

bills this year, and they are now stuck in the Senate. Please go to jobs.gop.gov and read the plan.

The Democrats' suggestion that "poor sales" are driving unemployment is shortsighted and out of touch, considering the overwhelming consensus among the businesses I have personally visited.

It's time for Senate Democrats and President Obama to follow our lead and pass these 17 bills.

NOT A PRETTY PICTURE FOR POLICE OFFICERS

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago, Bernard Melekian, who is Director of the Justice Department's Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, produced a job loss ratio and report on the police departments throughout the United States of America. Mr. Speaker, it was not a pretty picture. We pat our police officers on the back, say they do a good job, and watch 12,000 of them lose their jobs in the United States of America.

There's one point I want to bring out here, Mr. Speaker, and it's this: If we place so much homeland security responsibilities on our first responders, then how in God's name can we turn our backs when cities and towns and rural areas are in tough financial shape? We will have an opportunity to rectify and right the ship this afternoon.

CALLING ON SENATE TO PASS JOBS BILL

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

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Speaker, last week, unbeknownst to most people because it doesn't get a lot of coverage, we did something in this House that most people in the Nation didn't think we had the capability of doing. We passed, on a bipartisan basis, a bill that will help put people back to work. We passed a bill that made it easier for companies that do business with the Federal Government to get paid, the 3 percent withholding rule. It passed through subcommittee on a bipartisan basis, through committee on a bipartisan basis, and off of the floor of this House on a bipartisan basis. It is actually part of the President's jobs plan—the President directly addresses this 3 percent withholding in his jobs bill—yet it got absolutely no attention. More importantly, it sits today at the Senate with absolutely no activity on it.

This House, Mr. Speaker, has done its job, and we've done our job on a bipartisan basis to pass a bill to put people back to work. But the Senators—most specifically, the Democrat leadership in the Senate—are not doing their job, and I call upon them to do exactly that.

LET'S WORK TOGETHER TO REBUILD INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, jobs is the most important issue this House can deal with. And it's been said in the past that there are two things that are bipartisan: defense budgets and infrastructure budgets, transportation.

Historically, we've gotten together on transportation and we've had a transportation bill and we've developed a great infrastructure that made this country the country that it is. No longer is America the top nation in the globe on infrastructure; it's countries in Asia and other places. We're 15th on the list on infrastructure.

The President's got a jobs bill that will put \$50 billion into roads and bridges, infrastructure, and put people to work—25,000 people for \$1 billion of investment go to work.

Ray LaHood, a Republican Member of this House when I started, now the Secretary of Transportation, said yesterday that the Republican side—or at least some part of it—is not here to get things done, that they're here only to defeat this President, and they need to pass the bill to put people to work and improve infrastructure.

I agree with Secretary LaHood. Let's work for America together, let's be bipartisan, and let's rebuild our infrastructure.

REPUBLICANS ARE HOLDING UP JOB CREATION

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up on my colleague from Tennessee.

I heard my Republican colleague on the other side of the aisle talk about the Senate. Well, the fact of the matter is that the Senate Democrats, on at least two occasions, have tried to bring up the American Jobs Act, the President's job initiative. They even broke it into smaller pieces. But what happens is they vote for it, but they can't get the 60 votes because none of the Republicans will join with them to get over that 60-vote majority rule. So this is being held up by the Republicans.

Here in the House, Speaker BOEHNER has said that he will not post the American Jobs Act. You know, it's been 43 weeks since the Republicans took control of the House and they haven't passed a single jobs bill yet. When the Republicans say, oh, they're passing bills to deregulate, that's not going to create jobs.

I have spent a lot of time in the last few weeks going around my district to some of the Main Streets and talking to small businesses. They like the American Jobs Act because they like the fact that it has the payroll tax reduction. They like the various tax

credits if they hire people. But when you ask them about regulation, regulation is not the issue, Mr. Speaker.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 3, 2011.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on November 3, 2011 at 9:36 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 271.
That the Senate passed S. 278.
That the Senate passed S. 535.
That the Senate passed S. 683.
That the Senate passed S. 684.
That the Senate passed S. 808.
That the Senate passed S. 897.
That the Senate passed S. 997.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2112, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2112) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to instruct at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Dicks of Washington moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 2112, be instructed to insist on (1) the highest level of funding for the "Federal Highway Administration—Emergency Relief Program" account, within the scope of conference and only for activities consistent with the definition of "disaster relief" included in the Budget Control Act of 2011, and (2) the highest level of funding within the scope of conference for the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) programs.

□ 1240

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the motion to instruct.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

The motion instructs conferees to provide funds needed for the Federal Highway Administration to eliminate the backlog of repairs to highways, roads and bridges damaged in natural disasters. The motion also instructs the conferees to fund the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) programs.

It is not unusual for Congress to appropriate funds to address the backlog of disaster repairs for highways, bridges and roads. Since 1989, Congress appropriated additional funds to eliminate the emergency relief backlog on 20 separate occasions.

This motion will put nearly 60,000 construction workers to work repairing roads and bridges in 37 States. The Federal Highway Administration needs about \$1.76 billion for emergency relief repairs in States that received a Presidential disaster declaration.

I would remind my colleagues that the Budget Control Act reformed the process for determining the total amount available for disaster relief funding. Funding is based on objective criteria. Disasters must be declared, and the total amount cannot exceed the rolling 10-year historical average. If conferees provide the highest level of disaster relief funding within the scope of conference, it will be within that range. The motion instructs conferees to remain consistent with the Budget Control Act. And the act makes clear that if disaster relief funding is within the average, it does not need to be offset.

The motion simply asks the House to honor the agreement on disaster relief reached in the Budget Control Act.

The motion also instructs the conferees to support the highest level of funding for COPS within the scope of conference. The House bill, as reported by the Appropriations Committee back in July, included no funding for the COPS programs. However, the Budget Control Act provides a higher discretionary funding total for FY 2012 than the allocation the committee was working with during the summer. This permits the House to fund some items that were difficult to provide for in July. And the COPS programs should

be at the top of the list of things to fix in the CJS bill with a higher allocation.

The House has supported COPS on a bipartisan basis, and it is needed now more than ever. The economic downturn of the last few years is straining the resources of State, local and tribal governments across the country. Public safety agencies have been affected along with nearly everyone else.

According to the COPS office, nearly 12,000 police officers and sheriff's deputies will have been laid off by the end of 2011. Approximately 30,000 law enforcement jobs are unfilled. And an estimated 28,000 officers and deputies faced week-long furloughs in 2010.

We can't fix all the financial pressures facing local law enforcement, but we can do something to help stem the tide. This motion would support the hiring or rehiring of approximately 1,500 police officers in FY 2012.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to vote "yes" on the motion to instruct, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers other than myself at this point; so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), who has been a tireless advocate for both the COPS program and our firefighters and for local law enforcement.

Mr. PASCRELL. I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding.

I want to thank Mr. DICKS for his leadership on this issue. I want to thank Mr. ROGERS for his open-mindedness, as usual, hopefully as we go into this discussion.

As cochair of the House Law Enforcement Caucus, I want to call everyone's attention to one of the glaring differences between the bill the Senate passed earlier this week and the one reported by our own Appropriations Committee: Funding for our local police officers.

The Senate bill contained \$232 million for the COPS office, including \$200 million for COPS hiring. This bill completely eliminated funding altogether. We're here today to try to rectify that situation.

Mr. Speaker, we know that State and local governments are still slashing their budgets as a result of the recession. In fact, just last week the Department of Justice released a sobering report, "The Impact of the Economic Downturn on American Police Agencies." I think all of our Members should read it. I want to place this as Exhibit A in my presentation today, Mr. Speaker, into the RECORD.

The report revealed that nearly 12,000 law enforcement officers will lose their job this year alone. Another 30,000 positions remain unfilled, and 2011 would produce the first national decline in law enforcement officers in 25 years.

Less cops on the beat means more crime on the streets, plain and simple. It is a very specific aspect of this par-

ticular problem. It's not going to get better.

I work very closely with my counterpart, Representative REICHERT, who was a sheriff's officer in Washington State, to cochair the Law Enforcement Caucus. Earlier this year, 115 Members of this body, Republicans and Democrats, supported these programs in a letter to appropriators.

It is just not enough, Mr. Speaker, to pat our police officers on the back. We must support them. The Federal Government has a particular responsibility, specifically, to debate the issue and look at the issue of homeland security. They're the first there, our firefighters. If there's any manmade disaster or act of nature, they show up first before anybody from the Federal Government.

To see the number of police officers being reduced in this country is unconscionable, particularly after 9/11. Our crime is rising specifically in the towns where these police officers have been laid off, furloughed, demoted—and certainly lack the promotions. The Federal Government has some responsibility here.

I would also like to place into the RECORD a very strong statement on the issue of the matter of crime in our cities and in our towns. I will make that Exhibit B.

I think the homeland security issue is a critical issue. But let's bring it back to our own towns. Police departments in the United States now have put on a list of priorities what they're going to respond to and what they cannot respond to.

Listen to these. They've stopped responding to motor vehicle thefts in many towns. They've stopped responding to burglar alarms that go off. They've stopped responding to non-injury motor vehicle accidents. In many towns, the warrant squads—if you don't know what a warrant squad is, then you don't know what police departments do day in and day out. They've minimized, two or three people left to try to find the folks that have perpetuated crimes in our communities.

They've reported decreases in investigations of property crimes. You talk about a response when you call the police department. Wait till you see the response in terms of investigating these particular crimes.

This has all come out under the Justice Department. I'm not making these numbers up. That's why I submit for the RECORD the numbers.

□ 1250

Let me just conclude, Mr. Speaker, in saying this has to be a priority. Protecting the public is our primary priority, and I ask consideration of what the gentleman from Washington is putting forth today.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 21, 2011]
IN HIGH-CRIME AREAS, STILL TOO FEW POLICE
(By Dan Mihalopoulos and Hunter Clauss)

Despite Mayor Rahm Emanuel's highly promoted efforts at concentrating additional

police patrols in the city's most dangerous neighborhoods, many crime-ridden police districts still have fewer officers patrolling their streets than far safer areas of the city have, according to recent data obtained by The Chicago News Cooperative.

The data included officer-assignment data for all 9,400 Chicago police officers, as well as almost 1,000 detectives—information that the city has steadfastly declined to make public.

The analysis found that the distribution of patrol officers among the city's 25 police districts does not correlate to the places where crime rates are highest.

The 5th police district, which includes the Roseland and Pullman neighborhoods on the Far South Side, has 266 patrol officers, four fewer than the 270 officers in the 12th district on the gentrified Near West Side, the data showed.

But the 5th district experienced 1,049 violent crimes in the first eight months of this year, while the 12th district recorded 341 violent incidents during the same period, according to police department records.

Many predominantly black districts on the South and West Sides had more than three or four murders, rapes, armed robberies or assaults for every beat officer assigned to work within their boundaries during that period.

That contrasted drastically with 10 districts, mostly in more affluent sections on the North Side, where there were one or two such crimes for every officer.

Many City Council members and neighborhood activists have long campaigned for a police department reorganization that would put more officers in high-crime neighborhoods. Told of the deployment data analysis, they said the results vindicated their demands.

"It basically validates the need for redeployment and reallocation," said Alderman Anthony Beale, whose 9th Ward is largely in the 5th district.

Mr. Beale said this week that he would call for Council hearings on staffing levels in police districts. He said he had unsuccessfully sought deployment statistics from the police for years.

"Putting the most police in the areas with the most crime—it's just that simple," said the Rev. Marshall Hatch, whose New Mount Pilgrim Missionary Baptist Church is in a West Side police district with the second-lowest proportion of police officers to violent crimes.

Lt. Maureen Biggane, a spokeswoman for the police department, said officials were in the process of "right-sizing the department" and had focused initial redeployment efforts on the highest-crime districts. The debate over how best to deploy police officers has raged for decades, with representatives of more tranquil corners of the city successfully blocking repeated attempts to shift greater resources away from their neighborhoods to the most violent districts.

The topic has become especially heated as City Hall's budget problems have worsened in the past few years. Even after the planned closing of three district stations, the police department would remain by far the largest component of the budget.

Police spending is slated to drop by 4.4 percent in 2012, to about \$1.26 billion out of the total city budget of \$6.28 billion.

During economic boom times, former Mayor Richard M. Daley promised and delivered expansion of the police ranks. When the city's budget deficits grew, the Daley administration allowed the police force to dwindle.

In 2008, officials reluctantly confirmed that they had been forced to renege on Mr. Daley's vow to hire new officers, and police academy classes ceased training cadets. Re-

tirements and other attrition quickly drove down the count of sworn officers on the payroll.

Since his inauguration in May, Mayor Emanuel and his new police superintendent, Garry McCarthy, have faced reality. In presenting his 2012 budget-proposal, Mr. Emanuel said he would delete more than 1,200 perennially unfilled officer positions from the books "to end the charade of carrying hundreds of police officer vacancies without actually hiring them."

While acknowledging that they will have a smaller force than the Daley administration once commanded, Mr. Emanuel and Mr. McCarthy are as leery as Mr. Daley was of moving officers from safe neighborhoods to higher-crime areas. Instead, City Hall's new leaders say they have shifted personnel from the specialized units that Mr. Daley built up and reassigned them as beat officers in districts across Chicago.

Mr. Emanuel said he had transferred more than 1,000 officers "to beat patrols in our neighborhoods," removing them from desk jobs and special units.

"Every police district across our city received additional officers," Mr. Emanuel told aldermen in his budget speech on Oct. 12. "Those districts with the most crime got the biggest increases, as it should be."

Ms. Biggane, the police spokeswoman, said eight high-crime districts had benefited from the first redeployment wave, involving 500 officers, and other parts of the city have since received additional patrols.

But the Emanuel administration has declined to provide documentation of those moves. The new administration has adhered to longstanding policies of the Daley administration, whose officials denied Freedom of Information Act requests by contending that public disclosure of documents detailing officer deployment levels would compromise security.

The Chicago News Cooperative recently obtained a list of the unit assignments for the 10,300 sworn Chicago police department employees from a police source who requested anonymity because the department leaders have declined to release it.

The records described the unit assignments as of early October and appeared to reflect the vast majority of the recent personnel moves ordered by the Emanuel administration.

Most of the detectives were assigned to one of the department's five area headquarters, while about 2,400 of the police officers were either assigned directly or detailed to specialized units, including the narcotics section and the internal affairs division.

It was impossible to deduce from the data exactly where the officers in specialized units were working. The list also did not include supervisors.

The other 7,000 police officers, representing a majority of the department's sworn members, were each assigned to patrol beats in one of the 25 districts. The number of officers in each district ranged from a low of 191 in the 23rd district to 386 in the 7th district.

A comparison of the beat deployment figures with department statistics for property crimes and violent crimes in each district this year shows:

Four districts—the 25th, 8th, 6th and 4th—had higher ratios of both property crimes and violent crimes per officer than the city-wide average.

The highest ratios of property crimes to beat officer counts were in the 14th, 8th and 25th districts, each of which reported at least 15 property crimes per patrol officer in the year's first eight months.

The lowest proportion of violent crimes to officers was in the 1st district, which covers downtown Chicago, followed by the 19th district on the North Side.

The 4th district, in the city's southeast corner, had the largest gap between staffing level and violence, with 4.05 violent crimes per officer.

The 4th district covers most of the 7th Ward, whose alderman, Sandi Jackson, praised Mr. Emanuel for adding officers to areas of greater need, despite tight budget constraints. But asked about the Chicago News Cooperative findings, Ms. Jackson replied: "There is absolutely a disparity. We are not where we would want to be ideally."

Some experts say the reaction of aldermen in apparently underserved districts, though politically astute, would not lead to the wisest policies for fighting crime.

"It is reasonable and rational to expect that there should be more officers in areas with more crime," said Arthur Lurigio, a professor of psychology and criminology at Loyola University. "But there is no evidence that would necessarily be the case."

Mr. Lurigio said saturating areas with officers often merely pushed criminals to other places that then witnessed a spike in violence.

Still, the city should deploy its police officers based on a formula that would account not only for crime rates but also for average response times to service calls, said Wesley Skogan, professor of political science at Northwestern University's Institute for Policy Research.

"This is Chicago, so everybody wants more and nobody wants to give up officers," Mr. Skogan said. "Emanuel should use his crisis clout and allocate police resources based on workload."

THE IMPORTANCE OF COMMUNITY POLICING IN TOUGH FINANCIAL TIMES

Many of the cost saving techniques discussed within this report are directly related to community policing efforts. Community policing is a philosophy that promotes organizational strategies, which support the systematic use of partnerships and problem-solving techniques, to proactively address the immediate conditions that give rise to public safety issues such as crime, social disorder, and fear of crime (COPS Office 2009a). The three tenets of community policing—community partnerships, organizational transformation, and problem solving—are of increased importance when facing budget cuts that reduce the number of officers on the streets.

Collaborative partnerships to develop solutions to problems and increase trust in police can be seen in many of the solutions police agencies are using in light of the economic downturn. Specifically, the use of volunteers, partnerships between the police and private agencies, and the use of social media as a means to communicate effectively with the community in order to meet their needs, are all examples of how collaborative partnerships act as a cost-saving tool.

Organizational transformation exists through the alignment of organizational management, structure, personnel, and information systems to support community partnerships and proactive problem solving. From its inception, community policing's goal is one of forging strong relationships between law enforcement and the communities they serve. It aims to redesign the practice of public safety into a collective, collaborative effort (COPS Office 2009a).

The current economic crisis, which has thwarted many police activities, requires police agencies to place a greater emphasis on problem-solving techniques. By engaging in the proactive and systematic examination of identified problems and developing and rigorously evaluating effective responses, they will be able to best use the limited resources that are available to them.

Unfortunately, when agencies are forced to make widespread budget cuts, some have done so by reducing or eliminating some of their community policing programs. In fact, according to the MCCA survey, 39 percent of respondents who have reduced budgets stated that those budgets cuts were made to their community policing efforts (MCCA 2011).

Herein lies one of the major fallacies as it relates to community policing. Community policing should not be viewed as a particular program within a department, but rather as a department-wide philosophy. Programs are typically initiated as a response to a specific problem, in which only a small portion of the organization is involved and once the problem has been addressed the program is dissolved (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux 1994). Instead, community policing must be understood as a philosophy that promotes the systematic use of partnerships and problem-solving techniques to proactively address the conditions within a community that are cause for public concerns over crime and social disorder issues (Melekian 2011d).

Community policing is an organizational strategy. It can be used to govern the way police services are delivered, recognizing the police officer as an organizer of resources in pursuit of public safety rather than someone designated to perform specific tasks (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux 1994).

In an article in *The Police Chief*, COPS Office Director Melekian articulates the importance of the community policing philosophy in the face of the current economic climate. He argues that the downturn in the economy has affected the country in ways that could not have been predicted even 5 years ago. The enhancement of community policing and the myriad of social outreach programs that have been employed by local law enforcement were initially brought about in large measure by the combination of federal grant dollars and readily available local funding sources. That financial foundation is now in serious jeopardy in many local jurisdictions.

Melekian further highlights how some have made the argument that these economic challenges may compel us to abandon community policing because we simply cannot afford it (Melekian 2011d). However, experience has shown that community policing is a more cost-effective way of utilizing available resources than simple traditional policing practices, for a number of reasons. Primarily, community participation in crime-prevention amplifies the amount of available resources, while community partnerships used to address problem solving provides a more efficient distribution of combined police and community resources than simply reactive policing program models (Brown 1989).

THE IMPORTANCE OF COMMUNITY POLICING IN A RECESSION

Concord, Massachusetts—Deputy Police Chief Barry Neal has utilized the proactive approach of community policing to prevent crime and reduce victimization. “We recognize that we can’t solve problems alone, we need to engage the community and work in partnership with them,” he said. “It gives us direct daily face-to-face contact between the community and the officers, and also gives us the ability to prevent problems from occurring instead of reacting to them” (Ball 2009).

Albuquerque, New Mexico—Chief Schultz of Albuquerque is having officers develop partnerships with retailers to address shoplifters and boosters. The Police Department has experienced a 20 percent reduction in their workforce and is developing partnerships with retailers with the goal of sharing information in order to link petty crimes together to prosecute larger and stronger cases and get repeat offenders off the street. In addition, they are offering rewards to house-

keepers at hotels to report the accumulation of large amounts of merchandise, which can often be found in hotel rooms (Stelter 2011).

Kansas City, Missouri—“When we talk in Kansas City about ‘doing something different,’ a mention of community policing usually follows. And surely, the thought of police officers working hand in hand with neighborhood folks is enticing. But successful, citywide community policing would require a culture change for a police department that places more faith in arrest statistics than relationships as a crime-fighting tool. [In looking for a new police chief, Kansas City] believes a chief who finds a way to make it acceptable, indeed desirable, for officers to connect with citizens and help solve problems will be the start of the change that everyone talks about” (Shelly 2011).

CONCLUSION

In 2008, the entire country was introduced to the largest fiscal crisis since the Great Depression. Many who have worked in the field for decades have never seen an economic situation that has affected law enforcement like the one our country currently faces. As cities and counties across America are experiencing a downturn in local revenues, the effects on public safety budgets have been significant. Americans are faced with a new economic reality, in which they are challenged to develop new and innovative ways to leverage resources and maximize productivity in the face of diminishing financial means. Police agencies have not escaped the effects of shrinking revenues. In fact, the economic challenges facing many Americans are amplified when it comes to public safety.

To compensate for shrinking budgets, many individuals focus on what can be sacrificed from their normal lifestyle in order to offset the reduction in available spending. Families may forego their annual summer vacation, or choose to only shop in discount stores rather than their favorite department stores. However, law enforcement agencies face the more difficult and ever important task of maintaining the same quality of service that they always have provided despite a severe reduction in available resources. Therefore, to successfully deliver the high levels of community protection and emergency responsiveness communities depend on, law enforcement agencies must develop new and innovative techniques to address the needs of their communities in cost-effective and sustainable ways.

The recognition and acceptance of this new economic reality is more important than ever in developing strategic management practices to ensure the effective and efficient delivery of police services. Never before has the law enforcement community experienced such significant cuts to operating budgets and available resources. Rather than continuing to provide services through traditional means in hopes that the economy will return to pre-recession levels, police nationwide are shifting, adapting, and redeveloping the ways in which they do their job—to ensure the highest levels of public safety.

In every corner of the United States, state, local, and tribal police departments are being forced to lay off officers and civilian staff, or modify their operations as a result of budget cuts. Over the last 2 years, many agencies have experienced considerable affects from budget constrictions, including mandatory furloughs and hiring freezes, which have resulted in significant reductions in staffing levels never experienced before. Indeed, American law enforcement is changing, and the effects are likely to last over the next 5 to 10 years, if not longer.

While the exact nature of how these changes will take place is unclear, the data within this report suggest that changes may occur on several fronts. First, there may be greater application of “force-multiplier”

technologies such as closed-circuit TVs, automated emergency dispatch systems, video teleconferencing equipment, and social media usage. Utilization of technologies such as these has the ability to provide law enforcement agencies with a way to maximize available information while alleviating the need for an immediate response.

Another fundamental alteration that has been seen in delivery of police services as a result of the changing economy is the increased application of non-sworn individuals—both as employees and as volunteers. More and more police agencies have begun to shift some of the responsibilities that have traditionally been performed by sworn staff to civilian personnel as a means to mitigate payroll costs and maintain staffing levels. Further, some agencies have even engaged citizen volunteers to help alleviate the strain on police work loads. Such approaches can provide sworn staff with more time to focus on pressing and time-sensitive issues that can only be successfully managed by a law enforcement officer.

Some agencies have had to drastically change their methods for handling non-emergency situations and administrative duties. Many police agencies are no longer able to dispatch an officer to every call for service. Instead, more often police managers are forced to direct their resources to focus on situations which pose the most threat to public safety. For example, some agencies are no longer able send officers to collect crime reports for cases that don’t involve suspects, or dispatch patrol officers to every non-emergency/non-injury service call. The primary focus on law enforcement is protecting the safety of their communities. Therefore, agencies experiencing limited resources must adjust their approach to focus in on situations that are an immediate threat to public safety.

A more drastic change that is being seen as a result of the economic downturn is the increase in the number of agencies combining efforts and resources through consolidation, shared services, and regionalization. When agencies are faced with maintaining services levels with less and less, collaborating or combining agency’s efforts often is the only way to maximize available resources, training, and information.

As this report has shown, the recent economic downturn has placed serious constraints on police budgets and severely diminished the availability of resources. As an additional step to help compensate for declining resources, many departments have also begun collecting and disseminating crime data in real-time via new technology. This has allowed for the effective management and strategic deployment of resources to focus on specific problems as they develop. With the increased use of technology and information-sharing policies being institutionalized throughout many police departments nationwide, it has become essential that the collection of national census data relating to law enforcement agencies be collected with the same urgency.

It is crucial for policy makers to create proactive, aggressive, and productive problem-solving strategies based on relevant and current data. However, the delay in the current methods of data collection and dissemination makes it difficult to present an accurate picture of the state of police agencies as things happen. In turn, a true understanding of the challenges confronting law enforcement agencies as seen through comprehensive analysis takes time and resources. It will be important for federal partners to collaborate on a way to collectively participate in data collection efforts in the future that will increase the availability of up-to-date data, and its analysis and dissemination. By

collecting data more frequently and comprehensively, policy makers and government agencies will be able to adjust and realign their strategic goals to provide relevant assistance where law enforcement agencies need it most.

Institutionalization of the community policing philosophy is vital to the ability of law enforcement agencies to succeed and thrive in the current economic climate. Agencies must systematically use partnerships and problem-solving techniques to proactively address the problems that their communities are facing. Development and enhancement of symbiotic relationships between police and the communities they serve is key to ensuring community safety.

It is clear that the challenges facing America as a result of the economic decline that began in 2008 have been significant. Law enforcement communities are facing a new reality in American policing—one that requires a shift in the methods they use to uphold levels of service while dealing with ever shrinking budgets. However, the importance of maintaining and expanding community policing practices during this time of economic hardship is paramount. Research and feedback from the field indicate that community policing is a successful practice in both small and large agencies with significant public safety problems. Thankfully,

many of the law enforcement agencies in the United States already practice community policing, and more are coming to recognize the value of community partnerships in this time of limited resources.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the ranking member of the Transportation, HUD Subcommittee, Mr. OLVER.

Mr. OLVER. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to instruct conferees. This motion would instruct the conferees to provide adequate funding to the Federal Highway Administration's Emergency Relief program in order to eliminate the backlog of repairs needed as a result of hurricanes, earthquakes, floods, and other natural disasters.

Since the Hayden-Cartwright Act of 1934, Congress has repeatedly recognized the need to provide assistance to States when unanticipated disasters occur without conditioning the support on cuts to other programs.

Currently, there is roughly \$1.75 billion in emergency relief backlog covering disasters in 37 States. The 2012 year has been an unusually active one for natural disasters, and 33 States have experienced declared disasters totaling \$1.4 billion since the beginning of this year alone.

This includes \$50 million in repairs that are needed in my State, Massachusetts, due to tornadoes in the spring and damage from Hurricane Irene; \$42 million needed by Iowa to repair damage from Missouri River spring floods; and \$100 million in Ohio due to severe rainfalls in the early spring.

Mr. Speaker, as we have done 20 times since 1989 during both Republican and Democratic Congresses, we have a responsibility to our neighbors to provide them funding needed to address their emergency relief needs.

Mr. Speaker, the chart I have in my hand references those 20 acts of Congress. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the motion to instruct conferees.

EMERGENCY RELIEF PROGRAM SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS 1989—PRESENT

[Excludes \$100 million annual authorization under 23 U.S.C.125]

Public Law	Date signed	Title	Highway Trust Fund	General Fund	Purpose	Waivers
PL 101–130	10/26/1989	Fiscal Year 1990 Dire Emergency Supplemental to Meet the Needs of Natural Disasters of National Significance.	\$1,000,000,000	September 1989 Hurricane Hugo and October 17, 1989 Loma Prieta Earthquake.	October	Waived 23 U.S.C. 120(f) [now 120(e)] by extending the 100% Federal share from 90 days ¹ to 180 days and extending this to all projects (emergency and permanent repairs). Waived the \$100 million State cap.
PL 102–368	9/18/1992	Supplemental appropriations for Fiscal Year 1992.	\$30,000,000	Hurricane Andrew, Hurricane Iniki, and Typhoon Omar.	none	
PL 103–75	1/5/1993	Emergency supplemental appropriations for relief from the major, widespread flooding in the Midwest for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993.	\$175,000,000	Midwest floods of 1993 and other disasters	none	
PL 103–211	1/25/1994	Making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.	\$1,665,000,000	January 1994 Northridge earthquake in Southern California and other disasters including an additional \$315 million for the Loma Prieta Earthquake.		Waived 23 U.S.C. 120(e) by extending the 100% Federal share from 90 days to 180 days and extending this to all projects (emergency and permanent repairs) related to the Northridge earthquake. Waived the \$100 million per State cap for the Northridge earthquake.
PL 104–134	4/26/1996	Making appropriations for fiscal year 1996 to make a further down payment toward a balanced budget, and for other purposes.	\$300,000,000	January 1996 flooding in the Mid-Atlantic, Northeast, and Northwest States and other disasters.		Waived the \$100 million per State cap for the January 1996 flooding in the Mid-Atlantic and Northwest States.
PL104–208	9/28/1996	Making Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1997.	\$82,000,000	Hurricanes Fran and Hortense and for other disasters.		none
PL 105–18	6/12/1997	1997 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Recovery From Natural Disasters and for Overseas Peacekeeping Efforts, Including Those in Bosnia..	\$650,000,000	For an additional amount for the Emergency Relief Program for emergency expenses resulting from flooding and other natural disasters.		Waived the \$100 million per State cap for the December 1996 and January 1987 flooding in the western States.
PL 105–174	5/1/1998	1998 Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions Act.	\$259,000,000	For an additional amount for the Emergency Relief Program for emergency expenses resulting from floods and other natural disasters.		Waived the \$100 million per State cap for projects resulting from flooding during the fall of 1997 through the winter of 1998 in California
PL 106–346	10/23/2000	Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations, 2001.	\$720,000,000	For an additional amount for the Emergency Relief Program for emergency expenses resulting from floods and other natural disasters.		none
PL 107–117	1/10/2002	Department of Defense and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Recovery from and Response to Terrorist Attacks on the United States Act, 2002.	\$100,000,000	For emergency expenses to respond to the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the United States, for "Miscellaneous Appropriations," including the operation and construction of ferries and ferry facilities.		none
			\$75,000,000	For emergency expenses to respond to the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the United States, for the "Emergency Relief Program," as authorized by section 125 of title 23, United States Code.		none
PL 107–206	8/2/2002	2002 Supplemental Appropriations Act for Further Recovery from and Response to Terrorist Attacks on the United States.	\$167,000,000	For an additional amount for "Emergency Relief Program," as authorized by 23 U.S.C. 125, for emergency expenses to respond to the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on New York City.		Waived 23 U.S.C. 120(e) or projects resulting from the 2001 NYC WTC terrorist attacks by allowing all projects to be eligible at 100% without any time limit. Waived the \$100 million per State cap for such projects.
			\$98,000,000	For an additional amount for the "Emergency Relief Program," as authorized by section 125 of title 23, United States Code.		none
PL 108–324	10/13/2004	Military Construction Appropriations and Emergency Hurricane Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2005.	\$1,202,000,000	2004 Hurricanes Charley, Frances, Gaston, Ivan, and Jeanne, as authorized by 23 U.S.C. 125.		Waives the \$100 million per State cap for projects arising from Hurricanes Charley, Frances, Ivan, and Jeanne.
PL 108–447	12/8/2004	Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005	\$741,000,000	For an additional amount for the "Emergency Relief Program" as authorized under section 125 of title 23, United States Code..		none
PL 109–148	12/30/2005	Department of Defense, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations to Address Hurricanes in the Gulf of Mexico, and Pandemic Influenza Act, 2006.		\$2,750,000,000	Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Wilma.	Waived 23 U.S.C. 120(e) for Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Wilma. Waived the \$100 million per State cap for Hurricanes Dennis, Katrina, Rita or Wilma and for the 2004–2005 winter storms in the State of California.

EMERGENCY RELIEF PROGRAM SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS 1989–PRESENT—Continued

(Excludes \$100 million annual authorization under 23 U.S.C.125)

Public Law	Date signed	Title	Highway Trust Fund	General Fund	Purpose	Waivers
PL 109–234	6/15/2006	Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006.	\$702,362,500	For an additional amount as authorized under 23 U.S.C. 125, for expenses identified under "Formal Requests" in the Federal Highway Administration table entitled "Emergency Relief Program Fund" Requests—updated 06/06/06.	Waived the \$100 million per State cap for Hurricane Dennis and for the 2004–2005 winter storms in the State of California.
PL 110–28	5/25/2007	U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007.	\$871,022,000	For an additional amount for the Emergency Relief Program as authorized under section 125 of title 23, U.S.C..	Waived the \$100 million per State cap for the 2005–2006 winter storms in the State of California.
PL 110–161	2/26/2007	Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2008	\$195,000,000	For replacement of I–35W bridge in Minneapolis, Minnesota as authorized in Public Law 110–56..	PL 110–56 waived 23 U.S.C. 120(e) and lifted the \$100 million per State cap for the I–35W bridge replacement.
PL110–329	9/30/2008	Consolidated Security, Disaster Assistance, and Continuing Appropriations Act, 2009.	\$850,000,000	For an additional amount as authorized under section 125 of title 23, United States Code..	PL 110–329 lifted the \$100 million per State cap for Hurricanes Gustav and Ike.
Total from GF				\$5,368,384,500		
Total from HTF 1989–present.			\$7,264,000,000			

¹ The time limit for eligibility of emergency repair work [currently 23 U.S.C. 120(e)] was increased from 90 days to 180 days in 1998 (TEA–21).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the ranking member of the Commerce, Justice, Science Subcommittee, Mr. FATTAH.

Mr. FATTAH. I thank the gentleman from Washington State, who's the ranking member on the Appropriations Committee, and I thank our chairman, Chairman ROGERS. I'm very pleased that we are having a motion to instruct and that actually we're moving appropriation bills.

I rise in support of the gentleman from Washington's motion to instruct, particularly in support of additional disaster relief and also the COPS program.

It's critically important that we continue the national declining crime rates, and because of the layoffs or dismissals of over 12,000 police officers and the fact that we have over 30,000 law enforcement jobs that are unfilled today in our country, we see in many cities now a rising level of criminal activity.

I want to mention that in Paterson, New Jersey, we heard from the gentleman who used to be mayor of Paterson that they've had to lay off 125 police officers, a fourth of the police force there, and they've experienced a 15 percent increase in crime. And I think that one could draw a correlation between these two. In Flint, Michigan, the police force has been cut by two-thirds over the last 3 years, and its murder rate is higher than that of Baghdad. Last January, Camden, New Jersey, was cut by 163 officers, 44 percent of the total force.

It's critically important that we understand the direct nexus between the Federal effort which began many years ago to put cops on the street and to assist local officers and the dramatic declines that we've seen for more than a decade now in criminal activity in our country, and I would hope that this motion to instruct would inform all of the conferees how important this is in addition to the disaster relief.

When we call 911, we want to be calling for a police officer, not dialing for a prayer.

So we need real help, and the conferees will have an opportunity to adjust the figures hopefully in line with what we want as an ideal. If we can fund police officers in Iraq and Afghanistan, we can fund them in Flint, Paterson, and in Camden, New Jersey, and in other cities similarly situated.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman have further speakers?

Mr. DICKS. I have one additional speaker, and then I will close very briefly.

I have the right to close, I believe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), a very distinguished Member of the Congress and a person whose State has been very hard-hit by disasters, and we're going to do everything we can to work to assist him on this important endeavor.

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, on August 28 of this August, Hurricane Irene left a path of destruction from the Carolinas to Vermont. The districts of 55 of our colleagues were hit and hit hard. And that storm did damage without regard to partisan affiliation or income distribution. If you were in the path of that storm, you suffered.

The 55 Members of Congress who were affected by it created the Hurricane Irene Coalition, Republicans and Democrats, and we are united in the single goal of getting the aid to our people back home that they need to get back on their feet.

Hurricane Irene, Mr. Speaker, saved its greatest fury to the end, when it descended upon Vermont. It was the biggest damaging storm that we've had in 100 years. We lost 700 homes of hard-working Vermonters, many of whom had no flood insurance, 260 roads and 30 bridges were impassable, 13 communities were entirely cut off.

The good news was that the Vermont response is extraordinary. People came together. They started a school on the town green in Pittsfield when they were unable to go north or south because the road was cut off. Then when the main artery was reopened so school

buses could pass but they couldn't get out on their road, they got their chainsaws out and cut a half-mile path through the woods so the kids could get to school. That's the kind of spirit that we find in our districts, and I'm very proud of Vermont, and all of our colleagues are as well.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to express a statement of gratitude. I've had the opportunity to visit with Mr. ROGERS. I've had the opportunity to visit with Mr. LATHAM, with Mr. OLVER, with Mr. KINGSTON, with Mr. DICKS, with Mr. CANTOR, where they've given me the opportunity to tell them the specific story of Vermont and hear my request that Vermont be treated as Vermonters have treated others.

I rise in support of this motion to instruct so that this Congress can do what it's always done. It's come forward to help people in this country who have been on the bad end of a tough storm.

□ 1300

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Is the gentleman from Washington prepared to close?

Mr. DICKS. Yes, I am prepared to close and to yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The motion to instruct conferees on the fiscal year 2012 bill will encourage the conferees to consider and support several funding items as they negotiate the final agreement on this three-pack of bills. While I believe that this motion is unnecessary, I am willing to accept the gentleman's motion as it does address some important issues that will be considered by the conferees. As we move forward, I expect the ranking member and myself to work together to negotiate these issues, and therefore, today, I can accept this motion.

First, if approved, this motion would express the House's support for funding for the COPS program within the Department of Justice.

While local law enforcement is primarily a State and local responsibility, there is strong bipartisan support for a variety of Federal programs that help

first responders, including the COPS program for State and local police.

The Commerce/Justice/Science bill has historically included a range of programs to strengthen local law enforcement, including Byrne grants, State Criminal Alien Assistance, Juvenile Accountability, programs to combat violence against women, and COPS programs. COPS has not only supported the hiring and rehiring of new officers, but it has also allowed local police departments to modernize their technology and to address the enforcement and cleanup challenges of the meth epidemic.

However, we must make these funding decisions very carefully to avoid adverse impacts. State and local budgets are often incapable of sustaining new first responder positions when Federal money runs out, and this risk is especially high given the current economic challenges in our local communities.

Second, this motion encourages the conferees to support funding for the Highway Emergency Relief Program, commonly referred to as the "ER Program."

This program is authorized, and provides States with funds to repair eligible roads damaged by disasters and catastrophic events. This program was created to rebuild after disasters and get businesses and everyday life back up and running. Unfortunately, in 2011, the total amount of eligible disaster-stricken roads exceeded the level of available ER funds. It's important that we now provide the appropriate level of funding to ensure that States and communities receive the legitimate assistance that they are relying upon.

Mr. Speaker, again, while I don't think this motion is necessary, I will accept it, and I look forward to working with both sides on these important issues in order to come up with a satisfactory solution.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I want to commend the chairman for his commitment this year to return to regular order. I wish we could have finished all 12 bills, but we at least got six of them done. I just want to thank him and his staff and the staff of the minority for working together in a collegial way.

I think it's important for the American people to know that the Appropriations Committee here is working together on a bipartisan basis. Now, we may have differences on economic theory and everything else, but we are committed to getting these bills passed and bringing as many as we can to the floor. I hope that, next year, we can start a little earlier and get the budget resolution and move these bills. I would love to see us in the second session of this Congress get all 12 bills to the floor where the Members can offer their amendments. I think that still should be our goal and objective.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman for those words.

He is exactly right. He and I started out this year both new to our jobs on the committee; but determined, we agreed with each other and committed to each other that we would work together to try to restore the regular order that used to prevail on these appropriations bills, where we had heated debate but collegial debate, realizing that we have to finally come to some agreement on these bills that keep the government going. We don't have the luxury of failing. The gentleman has been a great partner in this work all year long, and I look forward to the rest of the work.

Now, on this year's bills, the 2012 bills that we're working on now, it is my hope and ambition—I know you share this with me—that we finish these bills before the end of this calendar year.

Mr. DICKS. Absolutely, we are determined to do that. I'm glad to see that the other body is actually bringing some of these minibuses to the floor and allowing their Members to have a vote. I think we may have inspired them.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. That would take some doing.

Nevertheless, I agree with you. I'm tickled to death to see the Senate is finally acting. They only passed one bill, up until 2 days ago, of the 12. We've passed six through the House, and have sent them over there without a response until now.

I want to finish the 2012 bills right away so that we can begin work in January on the 2013 bills and so that we'll have plenty of time to do them one by one, which is the regular order and what we all want to see happen. I know that's my goal and ambition, and I know the gentleman shares that.

Mr. DICKS. I concur with what you've said, and I concur with the direction we're going in. I just hope we can do a little better and finish the job next year. It has been done before. It's not impossible. We also have to think about the impact of these bills on the economy and the country. That's very important as well.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. We were sidelined a good part of this year from our regular business with H.R. 1. We inherited a House that had not passed an appropriations bill for fiscal '11, so we spent the first 5 months or so of the year trying to pass a bill to fund that current year, fiscal '11.

Mr. DICKS. Your point is that that's why it's so important to finish these in 2011, before the end of the calendar year, so we don't have to waste time next year in finishing the job.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Exactly. Nevertheless, it held us up for 5 months and kept us from doing our chores for fiscal '12. Then came along the debt ceiling increase debate, which took weeks and sucked all of the air out of everything else, so we were prevented on the committee from doing our regular chores.

As the gentleman says, we want to finish these bills for fiscal '12 so that finally, in fiscal '13, we can have a real clean year, taking each bill one by one.

Mr. DICKS. Speaking of a clean year, let's try to get rid of as many of those riders as we can, Mr. Chairman. You know it's the right thing to do.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. By the way, in closing, we're going to conference with the Senate on these three bills this afternoon—as a matter of fact, at 5 o'clock. That's the first time that there has been a House-Senate appropriations conference in years. So, between us and the Senate, we are achieving something almost historic here, and that is going to conference with the Senate, which used to be a routine thing, and we hope to restore that idea.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DICKS. 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, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1310

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2930, ENTREPRENEUR ACCESS TO CAPITAL ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2940, ACCESS TO CAPITAL FOR JOB CREATORS ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 453 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 453

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2930) to amend the securities laws to provide for registration exemptions for certain crowd-funded securities, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points