

during some of his life during those years knew him as a man of continued brilliance, of foresight and wisdom, and he continued to command our respect.

Mr. President, when the Fulbright Program was threatened, when it was endangered by cuts, he took to the phones in recent years to galvanize support. He roamed the Halls of the House of Representatives and the Senate for his beloved Fulbright Program. After all, all over the world, many leaders of the free world had been called Fulbright scholars.

We will miss this great man, Mr. President. I first met him when he was speaking at the Ouachita County Courthouse in Camden, AR. The year was 1944, and he was seeking his seat in the Senate. I was 10 years old at that time, but I could still take you to that corner in Camden, AR, where I first had the opportunity and the privilege of meeting J. William Fulbright. I just knew that I had met a great person. And through these many years, I was never quite able to ever bring myself to call him "Bill." To me, he was and he will always be Senator Bill Fulbright.

He spent his life attempting to end the obsession with war. He spent his life attempting to educate us that using war as the solution for our conflicts was a course of action that would bring us nothing in the end but sorrow. We will miss this great man, this great Senator, and this great person who has contributed so much to peace in the world and understanding among all men.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. BIDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware, under the previous order, is recognized to speak for up to 30 minutes.

Mr. BIDEN. I thank the Chair.

Before I begin what I wish to speak to, let me compliment my friend from Arkansas. I had the great privilege of being a young Senator serving with Chairman Fulbright. I did not know him nearly as well, nor was I as close to him, by any stretch of the imagination, as my friend from Arkansas, but it was a real honor and privilege and, let me say, something that I tell my children and will tell my grandchildren and I am sure they will tell their children, that their father and grandfather had a chance to serve with such a great man.

I will tell you one anecdote in my relationship with him. I remember him as a young man. I had just been elected. I was 29 years old. I had not turned 30 yet. I came down here to meet with what was then referred to as the old bulls of the Senate. I went around and made my obligatory stops at the offices. Senator Fulbright asked me what I wanted to do, and I said how very much I would like to be on the Foreign Relations Committee.

I say to my friend from Arkansas, back in those days I do not think there was anybody on the committee under the age of 55 and it was only senior

Senators, very senior Senators who were on the committee, made up of great men like Jack Javits and Mike Mansfield, Bill Fulbright, Stuart Symington, Hubert Humphrey, et cetera. And I realized it was a reach, and I did not expect to get on as soon as I did. But I just wanted to let him know.

He said, "Why do you want to be on the Foreign Relations Committee?" I said, "Mr. Chairman, one of the great concerns I have is our foreign policy, American foreign policy. It is my avocation, my interest. Quite frankly," I said, "Mr. Chairman, if as a Senator I would not be able to deal with foreign policy, there would be no reason to run for the U.S. Senate; I might as well run for Governor. But the reason I am here is because I care about that."

He looked at me, and he said, "Well, I understand your sincerity. Let me think about it." So I saw him coming over on the subway a little while later, a week later, and he said, "I thought about it." He said, "You really want to affect foreign policy?" I said, "Yes, I would like to eventually, Mr. Chairman." He said, "Why don't you go see my colleague, Senator McClellan." I said, "I beg your pardon, Mr. Chairman. He is the No. 2 man"—then was about to be the chairman—"of the Appropriations Committee." And I said, "That's appropriations." He said, "Yes, but that's where foreign policy is made."

I will never forget that.

Mr. PRYOR. A good story.

Mr. BIDEN. And he did support me, I might add, to go on Foreign Relations. But he told me if I really wanted to affect foreign policy, I should go with the other Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

TRIBUTE TO J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I come this morning sadly to eulogize one of the truly great political and intellectual giants of my home State of Arkansas. In a way, it is especially difficult for me because in 1974 I ran against him for the Senate.

J.W. "Bill" Fulbright had been a Congressman, president of the University of Arkansas, U.S. Senator, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and an icon to millions of people, not just in Arkansas, but all over the world.

In 1974 Senator Fulbright had served in the Senate for 30 years and was prepared to run for his sixth term. I was Governor of my State, completing my second term, and I can tell my colleagues that being a Senator is infinitely more enjoyable and less stressful than being Governor. I was not interested in running for the House of Representatives, nor was I particularly interested in returning to the practice of law.

While I had been a great fan of Bill Fulbright's, I was late in opposing the war in Vietnam, long after he opposed it. I had admired his courage in speaking out against that war almost from

its inception. I suppose now would be a good time to say that he once told me that his vote on the Gulf of Tonkin resolution was the worst vote he ever cast, and that he regretted it.

But I had to make a decision about the Senate race, and I had to make it by March 1974. So I made what was one of the most difficult decisions of my life—to run against him in the Democratic primary. There are people, needless to say, who never forgave me for it, and I understand that.

I do not mean this to sound self-serving, but it is not terribly uncommon for people to come up to me and say, "How does Arkansas elect the quality of people that it does?" And they always include Bill Fulbright's name. We have a saying in Arkansas that we defeat better men than most States have a chance to vote for.

So while our relationship was not close even before that primary election, it was certainly not close afterward. Happily, about 5 years ago, we had a 2-hour luncheon, which I would have to say was one of the highlights of my life. It was not spectacular from a content standpoint, but we obviously liked each other and regretted that we had not been closer the first 15 years I was here.

Out of that luncheon grew a very, very warm friendship, not only with him, but with his beloved wife Harriet, who is one of the truly superior people I have ever known.

I might say at this point that Harriet has been as loyal, faithful, caring, and compassionate during Senator Fulbright's illness as anybody could possibly be.

Mr. President, I will introduce more formal remarks into the RECORD sometime in the near future, but I hastened here this morning after his death last night to say that I know I speak for all of the people of my State in expressing our genuine sadness at the loss of this truly great man.

Bill Fulbright believed in public service. I was just a youngster when he was first elected to the Senate, but in the time I did know him, while I was Governor and in the past few years, I never heard him express any idea that was not noble, an idea that was not motivated by his commitment to his country, or an idea that would not inspire our young people to choose politics as a career. Though he did not suffer fools gladly, he was not a cynical man.

I came here to say he was a great icon, a great public servant, and a brilliant man who loved his country beyond the love of anything else. I will personally miss him and the warm relationship we had been enjoying.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

CRIME AND JUSTICE IN AMERICA

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise this morning to begin speaking on the issue of crime and justice in America and the Democratic crime bill, the Clinton

crime bill that was passed last year, and the proposals to change that crime bill. I realize there is sort of a frenzy underway here where, to use the old expression, the freight train is rolling down the tracks, the contract is underway, and we are in a great hurry to change everything here.

I am going to spend a half hour or so this morning, and then future mornings, as we approach the debate on the Senate floor on the changes in the Biden crime—in the crime bill, and try to lay out some of at least what I see to be the facts.

Last year, Congress completed a 6-year effort and enacted a major anticrime law in which the Federal Government launched a bold and multifaceted attack on violent crime and its roots back in our communities, not here at the national level. For the first time, the Federal Government made major commitments to help States and localities, the places where 95 percent of all the crimes are committed and all the crimes are prosecuted. We got involved, to help them redress the greatest shortcomings in our system. And after years of study and overwhelming consensus, it was agreed that those shortcomings in our criminal justice system were and are.

No. 1, first and foremost, there is a shortage of police out on the streets of our communities. That is number one.

No. 2, the shortage of prison space and the need for sentencing reform at the State level.

No. 3, the shortage of effective responses to drug offenders.

No. 4, the lack of serious response to rape and family violence.

No. 5, the lack of safe places and positive activities for those children referred to as at-risk children, who grow up surrounded by illegal drugs, crime, and violence.

Everybody I am aware of agrees these were the problems we had to speak to. I might point out we pretty well have taken care of—which is a much easier problem to take care—the Federal side of that equation. We have enough Federal prison space in the Federal prison system. When you get sentenced, you go to jail for the totality of that term. I was the coauthor of that bill. In the Federal courts, if a judge says you are going to go to prison for 10 years, you know you are going to go to prison for at least 85 percent of that time—8.5 years, which is what the law mandates. You can get up to 1.5 years in good time credits, but that is all. And we abolished parole. So you know you'll be in prison for at least 8.5 years.

But in the States, the average amount of time people serve once sentenced in the State court is 43 percent of the time. So on average, in the States—my State being one of the exceptions, the State of Delaware, which essentially has the same records as the Federal Government; they keep people, on average, 85 percent of the time—but most States keep people in jail, if they get sentenced to 10 years in the State

court, they only serve 4 years 2 months in a State prison.

So we fixed it at the Federal level. This was to help begin to not send rules or regulations or mandates to the States, but to send them money to fix the problems. It was to help them fix the problems I have stated, which everyone agreed on: Lack of police, lack of serious response to rape, et cetera.

Now, in its breadth, the crime bill we passed reflects the lessons learned over the past decade as we studied crime and law enforcement and worked on passing this law; namely, that all of the shortcomings have to be addressed at one time. Correcting one without the other is futile because crime knows no easy single answer. What we found out in the States and what we found out in our earlier experience in the Federal Government is when you increase penalties and you do not increase the number of prison spaces, you do not do much. If you put more cops on the street, they make more arrests, you increase the penalties, and you do not have places to put the felons, then the people just walk. So now you have convicted felons who are out on the street, not having served their time. So we learned we cannot just deal with one piece of it.

The anticrime law we passed last year addressed each of these shortcomings, as I will detail in a moment. In its approach, as well as in many specifics, the law was a result of bipartisan efforts—at least at the outset.

The law is already at work; \$1 billion has already been awarded to the States and localities to put almost 15,000 new police officers on the streets in the community policing program. That is already done. The law only passed last fall and already almost 15,000 cops, new cops, brand new—not supplanting cops that were on local forces, almost 15,000 new local cops that were not there before—within the next several months, after they finish their training, are going to be on the streets in the United States of America because of this crime bill. Dollars, under the drug court program, the Violence Against Women Act, are going to be awarded over the next few months.

I hoped I could spend the next several months watching over the smooth and speedy implementation of this law, as well as turning my focus to the substantial issues that still lie before us. Just to name two priorities, we must turn all our talk about our war on drugs into a real battle, and we have to reform our juvenile justice system as it struggles to deal with violent, youthful offenders unlike any the current system was designed to handle.

That is work still to be done. I thought we would be on the floor here this next year and the following year, dealing with finally doing something real about the drug problem and doing something more about juvenile justice because when I wrote the crime bill, I never advertised it as—as my grandfather would say, this is not a horse to

carry the sleigh. The whole sleigh on crime is more than what the crime bill was about, and we have said that, frankly, from the beginning. What we did, we thought we were going to have in place; we thought we were going to be just implementing.

Very soon, the Senate will embark on a debate, not about new challenges, but of the anticrime law we just enacted last fall. The House is already taking apart this law piecemeal.

What is motivating a retreat on the bill that contained so many provisions drafted and once supported by Republicans, as well as Democrats, quite frankly, escapes me. I will let you draw your own conclusions. But I ask you walk with me through the changes the Republican leadership seeks to make in the anticrime law. I suspect the merits will speak for themselves.

At the same time, I want to make clear what I will fight for and what I will fight against, as we revisit the issues debated in the crime bill last year so thoroughly. Let me turn first to the central provision of the present new crime law, a program designed to address the first major law enforcement shortcoming I mentioned, a program that deserves, in my view, to be preserved and one I will fight to save from the Republican chopping block. Let me speak first about that program.

That program puts 100,000 new police on the street. I do not know a responsible police leader, an academic expert, a public official who does not agree that putting more police officers on our streets back home and in our neighborhoods is a good idea, a good idea that goes by the name of community policing. The true innovation of community policing is that it enables police officers to pursue dual goals. They are better positioned to respond to and apprehend suspects when crime occurs. But they are also better positioned to keep crime from occurring in the first place.

Today, too many police officers are strangers in their own communities. From headquarters or cruisers, they respond to radio calls only after crime has occurred, forever behind the curve. Police officers are a part of their community. Community police officers will be a part of their community. They know their community—the hot spots, the troublemakers, the gang members—and they can work to prevent crime in the first place.

I do not want to go back to a nostalgic and romantic view of what used to be the case. But most of us who grew up in anything that remotely resembles a city or a town that had an identity when we were kids, those of us in this Chamber, when we were kids, we knew the local cop. He walked down the street. He knew everybody. He knew who owned what store. He knew the kids who were troublemakers and those who were not. We knew if we got into trouble, he would call our mothers or call our fathers.

Things have not been working too well is for a whole range of reasons—mainly the shortage of bodies—but one of the reasons is that we have moved away from community policing. In my own State, community policing took the form of foot patrols with a particular focus on breaking up street-level drug dealing that had turned one of Wilmington's neighborhoods into a crime zone. These efforts successfully suppressed drug activity without displacing it to another part of the city. The Wilmington example fits the shorthand description often used for community policing; that is, putting cops on the streets to walk the beat. But in practice, community policing takes on many forms, depending on the needs of any particular community.

The form of community policing takes various forms. From community to community, the results coming in from the field are all the same. Community policing works. In New York City, a place where crime can seem insurmountable, the police commissioner began an aggressive community policing program that contributed to a significant decrease in serious offenses last year.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). The time for morning business has expired.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I do not want to ask unanimous consent to continue morning business if my friends are ready to go on the bill. I do not want to do that. But, if they are in no hurry, I would ask unanimous consent to continue for another 15 minutes.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, there others who are seeking time for morning business, including myself.

How much more time does the Senator feel he needs?

Mr. BIDEN. About 15 minutes.

Mr. CRAIG. All right. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we be in morning business until 10:45 with 15 minutes allotted to the Senator from Delaware and 15 minutes allotted to the Senator from North Dakota, and the balance of the time for this side, until the hour of 10:45.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. I thank my colleague from Idaho.

Mr. President, with the New York City community policing, since they instituted community policing, murders have dropped 19 percent, robberies have dropped 16 percent, burglaries went down 11 percent, and auto thefts were reduced to 15 percent.

In Tampa, FL, police committed themselves to moving crack dealers off the street corners and forged an unprecedented alliance with the citizens of the community to achieve that. Through a combination of standard

buy-bust operations, new outreach to the community involvement of other city agencies and local media, the dealers have been driven off within a year and the streets within the targeted area returned to normal.

In New Haven, CT, one of the most innovative police chiefs in the Nation, Nick Pastore, with his aggressive community policing effort, led to a 10-percent drop in serious crime in the year 1992, the last time we have the figures.

Policing community techniques were introduced in the New York subway system 4 years ago, and the results have been phenomenal. Robberies have fallen by 52 percent. In the Inglewood section of Chicago, community policing is credited with a 6-percent decrease in violent crime last year.

The new anticrime law enacted last year targets \$8.8 billion in funds to State and local law enforcement to be used specifically to train and hire 100,000 community police officers across the Nation. Like community policing itself, this program works. Already, the Justice Department has awarded almost 15,000 new officers to State and local communities.

All of these are local officers with no Federal control, no Federal mandate. These are local cops for which the Federal Government is kicking in \$70,000 per cop.

In short, in only the first 6 months following the passage of the new crime law, almost 15,000 new police officers will be on the street. So much for the critics who claim that the new crime bill would fund only 22,000 police officers in 6 years. We have almost 15,000 that will be on the streets, new ones, in 6 months; not 22,000 in 6 years as our critics say. In fact, the law will fund 15,000, as I said, in the first 6 months alone, and we will be well on the way by the time the first year is over to surpassing the 20,000 mark.

The effectiveness of the cops program derives from its design. The cops program is a result of setting a precise goal, and enacting in a responsible program to achieve a precise goal. When he took office, President Clinton called on us to put 100,000 more police on the streets over the next 6 years.

To put it another way, we have roughly 530,000 local police officers in all of America, State cops to town cops to county cops. At the end of the process, there will be 630,000 cops on the streets of America. Already, that number will be up by 15,000 at the end of the first 6 months.

So he asked us to put 100,000 cops on the street. We then designed a program that funds that effort and that effort alone. The Federal dollars were awarded for the sole purpose of hiring new police officers so that in 6 year's time America will have 635,000 police doing community policing.

The position of this program stands in stark contrast to the Republicans' new law enforcement block grant which would spend roughly the same amount of Federal funds—to be spe-

cific, \$8.5 billion—without guaranteeing a single, solitary additional cop back home. Read their proposal. Money is sent, not like it is now directly to a police department to hire a cop locally. Money will be sent to Governors back in our home States. With that money the Governor, out of that \$8.5 billion we are going to send to the Governors now—not to the police—they will be able to hire or pay overtime to undefined law enforcement officers, or to procure equipment, technology or other material that is directly related to basic law enforcement functions, such as the detection or investigation of crime or the prosecution of criminals.

That may sound fine on the surface. But let us look at it a little bit closer. Let us call this what I call the first weakness of the Republican change. I call it the officer loophole because the Republicans do not define law enforcement officers as career officers dedicated to enforcing the criminal laws, as it is defined in the Biden crime bill. Indeed, the Republicans do not define law enforcement officer at all in their new crime bill.

Let us call the second weakness what I call the equipment loophole. The Republican proposal would fund any equipment or technology related to law enforcement functions, and those functions are specifically defined to include prosecution.

These two loopholes mean that the Governor of a State who will get the money now—it will not go to your local police department. It is the same old bureaucracy that is going to be set up. Right now all the police department has to do, they do not have to go to get anybody's permission. They can make an application. Once they check with their local government, their local civilian officials and send an application directly to the Attorney General of the United States, and the Attorney General of the United States can send back directly the money to hire those new local cops. But now we are going back to the bad old days, which is the Governors sit there and say, This is what I want to do with the money. Send me the money. I will take care of it. The two loopholes I mentioned means that the State can spend all of their money to hire prosecutors, all their money to improve the court systems or anything related to law enforcement. Arguably, the money could even be used to hire officers to enforce the civil laws as well as the criminal laws in the State. For example, the Governor could use the money to hire public health officers; they could use the money to hire the public health officers to inspect restaurants and businesses.

Equipment as defined by the Republicans could include not merely police equipment, which the new anticrime law already grants a portion of funds to provide for new equipment, but it could—in this case, they could use this money, which was heretofore only to