Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, I am rising today in strong opposition to H.R. 728. The reason I am doing this is not just because I have a personal dislike of this bill but because ever since I was elected I have met regularly with the law enforcement community in my district in Oregon, and they are opposed to this bill.

Why are they opposed to this bill? Why am I opposed? Well, it is a strange bill; it promises a lot of things, it delivers absolutely nothing except tremendous hardship for our police communities who are trying to do community policing, trying to do prevention.

H.R. 728 will mean less police on the streets and less money to prevent kids from committing crimes. It will cut a program that works well, the GREAT program. Why is it a good idea to put some money into prevention? Because it is a very, very much cheaper program; you put a few dollars into prevention and you keep a kid from crime. You put that person in jail, and it is going to cost us $24,000-plus per year.

But you do not need to take my advice on this matter. You really need to take the advice of the law enforcement community. I say to my colleagues, you do not just have to just join me in voting ''no''; let us, all of us, join the National Association of Police Organizations, Fraternal Order of Police, the Brotherhood of Police, the major city chiefs, the National Troopers Coalition, the National Sheriffs Association, the Police Foundation, the National Black Police Foundation. And they join with other organizations, like the Child Welfare League of America, the Children's Defense Fund.

I want to say to my colleagues, we are not all experts in every issue, but we can go to the experts. We can ask them what they think about each piece of legislation. I do that. I ask you to join with the law enforcement community of this country and vote ''no'' on H.R. 728. It will be bad for our communities, it will be bad for our kids, and it will be horrible for our budget.

## VOTE ''NO'' ON H.R. 728

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] for 5 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the effort of my colleagues in discussing H.R. 728, which will be considered by this House of Representatives today and tomorrow.

There are three issues before us: police, prevention, and pork.

On the police side, we passed a crime bill last year. President Clinton made it clear that he wanted to put 100,000 new police on the streets of America to make our neighborhoods and homes safer.

I represent a congressional district in downstate Illinois, small-town America. I can tell you from my town meetings, my contacts with people I represent, that this is exactly what they want to see. They want to make sure that there is a policeman in a car, patrolling at night, on the weekends, keeping a eye on their homes, watching out for their families, looking for anything that might be suspicious. That is basically what they are looking for.

Last year's crime bill would deliver it. In fact, last week President Clinton announced in my congressional district, one of many, I might add, 54 new police who will be working in those towns, in those villages, in those cities and counties because of the crime bill we passed last year, 54. A downpayment in my district on a national promise to put 100,000 police on the street protecting us.

The second thing that we were committed to in that crime bill is something that every law enforcement official that I have spoken to supports. They have all said, ''Congressman, give us more cops. Build more prisons, but don't think that will solve the problem. You can't build prisons big enough or fast enough to stop crime in America. You have got to do something to prevent crime.''

That is part of the program that we passed last year in the crime bill.

Some of my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle mock these crime prevention programs. They like to tell you stories about waste and how it is not going to work. I wish some of them would sit down and talk to the policemen I have worked with. I wish some of them would join these policemen as they go into the classrooms under their program, a program conceived under President Reagan's administration, to alert our kids to the dangers of narcotics.

Prevention pays off. Kids learn the dangers of narcotics, stay away from them, do the right thing with the right information. Good prevention, the kind of prevention we want to encourage.

So, with the police and with the prevention, why are we returning now to the crime bill, for goodness sake? It has to do with pork, the third P. Because, you see, the Republican approach in H.R. 728 wants to take all the money that will be earmarked for new policemen and hand it over to mayors and local officials and let them in their judgment decide how to spend that money.

You might say what is wrong with that? Surely they will do the right thing? Part of maturity is learning from past mistakes.

In the early 1970's we tried exactly what the Republicans want to try now. We called it the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration; high-sounding, money from Washington, down to the local level, saying to local officials, ''Go fight crime.''

Do you know what happened? Do you know what happened to those Federal dollars when they got down to the local level? One out of every three dollars was spent on consultants—not on cops, on consultants.

The Governor of one State decided he would take his law enforcement money and buy a jet plane for his State, a jet plane.

Another one bought a tank in a small rural town. They kind of went crazy. They bought equipment they did not need. Instead of putting police on the beat, they ended up a lot of buddies and friends with consulting contracts, and the net result of it, it did not work.

Now the Republicans want to return to those thrilling days of yesteryear, turn the money over to the local officials, and let them have it.

Well, let me tell you something: We need cops, not consultants. A lot of people say, if Congress passed the crime bill, why are we considering a new crime bill just a few months later? The answer, my friends, will not be found with police but with politics.

I think the people in this country are sick and tired of folks who are trying to dance around this law and order and crime issue to get a vote, trying to find a new partisan stand to say, ''We are tougher on crime.''

The President came up with an idea that was sound, was backed on a bipartisan basis last year in the crime bill: 100,000 cops in America. It is going to pay off in a lot of the small towns that I represent, and I think it will pay off nationwide.

But if it is going to work, we have to stop this Republican effort with H.R. 728.

I am happy to join with my colleague from Michigan, Congressman STUPAK, who, before he came to Congress, was a professional law enforcement officer. He has been out there, wearing the shield, putting his life on the line. His judgment on these issues means a lot more to me than the judgment of political consultants who would have us undo a crime bill which is moving in the right direction, a bill dedicated to more cops and prevention and one that does not leave us wide open for pork.

## COMMUNITY POLICING IS SUCCESSFUL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLDEN] for 3 minutes.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise toady in favor of the Conyers-Schumer substitute that will be offered later on this afternoon.

I say to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle that I have voted for many of the pieces of legislation that they have brought forth in this this session of Congress because I agreed with them and I felt they were right.

But I urge my friends to reconsider what they propose doing to the cops-on-the-streets program. I have spent 14 years in law enforcement, 7 as a county sheriff. And I believe in my heart that if we are going to win the war against crime, to make a significant contribution to reducing crime, we need more police officers on the street.