of various sizes;

(2) law enforcement agencies that serve various populations; and

(3) law enforcement agencies that serve areas of various crime rates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

New York (Mr. WEINER) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WEINER. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WEINER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have some examples of transition moments where we acknowledge here in Washington that there are some problems that cross the line between not a purely local problem becoming a national problem.

When the COPS program and the crime bill was passed in the mid-1990s, we made an acknowledgment here in Washington that was widely cheered around the country when we said we were going to get off the sidelines in fighting crime, and we were going to go into the business of directly helping States and localities hire police officers. We said the crime was a national challenge as well as a local one.

Well, September 11 proved that point again. It reminded us that while there are needs to make sure that our localities are safe, we don't want to substitute control for local police departments.

There is a Federal role, and it's hard to dispute, in helping localities defend themselves against terrorism, deal with the challenges of immigration, and, basically, help fight crime.

□ 1630

The COPS program that was passed was an unqualified success. It provided police to localities large and small all throughout the country. I like to say that it was a classically democratic, with a small “d,” success in that small police departments, 80 percent of all the funds went to the smallest of police departments, and it also went to the big cities. Everyone benefited. Now 110,000 police officers have been hired, and it's time to reauthorize this program, and that's what we are proposing to do here.

A similar bill was passed with broad bipartisan support in the last Congress, but, unfortunately, it was too late to pass the other body, and now we are trying to do it again.

This is fully funded in President Obama's budget. It's \$1.8 billion a year for the total authorization for the COPS program. It will provide 10,000 cops per year for 5 years. It makes improvements over the last program by allowing technology grants for local police departments and also hiring funds for prosecutors so we're not just arresting people but we are making sure that the prosecutions are done expeditiously. We also take some steps to

recognize the reality that we have today by allowing funds to be used for police officers expressly on terrorism duty. Also we take something and create the Troops-to-Cops program, which makes sure that troops that come back from the front get priority in hiring. And we also use some innovative programs to make sure that illegal drug manufacturing and distribution, particularly of the methamphetamine problem, are addressed.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill.

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. KING of Iowa asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1139, the COPS Improvements Act of 2009, increases the authorization for the COPS ON THE BEAT Federal grant program by a whopping 72 percent. Why is the question I ask. Are crime rates up 72 percent? According to the FBI, they are not. Overall crime rates are down nationwide.

In the first 6 months of 2008, violent crime decreased by 3½ percent and property crime decreased by 2½ percent. From 1997 to 2006, the violent and property crime rates fell by 22 percent. Clearly, the crime rate is not a justification for dramatically increasing the expenditure of taxpayer dollars. If crime hasn't increased, why are we increasing spending on a law enforcement program that has mixed results?

Both the Justice Department's Inspector General and the Government Accountability Office found that thousands of hires funded by the COPS program never occurred because law enforcement agencies used COPS funding to cover their budget shortfalls, backfilling the holes in their budgets rather than putting cops on the street in some cases.

A 2005 GAO report concluded that factors other than COPS funds accounted for the majority of the decline in crime from 1994 until 2001. The crime rate did drop during this time period. It dropped by 26 percent, Mr. Speaker, and the COPS program did contribute to this decline. It contributed only 1.3 percent of the 26 percent decline. That 1.3 percent decline only cost the American taxpayers, and I emphasize the word “only” satirically, \$7 billion. If you do the math on that, it works out to be this: The COPS funding, even though we've had a significant decrease in crime, was only accountable for 5 percent of the reduction in crime, according to the GAO report. That's one-half of the solution, and here we have a 72 percent increase. And if you do the math on the 72 percent increase, the 5 percent solution becomes an 8.6 percent solution presuming all other factors remain the same.

This is not a good return on investment. Perhaps the increase in COPS

spending is designed to generate jobs instead. The majority of cities' budget shortfalls and officer layoffs in police departments around the country are the justification, I think, for spending yet more money that we don't have. The fact is that roughly there is a 2- to 3-year lapse from the time Congress appropriates money to when a police officer actually reaches the street; so money appropriated under this new authorization will not even reach the streets until 2012 or 2013.

Congress just appropriated \$1 billion for the COPS program in the economic stimulus bill, and we gave this money to the States with no strings attached, Mr. Speaker. We removed the 25 percent State matching requirement and the cap on grant awards. So this \$1 billion will fund fewer than 6,000 police hires. You heard right. According to the Justice Department, we spent \$1 billion of taxpayer money to hire fewer than 6,000 police officers. That works out to be \$167,000 per officer. We send them a check, and they convert \$167,000 into one officer when we take the strings off.

If my colleagues in the majority were truly interested in helping police departments maximize the number of officers they can hire, they would have kept the matching requirement and cap in place; then the \$1 billion would have hired approximately 13,000 officers but not fewer than 6,000.

The COPS program is currently authorized at \$1.04 billion, Mr. Speaker. Last Congress the sponsor of the bill, Mr. WEINER of New York, proposed increasing the authorization by only 10 percent to \$1.15 billion. I say only 10 percent because in today's context, it's 72 percent. But even that more modest increase was too much for our colleagues in the Senate, who rejected such an idea. I would have supported this bill on the floor this year if it reauthorized the COPS program with the same 10 percent that was offered by the gentleman from New York last year. And I supported an amendment in committee offered by my colleague from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) to fund the program at that level. But in the last Congress \$1.15 billion was good enough; this year it's not, for some reason. This year it must be \$1.8 billion, although the Judiciary Committee had held no hearing, received no evidence or testimony for this dramatic increase, which is a proposal under suspension before this Congress, Mr. Speaker.

The bill before us today increases Federal spending without any demonstrated need. It's like giving huge bonuses to AIG executives. There is no justification rather than an insatiable desire to spend taxpayers' money and funnel resources off the backs of the taxpayers in America, the workers in America, into the inner cities where these jobs would be created at the cost of \$167,000 a job by record, and the efficiency level that would be increased, taking us from a 5 percent of our 26 percent reduction in crime, 5 percent of

that coming direct by the COPS program now might take it to 8.6 percent at this huge, huge cost.

It's interesting to me to hear the gentleman from New York State that they need help at the local level, and I believe I heard him saying enforcing local laws but also enforcing immigration laws. So I would be also more amenable to this legislation if it were directed to 287(g) programs. At least then we'd have a Federal interest and something that I think would be helpful to all citizens in this country. But it is encouraging to me to hear from the gentleman from New York that we need to use Federal money to enforce immigration laws at the local level through local officers.

I oppose this legislation.

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

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1139, the COPS Improvements Act of 2009. I want to thank my colleague Mr. WEINER, who understands the significance, the history, the data, and even the science of the success of this bill and this law.

Mr. Speaker, after September 11th, as we as a Nation, as a Congress, made a new commitment to homeland security protecting our communities, the fact is that for years under the Republican-led Congress, cops hiring grants were gutted for more than \$1 billion a year in the late 1990s to only \$10 million in fiscal year 2005 and then zeroed out, zeroed out. Not only do they want them to be outgunned, Mr. WEINER; they want them to be outfunded. That's what they want. They want to take pictures with cops, pat them on the back, and not support them.

As a longtime member of the Homeland Security Committee, I have always believed strongly that real homeland security begins in our streets, in our communities, and that means funding for our cops. The whole purpose of the COPS program was to provide community officers to be trained in the streets. Read the legislation. When President Clinton created the COPS program in 1994 with the goal of putting 100,000 new officers out on the streets, it was met with some skepticism, but today it's clear that this program helped turn the tide against crime. In fact, the GAO isolated the effect of the COPS program and estimated that there was a 2.5 percent decline in the violent crime rate between 1993 and 2000 because of this program alone. When you think about it, that's tens of thousands of violent crimes that weren't committed simply because we did the right thing and provided our officers with more support on the streets and the proper training.

So I stand here on behalf of the police officers of this country and I stand here on behalf of those folks who work in prosecutors' offices all across America. We're going to help you. We are

going to make sure you have assistance and resources to do the job.

So three times the current amount and it comes at a time when our States and municipalities need it most. In my district alone, 324 police officers on the streets because of these grants.

I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this vital bill and pass this legislation.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI).

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1139. I want to commend my colleague on the Judiciary Committee, Congressman WEINER, for introducing this bill.

As I remarked during the committee markup, this bill has special significance for me. In 1994, as Attorney General of Puerto Rico, I worked alongside the Clinton administration to secure passage of the legislation that established the COPS program. As someone whose own family has been deeply touched by violent crime, I'm unbending in my belief that the most basic human right a government owes to its citizens is a right to personal security. The COPS program is rooted in this premise.

Thanks to the COPS program, over \$160 million in grants have been awarded to law enforcement agencies in Puerto Rico to hire new officers, improve school safety, and purchase crime-fighting equipment. No statistic, however, can capture the true impact the COPS program has made. The numbers of lives saved, crimes prevented, and families spared the pain of losing a loved one, these numbers are beyond calculation.

All we hear from our colleagues from the Republican side are concerns about the cost of this bill. Well, all I should say is that if there is any cost that is justified, it's the cost of protecting our people. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, in response to the gentleman from Puerto Rico, who I believe comes here very sincerely and brings himself to this floor for this discussion, I hear him say the most important human right is the right to personal security. And I would ask if the gentleman from Puerto Rico could address the situation as where do human rights come from, if they exist at all? Where's the list of human rights that exist?

I would submit that we don't have any human rights in law. I would submit that we have natural rights that come from God that flow through the Declaration of Independence and are clearly defined in the Constitution itself, but that the idea of human rights just simply doesn't exist in law. They exist in the imagination of judges. So the gentleman's response from Puerto Rico, although I see he's leaving the floor, it may be for a particular reason.

The other gentleman's comments about the COPS program that today it's clear that there has been a 2½ percent reduction in crime from 1993 until the year 2000, Mr. Speaker, I have a report here. This is a GAO report and I will give you the date in a minute, but it's a current GAO report, and I presume it's the same report the gentleman is referring to. It says this:

"While we find the COPS expenditures led to increases in sworn police officers above levels that would have been expected without these expenditures and though the increases in sworn officers led to declines in crime, we conclude that the COPS grants were not the major cause of the decline in crime from 1994 through 2001."

□ 1645

I think this report doesn't support the gentleman's position. The data that I laid out in my opening statement does.

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PASCRELL. First of all, that is a total report. There have been many reports on the effectiveness of the COPS program, not just that one. But the accuracy of that report is not being questioned by me by any stretch of the imagination.

It is a contributing factor to the decline in violent—violent—crimes. That is what we are talking about. There is a very basic difference between the stealing of an automobile and a violent crime of armed robbery, for instance. When you break down the crimes, sir, you will see that this had a very effective part.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I will concede the gentleman's point, to a degree. And the point is this, that there has been a minimal decline in crime. But this report, by the way, for the record is October 2005, and I don't think it contradicts the statement that I made in my opening statement. But 5 percent of the decline in crime is attributable to COPS, and that is a study I have identified.

If we appropriate an additional 72 percent, one could calculate you could have of that decline in crime, 8.6 percent of that might be attributable to COPS.

I would then at this point, Mr. Speaker, reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEINER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First let's get some clarity on the GAO report. The gentleman artfully pulls a line out of it. Let me tell you the conclusion. This is from page 11 of the GAO report. You can follow along with me, I say to the gentleman from Iowa.

"For the years 1998 to 2000, we estimated that the COPS grant expenditures that were associated with the reduction in indexed crimes from their 1993 levels ranged from 200,000 to 225,000

indexed crimes, while one-third of these were violent crimes, two-thirds property crimes."

That is the GAO. If you want another authority that says that this has worked, you can ask the 381 Members of Congress that voted for it last year. If you want only partisan Republicans, how about John Ashcroft, not someone I am fond of quoting, who said the COPS program is a success. Attorney General Gonzales, every attorney general has said, you know what? The COPS program has been a remarkable success.

I say to the gentleman from Iowa, put your money where your mouth is. In the stimulus bill, which I believe you voted against, there was \$1 billion for COPS. They are taking the grants now, and contrary to your opening statement, not only will it not take two or three years, they are going to be on the street this year.

In Iowa, there have been 110 police departments, large, small, intermediate, that have applied for this stimulus money to hire police under the COPS program.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEINER. I haven't raised the challenge yet, and then you will get an opportunity to give a one-word answer.

The challenge is this: Are you willing to write to the COPS office at the Justice Department and say please deny these police officers, who you acquaint with the criminals at AIG, and that is a shame and I think goes too far, will you say, don't grant any of these applications to Iowa? We don't need the cops. Our crime is not like crime elsewhere. Or despite the fact that I campaigned about the crimes being committed by illegal and undocumented immigrants, we don't need any further help.

Are you prepared to write a letter to the COPS program saying we don't want any money from the COPS stimulus money?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEINER. I would be glad to yield.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I would be happy to write that to your chiefs of police. This is a nationwide piece of legislation.

Mr. WEINER. Reclaiming my time, "reclaiming my time" is not something I am asking permission for.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Both gentlemen will suspend.

Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. WEINER. It is noteworthy that you point out my chiefs of police. Well, maybe you should ask the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Association of Police Organizations, the National Sheriffs Association, International Association of Chiefs of Police, National Association of District Attorneys, National Narcotics Officers Association, U.S. Conference of May-

ors, National League of Cities. These are all people that support the Weiner position, not the King position.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, where but Washington would there be such an atmosphere of arrogance that when in the nineties there was a drop in the crime rate we would start lauding ourselves and saying we did that here in Washington?

Let me tell you who did that. I know in Texas they raised taxes. They built more prisons. They elected judges like me. We started having longer sentences, juries worked longer and harder, law enforcement worked longer and harder through the nineties. They brought more people to justice. There were more trials. People went from serving just a month on a year in many cases to serving one-third, one-half or more of their sentences before they were paroled, and many much longer than that. We were keeping people longer.

There was a 1,000 case backlog in my one district court, but because of the hard work of hundreds of people, that got cut by 80 percent, even though the number of cases rose each year. It wasn't Washington that got that accomplished.

That is why the report from the GAO says a 1.3 percent decline in overall crime rate could be attributed to the COPS grants. And when you consider what my friend Mr. KING pointed out, it took 166,000 Federal dollars to get one policeman? Man, we would be better off if we had a program that said, you know, for every dollar of local taxes or State taxes that are raised to go in law enforcement, we will cut the Federal taxes, because I can promise you the States and the local governments can do a whole lot more efficient job than hiring law enforcement for \$166,000 apiece.

That is where the difference was made. It wasn't made in Washington. It was made by the hard-working law enforcement officers and court officials back in the States and local governments.

Mr. WEINER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I hope the gentleman did not dislocate his arm patting himself on the back for bringing down crime. Perhaps he should offer a little bit of credit to the 171 officers hired in his district.

Do you know why crime went down, I say to the gentleman? Crime went down because there were police officers doing their job, putting their lives on the line every day. And while some people might have been sitting behind a bench feeling very proud of themselves, those police officers deserve our credit and honor.

I have now heard two speakers in a row, one who has equated police officers to the AIG criminals and another

who said it is not the cops, it is one judge who happened to get elected to Congress. Both of them are wrong. It was a successful piece of legislation. And if the gentleman doesn't think so, maybe he wants to give his 171 police officers to the next speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman for the time.

It is interesting to hear my good friend from Texas speak on the basis of lowering crime in one part of the State for lowering crime in all parts of the State. Coming from the fourth largest city in the Nation, let me suggest to him that we have ready evidence that COPS ON THE BEAT in fact are probably as constructive or more constructive than the lock-them-up, throw-away-the-key concept. It is interesting as well that I heard my good friend mention and support raising taxes. I have never heard him support and celebrate the idea of raising taxes.

We did build a lot of prisons in Texas. It gave us the name of being renowned for locking up more people than probably a lot of nations around the world. I don't know, however, how effective you could argue that was without strong law enforcement.

Law enforcement provides for the prevention of crime. That is why I am a strong supporter of the COPS ON THE BEAT program, and particularly glad that in March our Attorney General through the administration offered \$1 billion to our police departments across America to ensure that there would be stimulus dollars being used for the COPS grants.

We note that in the 1990s crime did go down, and whatever the GAO study says that is confusing, it is clear that in 1998 and 2000, the hiring grants are responsible for reducing crimes by about 200,000 to 250,000 crimes, one-third of which are violent.

Mr. Speaker, in the backdrop of the loss of lives of several of our law enforcement officers from California to the east coast, this is no time to bash police. This is a time to join in and support small departments, large departments, medium-sized departments who are supporting the idea of the COPS reauthorization. I want to thank Mr. WEINER for his leadership.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. WEINER. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 45 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

We offered in the committee an amendment that would allow us to study the best practices so that we could help departments utilize these COPS grants in an effective way. In the 18th Congressional District, some \$56,857,000 in grants were awarded and

875 additional police officers and sheriffs deputies were welcomed into the 18th Congressional District. Ten local and State law enforcement agencies in our congressional district were beneficiaries of these. We have more constables and sheriffs and police departments, \$2 million was added to provide for 19 school resource officers, and \$9 million was awarded for crime fighting technologies.

Mr. Speaker, the COPS reauthorization bill is the right way to go. We cannot have a criminal prevention system that does not have preventive law enforcement. That is what we get with the COPS program. I rise to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1139, the Community Oriented Policy Services (COPS) Improvement Act of 2009. I would also like to thank Representative WEINER of New York for introducing this important legislation. This legislation was introduced last Congress and I was a co-sponsor last term. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

The COPS program was designed to help bring about fundamental changes in policing by drawing officers closer to the citizens they protect. And, in scores of communities across the nation, the COPS program did just that.

The idea of community policing is to get away from the traditional "call and response" model, in which officers run from one emergency call to the next. It involves sending officers into the streets and into the neighborhoods to build relationships with residents, identify the sources of crime problems, and solve them before they get worse. The success of the COPS approach to policing is dependent upon the relationships built between the police and the members of the communities they serve.

Since 1995, COPS has awarded more than \$10 billion to advance community policing, including grants awarded to more than 13,300 state, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies to fund the hiring and redeployment of nearly 117,700 officers. In addition to funding law enforcement positions, the Office of Community Policing Services has been the catalyst for innovations in community policing and broad implementation of effective law enforcement strategy. Presently, departments that employ community policing serve 87 percent of American communities.

On March 16, 2009, U.S. Attorney General Eric Holder announced that the Department of Justice will be accepting applications for \$1 billion in Recovery Act Funds for the COPS program. Approximately 5,500 law enforcement officer jobs will be created or saved in law enforcement agencies across the country through funding provided by the Department of Justice.

Recently, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, H.R. 1, included \$4 billion in Department of Justice grant funding to enhance state, local, and tribal law enforcement efforts, including the hiring of new police officers, to combat violence against women, and to fight against internet crimes against children.

Similar to Edward Byrne Justice Act Grant (JAG) awards, Recovery Act funds that are authorized for COPS can also be used to hire new officers or rehire recently laid off officers, fill unfunded vacancies and help prevent scheduled layoffs within law enforcement agencies.

COPS funds are allocated directly to the local level governments and law enforcement agencies and provide a three-year period of funding.

Specifically, H.R. 1139, the "COPS Improvements Act of 2009," reinvigorates the COPS program's ability to accomplish its critical mission by establishing three grant programs: (1) the Troops-to-Cops Program, (2) the Community Prosecutors Program, and (3) the Technology Grants Program. The Troops-to-Cops Program would fund the hiring of former members of the Armed Forces to serve as law enforcement officers in community-oriented policing, particularly in communities adversely affected by recent military base closings.

The Community Prosecutors Program would authorize the Attorney General to make grants for additional community prosecuting programs that would, for example, assign prosecutors to pursue cases from specific geographic areas and to deal with localized violent crime, among other crimes.

The Technology Grants Program would authorize the Attorney General to make grants to develop and use new technologies to assist State and local law enforcement agencies reorient some of their efforts from reacting to crime to preventing crime.

The investment in COPS through the Recovery Act although crucial is a one-time investment limited to the purpose of hiring officers. The reauthorization of COPS is necessary for the program to continue past the investment of the Recovery Act.

Reauthorization is also necessary so that the COPS program can include the innovative aspects of the program as explained above.

The Houston area has made great strides in reducing crime. I am confident that with programs like COPS Houston can better combat crime.

CRIME STATISTICS

According to Houston Police Department statistics: Violent crimes

Violent crimes in Houston increased less than 1 percent in 2008 compared with 2007.

Homicides dropped by 16 percent.

The number of homicides dropped from 353 in 2007 to 295 last year.

Sexual assaults increased more than 8 percent from 2007.

Aggravated assaults increased at 9.1 percent.

Domestic violence

Of the 1,092 additional aggravated assault cases in 2008, more than half were reports of domestic violence.

Nonviolent crimes

Nonviolent crimes declined more than 10 percent in 2008.

Property thefts dropped by more than 10 percent.

Auto thefts decreased last year, dropping more than 21 percent to 15,214, down from 19,465 in 2007.

While Houston has made great strides in combating crime, more must be done to ensure the safety of Houstonians in their communities and their respective neighborhoods. I believe that the COPS program will be of benefit to the people of the 18th Congressional District as well as other communities in Texas and in communities around the United States.

To date, \$56,857,827 in COPS grants were awarded to law enforcement agencies in the 18th District of Texas. COPS grants have

funded 875 additional police officers and sheriff's deputies to engage in community policing activities, including crime prevention, in the 18th District. 10 local and state law enforcement agencies in the 18th District have directly benefitted from funding made available through the COPS Office. \$2,091,064 has been awarded to add 19 school resources officers to improve safety for students, teachers, and administrators in primary and secondary schools throughout the 18th Congressional District. \$9,026,291 has been awarded for crime-fighting technologies. This funding has allowed officers to spend more time on the streets of the 18th Congressional District of Texas fighting and preventing crime through timesaving technology, information-sharing systems, and improved communications equipment.

AMENDMENT

The COPS program was designed to help bring about fundamental changes in policing by drawing officers closer to the citizens they protect. And, in scores of communities across the nation, the COPS program did just that.

The idea of community policing is to get away from the traditional "call and response" model, in which officers run from one emergency call to the next. It involves sending officers into the streets and into the neighborhoods to build relationships with residents, identify the sources of crime problems, and solve them before they get worse. The success of the COPS approach to policing is dependent upon the relationships built between the police and the members of the communities they serve.

Because the success of the COPS approach to policing is dependent upon the relationships built between the police and the members of the community it served, I offered an amendment to the Judiciary Committee markup. My amendment was accepted and was included within this legislation.

H.R. 1139 requires that the Attorney General shall provide for a scientific study of the effectiveness of the programs, projects, and activities funded under this Act in reducing crime. The study is to be completed within four years of enactment of this bill.

My amendment, which was accepted at the Judiciary Committee markup, specifically requires that

"Such study shall include identified best practices for community policing that have demonstrated results in building and strengthening the relationships between police departments and the communities such departments serve."

The requirement that the study identify "best practices" in community policing is important because the enumeration of these best practices will serve as an unequivocal benchmark by which the successes of the COPS program can be measured.

These "best practices" would establish bright line rules to analyze community policing and the derogation of which will require retooling and adjustment of the community policing measures involved. Moreover, the Attorney General is in the best position to complete this study and certainly is in the best position to determine what constitutes "good" community policing. My amendment would support and strengthen the development of good community policing methods.

I believe that H.R. 1139 is strengthened with the inclusion of my language. Again, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1139

OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Page 11, line 7, insert after "crime." the following: "Such study shall include identified best practices for community policing that have demonstrated results for building and strengthening the relationship between police departments and the communities such departments serve."

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I will go back to this October 2005 study since I think there has been some confusing verbiage that has emerged here with a regard to a number of different studies. I don't think I have heard anyone actually directly rebut the study that I have referenced, but I want to just go back to the concise language.

It says, it concludes, "COPS grants were not the major cause of the decline in crime from 1994 through 2001." I find nothing in this report or any report that says that COPS grants are the major cause of the decline in even violent crime, although they were a contributing factor, and I stipulated those contributing factors.

Another point is I didn't equate any AIG executives as criminals. In fact, I voted against that bill that sought to reach back. It was a mistake made by Congress and people were looking for cover. That is what that was about. I opposed both components of that. I will continue to do so. In fact, I defended that they be able to keep those bonuses, because Congress made a huge mistake and we shouldn't interfere with the relationship between employers and employees.

Mr. Speaker, what I am having trouble getting my mind around is the image of data analysis that has emerged as I listened to the gentleman from New York, Mr. WEINER. He has argued all this data as to why we need to increase the COPS grant by 72 percent.

It surely couldn't be because police departments want more Federal funding. It surely couldn't be because they want to build empires. It surely couldn't be because crime has gone up. No one has said crime has gone up. In fact, it has gone down. Violent crime, nonviolent crime, has all gone down.

So what is this? Is this Mr. WEINER sitting in a loft somewhere analyzing data, divining away, maybe from the emanation from numbers, maybe it was something heretofore unimaginable, but calculating that we need to take another \$1 billion into COPS, which we did, this Congress did, and now reach for an additional 72 percent, Mr. Speaker?

I cannot quite get that image fixed in my mind, that Mr. WEINER independently reached a conclusion off of data that would support this great big growth in COPS funding. There has to be something else. I don't think it has been clear. But I think the gentleman from Texas does understand this, and I hope he can illuminate us.

I would be happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, to say that we may want to pat ourselves on the back sitting behind the bench, I didn't ask for the words to be taken down. I don't believe they quite violate the rule.

□ 1700

But I can tell you what sitting behind the bench did for those years. It gave me a great vantage point to see what was doing good and what wasn't.

Now, I never kept a jury past 3 a.m., so I can't say I kept anybody all night. But I can tell you that the prosecutors, the defense attorneys, the law enforcement people, the parole boards, the confinement officials, the taxpayers that kept coming up with more and more money, they did an incredible job. They worked incredibly hard. They didn't get paid enough.

And I know the gentleman has referred to 170 or so law enforcement in my district that were added. And I really do need to get to the background information and figure out exactly where all those people were and for whom the Federal Government is taking credit for hiring.

But, you know, obviously the local governments had to take over that share, and so it was an incentive to start hiring more people. But the audit indicates that, looking at only 3 percent of the COPS grants, Federal auditors have alleged \$277 million in misspent funds. The studies have shown that spending on the COPS program has not led to an increase in the overall spending by local law enforcement, so it hasn't increased law enforcement spending. That's what the studies show.

So if the overall spending on law enforcement programs, even with the additional Federal increase, has not increased law enforcement spending, then it's pretty clear that the money spent here did not do the trick of reducing crime. It came from lots of other sources.

And I come back to my original point. There is nobody that does a more efficient job than the local governments and the State governments in addressing these problems, because once that money comes through Washington, it is incredible the slice that this place takes out of the money before they send it back, whether it's education, whether it's law enforcement, whatever it is. And if we could come to a bipartisan agreement that would say, for every dollar you raise local and State taxes, we're going to reduce your Federal taxes, I think we could then hit that increase in law enforcement that obviously both sides want to see. It's just that that would be far more efficient. It would get to the people back in the State and localities who are really doing the job and from which my vantage on the bench allowed me to see, not pat myself on the back, but to see who was doing the job, and not bureaucrats up here in Washington talking a good game.

That's where the difference is made and that's where we can help.

Mr. WEINER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I'm not really sure where to begin. First let's start where the statistics came from that 171 police officers and sheriff deputies in the First district were hired. That's the COPS office. Those grants came from your constituents.

And I would say to the gentleman, all of those things and all of the moving parts in the criminal justice system, of course, they're very valuable. But why do you dismiss the 171 police officers? Why aren't they valuable? Why aren't they something that's of value?

And the gentleman said he wants the taxes reduced here in Washington. He had a chance for that. He voted against the stimulus bill which offered a tax cut to 90 percent of all of his constituents.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, during the break, the director of police in Memphis, Tennessee, Director Larry Godwin, called me. He called me to thank me for the COPS bill. He called me to thank me because he was going to hire 125 policemen in the next fiscal year and 125 in the following fiscal year and those would be hired because of COPS monies that were in the Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

Director Godwin and I have known each other for a long time because I started my career as the attorney for the Memphis Police Department, attended International Association of Chiefs of Police meetings, and know that the patrol is a deterrent to crime. Patrol is the first way to stop crime.

These COPS programs hire more policemen, put them on the street, and oftentimes in innovative community policing activities.

The Afro American Police Association, Lieutenant Curry, and others have talked to me about community policing and how it helps my community reduce crime.

My Mayor, Willie Harrington, has asked me to come to Washington and work to get more COPS money and help him with putting more cops on the street; and that was one of the first things I wanted to do here. I'm a cosponsor of this bill. I am a proud supporter of it, and voted for the Recovery and Reinvestment Act because crime is a serious issue all over this country.

We support policemen in Afghanistan and Iraq. We need to support policemen all over this country and protect our citizens from crime.

The crime rate is going up. And by supporting this COPS bill you can make a difference. You can keep citizens alive and reduce crime. This is an effective deterrent to crime. It's what the policemen on the street tell me. It's why the Office of the United States Mayors has endorsed this bill.

I rely on the United States Mayors, the International Association of Chiefs

of Police, my cops on the street, and my experience as a police legal advisor.

And I appreciate Mr. WEINER for bringing this bill, and I'm proud to be a sponsor, and urge this House to pass it.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains for each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa has 3½ minutes. The gentleman from New York has 7¼ minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I would reserve.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I will yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, it's curious to me now that I find the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), I guess it's a matter of public record, is a cosponsor of the legislation. I have two gentlemen here on the floor of the House of Representatives that, theoretically, at least, shaped this legislation and this policy that weren't satisfied with an additional \$1 billion in previous legislation, but had to bring forward an expansion of the 72 percent increase, this 72 percent increase.

And again, the image of the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) or the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) calculating out the data to conclude, and I'd ask the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), before he leaves the floor, I'd be real happy to hear from him and yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, if he could tell me how many police officers are enough, per capita, for 100,000, say, citizens. What is the average in the Nation? What is enough? How does a person arrive at this requested 72 percent increase of \$1 billion tossed into this, \$167,000 a job, 100 percent federally funded, no copayment, completely grants, and presuming the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) is right, and some, if not all these jobs will actually be in uniform on the streets within a year. But what is an appropriate number of police officers? What's your goal? Is there such a thing as too many police officers? That's really my question.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I depend on my mayor, my police director and the citizens of my community who have e-mailed me and told me, we want more policemen; we want more deterrent. We need a safer community and a neighborhood. We want our children safe. We want our old people safe, and I'll respond to them. That's the number of policemen that we need is enough to satisfy my mayor.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I didn't ask the gentleman for some opinion of wanting more police officers. I recognize that if one's in uniform defending the streets in this country, that you're always going to want more help. I can't imagine a Police Department saying I don't

need another officer, and I can't imagine a local jurisdiction, the taxation at a local jurisdiction saying no, we'd rather tax at home than we would at the Federal Government. I don't have a police chief saying to me that they want to reject the Federal funding and they want to tax their local citizens. And I've never known anyone that didn't need more help in what they were doing.

My question to the gentleman was, out of 100,000 people, how many police officers should we have? What is optimum? How many are too many? And if the gentleman can answer that specifically, then I'd like to hear it. And if not, I hope you wouldn't ask me to yield.

But do you have a specific answer?

I would yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. It's not as simple as math. But I know this: There were funds that were voted for Iraq that I voted against to protect the people in Baghdad. I want to protect the people in Memphis, Tennessee.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I oppose this legislation for the reasons that I have said. It's an outrageous growth in Federal spending. It is a transfer out of the pockets of the taxpayers into the inner cities, the jurisdictions that would be the biggest beneficiaries of this. And everyone in government is going to have the instinct to try to grow their empire, Mr. Speaker. And we don't have data that says what is the optimum number. We don't have even the admission that there's such a thing as too many government employees in any category. And I would not either submit that too many police officers would be the first category that I'd want to reduce in government. It is not.

We need to be prudent. We need to be responsible. I'm looking at a national debt and a national deficit and a budget that has grown to be a \$9.3 trillion deficit out of this President's budget, \$9.3 trillion. That's all the corn we can raise in Iowa for the next thousand years, just to deal with President Obama's deficit. And if we are going to retire the debt, it's everything since the time of Christ, Mr. Speaker.

I oppose this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WEINER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, in answer to the distinguished gentleman's question, how many is enough, I think 214 for the State of Iowa, going to 110 police departments and agencies. Do you know why I believe that? I believe that because that's the number of applications and that's the number of police officers that small sheriff's departments, you see, it's an average of only two police officers per jurisdiction, has requested of the recovery money that you voted against. I mean, that's how much.

Now, you can say that there's no Federal role in policing, and you'd be

in a minority. You'd be in a tiny minority. You wouldn't even be in a majority in your own caucus, let alone in your State.

But I give credit to my colleagues who stand up on the floor who say there's too many cops. I give credit to my colleagues who have the audacity to stand up on the floor and say, you know what? Everyone wants police officers. They're not so important. Why don't we not hire police officers? I give them credit for that.

If you believe there is no Federal role in local law enforcement, you should vote "no" on the COPS program. But then, do not be inconsistent. You should make every effort to ensure that Iowa and Texas and the other States don't get this money, don't apply for this, because they obviously disagree with you.

The fact of the matter is there is a Federal responsibility for crime. We do have a Federal—there is a Federal role for this. And it's been successful.

Now, you can say that it is not the primary or the major. The fact of the matter is the GAO was asked to study a very basic question: Did the COPS program succeed in its objectives in reducing crime? And the answer is, you can read the conclusion. You don't have to pick a line here and a line there. You can read the conclusion. It says that it did. And now we want to make sure that this program lives for five more years.

And the gentleman's made a lot—This is a dramatic increase over what we've had in the past. Yes. It was zeroed out in the Bush years. Zero, nada, zippo.

Now, despite the fact that John Ashcroft and Gonzalez and police officials and Tom Ridge all said this program was a success, I mean, there is a time, and I have to say to my good friend from Iowa that I enjoy the ideological debates that sometimes go on on our Judiciary Committee and here on the floor. But these are human beings. These are officers of the law who every day put their lives on the line. And what we are saying is we want to help localities ease that burden.

And you know, not long ago the National Sheriffs Association weighed in and said that they support this expansion. And not long ago, an organization of police agencies called the Police Executive Research Forum did a survey of its police department membership. 62 percent said they're cutting overtime spending because of the fiscal downturn. A quarter of them said that they're reducing employment through attrition in order to deal with the fiscal downturn. 47 percent of them said that they were discontinuing officer training because of the fiscal downturn.

Now, you can say hey, it's not our problem; things go up, things go down. Or you can say we want to help. We want to do something about it. We want to help localities.

And I would say to the gentleman that if he is going to go home and do what the gentleman from New Jersey suggests, and pose with police officers and say we honor your service, do more than honor their service. Help them not get laid off. Help keep them on the job. Help expand police departments.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEINER. I would be glad to yield.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just want to ask if it was his intention to infer erroneously that I had said that there are too many cops.

Mr. WEINER. Well, actually you mean imply. The answer to the question is, yes. You clearly did suggest that you know what—how many is too many, you said. I mean, I don't want to get the—I don't know how you get someone to say exactly what you said. But you said how many is too many? And the answer is very clear. The police departments in Iowa disagree with the Member from Iowa, and so do I. I believe—if I can just conclude, I believe that this is a program that works. You know, we don't have a lot of them in the Federal Government. We have some that work. This one, on a broad bipartisan way Members have said that, you know, this has been a success.

You can go to any police department in your district, and forgive me for not having the number at my fingertips, and say hey, has the COPS program helped you reduce crime? See what they say. See what these 110 police agencies in Iowa say. Ask them. Say, has this program been successful? And they'll say yes. And they'll say something else. They'll say please, help us keep this local agency a success story moving forward.

□ 1715

And if the gentleman doesn't believe that we should have a Federal role, by all means, he should vote "no," but I do believe that overwhelmingly we do, and what we're trying to do here is to keep up with the times and say, you know what? If you've got to cut things on the local level now, you won't have the need to cut law enforcement. Ask people in any townhall meeting in Iowa or anywhere else if they think it's a good idea if we protect law enforcement funding with all the challenges that we have today. Let me conclude with this final thought.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield for a brief point?

Mr. WEINER. Let me just finish this because this is now more than one time that this has been quoted incorrectly.

There is a GAO report from June 3, 2005. Make sure we put this up on our Web site. You can go to house.gov/weiner, anyone who wants to. It's the Government Accountability Office. They'll tell you that it worked.

I'll be glad to yield.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman.

I appreciate the opportunity to make the point that asking a question, which is what I asked, which was "how many are too many?" does not infer a position by any form of logic that I know of.

Mr. WEINER. Reclaiming my time, generally speaking, I think the lady doth protest too much. When someone says, "How many is too many?" they don't mean that they want more. They mean that they want less. If you want to withdraw that comment, I would if I were you because I'm concerned.

I think most of the citizens of Iowa—and I represent Brooklyn and Queens, so maybe I don't speak for the people of Iowa, but I do know 110 police departments, sheriff's departments and agencies in Iowa have applied for the first billion dollar grant. By the way, there's \$8 billion worth of applications for that billion dollars. It's clearly a demand. So it's not your colleagues who are saying it. It's not Congress who is saying it. It's not the cops' office. Those police officers and those sheriff's offices are voting with their pens. They're saying, "Please, help us. Don't listen to our Congressman. Listen to the Congressman from Brooklyn and Queens. Please expand this program."

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman WEINER for his outstanding work on this bill.

In 1994, the COPS program changed the way we fight crime in this country, by giving local jurisdictions the support needed to put more than 100,000 new officers on the street.

The results were clear: a nationwide drop in crime, and safer streets in our rural and urban areas alike.

The COPS program is needed now more than ever. States, counties, and cities struggling to balance their budgets have made cuts to law enforcement programs even as the threat of terrorism has put new burdens on our first responders, and recent news reports show violent crime in our cities is again on the rise.

This bill will help us face those problems, by putting thousands more officers where they can do the most good: on the streets of our communities.

I am a Co-Chairman of the Law Enforcement Caucus, which was founded to advocate for the law enforcement community, ensure our law enforcement officers are provided the resources they need and build on key programs—such as COPS—to keep our communities safe.

The COPS program is a proven concept that has the full support of the law enforcement community, and this bill will improve the program by expanding the utility of grants and increasing its authorization amount level by nearly \$800 million.

I thank the Chairman and the Committee for their work on this bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank my good friend from New York (Mr. WEINER) and his involvement in getting this bill to the floor today. I am pleased to support its passage, and am proud to be the lead Republican on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, not to date myself, but the Community Oriented Policing Services

(COPS) program was established the year I had the privilege of being elected to this body, in 1994, by the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act (the '94 Crime Act).

The COPS program has aged better than me, enabling more officers to be hired, contributing to lower crime rates than would otherwise be the case, and increasing the technology and equipment available to our law enforcement officers to do the job we ask of them. According to the Department of Justice, the COPS program has helped state, local and tribal governments hire more than 117,000 officers and has awarded more than \$11.4 billion to over 13,000 law enforcement agencies across the United States. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) has estimated that COPS funding contributed a 2.5% decline in the violent crime rate between 1993 and 2000. In my own district, nearly 300 officers have been hired since the program started. Statewide, the COPS program has funded more than 3,700 officers and sheriff's deputies, more than 225 school resource officers, and has provided more than \$55 million in technology grants for departments. It's hard to argue with fighting crime, lowering crime rates, hiring trained officers in our local communities, and providing equipment and technology upgrades otherwise not available to cash-strapped communities.

As my colleagues know, the recent stimulus bill contained \$1 billion to hire or rehire laid-off officers. Some may say: Why are you authorizing this program again when you just gave it a considerable amount of money in the stimulus bill?

Mr. Speaker, last week was the deadline for departments to apply for a slice of that stimulus money to hire officers. The COPS office tells me that the \$1 billion in the stimulus bill will pay for 5,500 new police positions nationwide. The COPS Hiring Recovery program—the stimulus program—received applications from a staggering 7,200 departments nationwide! That's \$8.4 billion in requests for 40,000 officers. Again, the stimulus program contained \$1 billion and will fund just 5,500 officers. So, when the funding is doled out, departments in every corner of the country are going to be greatly disappointed because more than 34,000 of the officers requested will not be funded.

Also, the COPS office tells me that the vast majority of applications for the stimulus funding were for new officer positions, not to replace laid-off officers, so clearly there is a need for this program. To give you some perspective on the number of applications just received by the COPS office, when the program started in the mid-1990s, the office received about 6,000 applications. When the application period ended last week, there were 7,200 applications, so clearly police departments are in need and the COPS office is swamped.

Mr. Speaker, this popular community policing program will reauthorize through Fiscal Year 2014 the COPS program. I am pleased to see it includes Mr. WEINER's Troops-to-Cops Program, which would fund the hiring of former members of the Armed Forces to serve as law enforcement officers in community-oriented policing, particularly in communities adversely affected by military base closings. It also includes technology grants and authorizes up to \$350 million a year for grants to departments to obtain or upgrade technology and equipment.

Mr. Speaker, the COPS program has advanced community policing in all jurisdictions across the United States by enabling law enforcement to hire and train law enforcement officers to participate in community policing, purchase and deploy new crime-fighting technologies, and develop and test policing strategies. You'd be hard pressed to find a program that is better liked by the law enforcement community and city officials. More importantly, the COPS program is well run and an effective use of taxpayer money. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. WEINER. I yield back my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1139, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

STATUTORY TIME-PERIODS TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2009

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1626) to make technical amendments to laws containing time periods affecting judicial proceedings.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1626

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Statutory Time-Periods Technical Amendments Act of 2009".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO TITLE 11, UNITED STATES CODE.

Title 11, United States Code, is amended—

- (1) in section 109(h)(3)(A)(ii), by striking "5-day" and inserting "7-day";
- (2) in section 322(a), by striking "five days" and inserting "seven days";
- (3) in section 332(a), by striking "5 days" and inserting "7 days";
- (4) in section 342(e)(2), by striking "5 days" and inserting "7 days";
- (5) in section 521(e)(3)(B), by striking "5 days" and inserting "7 days";
- (6) in section 521(i)(2), by striking "5 days" and inserting "7 days";
- (7) in section 704(b)(1)(B), by striking "5 days" and inserting "7 days";
- (8) in section 749(b), by striking "five days" and inserting "seven days"; and
- (9) in section 764(b), by striking "five days" and inserting "seven days".

SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.

Title 18, United States Code, is amended—

- (1) in section 983(j)(3), by striking "10 days" and inserting "14 days";
- (2) in section 1514(a)(2)(C), by striking "10 days" each place it appears and inserting "14 days";
- (3) in section 1514(a)(2)(E), by inserting after "the Government" the following: ", ex-

cluding intermediate weekends and holidays,";

(4) in section 1963(d)(2), by striking "ten days" and inserting "fourteen days";

(5) in section 2252A(c), by striking "10 days" and inserting "14 days";

(6) in section 2339B(f)(5)(B)(ii), by striking "10 days" and inserting "14 days";

(7) in section 2339B(f)(5)(B)(iii)(I), by inserting after "trial" the following: ", excluding intermediate weekends and holidays";

(8) in section 2339B(f)(5)(B)(iii)(III), by inserting after "appeal" the following: ", excluding intermediate weekends and holidays";

(9) in section 3060(b)(1), by striking "tenth day" and inserting "fourteenth day";

(10) in section 3432, by inserting after "commencement of trial" the following: ", excluding intermediate weekends and holidays,";

(11) in section 3509(b)(1)(A), by striking "5 days" and inserting "7 days"; and

(12) in section 3771(d)(5)(B), by striking "10 days" and inserting "14 days".

SEC. 4. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO THE CLASSIFIED INFORMATION PROCEDURES ACT.

The Classified Information Procedures Act (18 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in section 7(b), by striking "ten days" and inserting "fourteen days";

(2) in section 7(b)(1), by inserting after "adjournment of the trial," the following: "excluding intermediate weekends and holidays,"; and

(3) in section 7(b)(3), by inserting after "argument on appeal," the following: "excluding intermediate weekends and holidays,".

SEC. 5. AMENDMENT RELATED TO THE CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT.

Section 413(e)(2) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 853(e)(2)) is amended by striking "ten days" and inserting "fourteen days".

SEC. 6. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE.

Title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 636(b)(1), by striking "ten days" and inserting "fourteen days";

(2) in section 1453(c)(1), by striking "not less than 7 days" and inserting "not more than 10 days"; and

(3) in section 2107(c), by striking "7 days" and inserting "14 days".

SEC. 7. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on December 1, 2009.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WEINER. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WEINER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Statutory Time-Periods Technical Amendments Act changes the court filing deadlines in a number of statutes so that they correspond with new Federal court rules that are scheduled to go into effect on December 1, 2009.