

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

be used to hire a cop, to buy computers for prosecutors or judges or telephone booths or lighting or whatever the Governor decided would relate to law enforcement functions. And 100 percent of the Federal funds could be used for this equipment, or to fund prosecutors, or to pay judge's salaries, without one single penny having to go to hire an additional cop.

I support many of these functions. In the crime bill, for example, we provide for a significant amount of money to the States to hire State judges. We put in money for new equipment. But we segregate, in the present crime law, almost \$9 billion. It says you must hire a sworn officer, that is somebody who is a criminal law enforcement officer. That is all you can do with the money now.

This new law proposed by the Republicans will, in fact, guarantee that we will not get 100,000 cops on the street. I am opposed to replacing the program that guarantees 100,000 new cops on our streets with the proposal that could spend over \$8 billion in Federal funds, without putting any new cops anywhere.

The Republican proposal suffers from an additional fatal flaw. It requires no fiscal accountability or responsibility. I find this fascinating. They are talking about tightening the budget, tightening spending. Here they are going to take over \$8 billion, with no accountability, and send it back to the States. Why do we not just have plain old revenue sharing? Why call this a crime bill? The bill uses a formula to simply hand out Federal funds to officials, with no strings attached and no accountability. That sounds great, does it not?

Well, the anticrime law requires that States and localities match Federal grants with their own money. And this match requirement is not born out of a lack of generosity on the part of the author of the bill, me or anybody else who voted for it. The offer of \$8.8 billion in Federal funds to assist what is purely a State and local function can hardly be characterized as not being generous. No, the reason I wrote in a match was to require accountability, a match required born out of experience.

I started my career as a county councilman, and I know how local officials work. God bless them, they have a tough job. We would sit there in budget meetings when I was a county official, councilperson, and somebody would say, well we are going to buy a new park, or do this in the park, or we are going to add two more police, and I or somebody else would say, how much is that going to cost? I am not exaggerating when I say the answer would come back that it will not cost anything. Wait a minute, you just said we are going to hire two new cops. They said, that is Federal money. That is Federal money, and it is not going to cost anything. Well, it is my tax dollars.

So I found when a county or city has to put up some money for a program, they think twice about whether or not they really want it. Remember the al-

legations in the old LEAA Program, where police departments are out buying Dick Tracy wristwatches, purchasing riot control gear in small towns that never even thought about a riot? In the LEAA Program, we went a long way to begin to work toward using our money wisely. We built in three key concepts. We targeted law enforcement to aid specific programs; required a match of one State or local dollar for every three Federal dollars that we spend, and required extensive State plans to explain what they are going to use the Federal dollars for. We do not demand that they do anything, except tell us what they are going to use them for.

The resulting law was what we called the Byrne Grant Program, which is a predecessor to this crime bill, a fiscally responsible, well-run program that continues today. The same concept marks the essential elements of the anticrime law for 100,000 cops. In fact, we even improve the Byrne concept in one respect. We permit localities, not just Governors, to apply directly for the funds to ensure that the money gets where it is most needed.

I think my Republican colleagues should go back and look at the experience of LEAA before they pursue their proposal of block grants for police and any other purpose. Their proposal is an \$8.5 billion giveaway of Federal dollars with no specific goals, with loopholes, and loose language that would permit every cent to be spent without any increase in police on the streets to show for our investment at the end of the 5 years.

In contrast, the anti-crime law enacted last year, which was bipartisanly constructed in the first instance, builds on the LEAA lessons. It sets specific goals, provides a simplified application, requires accountability for evaluation and matching requirements. In addition, the matching requirement is set up so the local share increases from year to year. In this way, we ensure that local dollars are to be used responsibly.

I see my time is coming to a close. Those who say, wait a minute now, BIDEN, under your bill that is now law, you required the States to kick in money. I say, yes, that is right. They say, well, in our bill we do not. Well, I ask a rhetorical question. This bill they are going to offer is a block grant for 5 years. Say they go out and hire cops for the local communities with block grant money and we pay for all of it for 5 years; what happens at the end of 5 years? The Federal Government is guaranteeing that we are going to take over local law enforcement costs for the rest of eternity? Is that what we are saying? No. In 5 years, the mayor has to go back to the taxpayers and say, hey, now we have 50 cops on the street, 10 are being paid for by Federal dollars. We no longer have those Federal dollars. Now I have to raise your taxes or cut the 10 cops.

Is it not wiser to make that decision at the front end, where you have to go

to the voters or your community and ask, do we want more cops? The Federal Government will give us \$70,000 to start off here, to keep this cop for 5 years, and we are going to have to kick in probably \$50,000 over that 5-year period. At the end of the process, we have to pick it up. What do you want to do? I think it is time we asked citizens to be as responsible as legislators should be and are not. That is, if you want to have more cops, it costs money, flat out. It costs money.

The local officials should have the guts to go to their constituency and stop talking about how tough they are.

Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] is recognized.

#### FEDERAL LANDS ACT FOREST HEALTH AMENDMENTS OF 1995

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, along with Senators HEFLIN, MURKOWSKI, GORTON, DOMENICI, BURNS, PACKWOOD, KEMPTHORNE, and a statement of support from the minority leader, Senator DASCHLE, I will, in the near future, introduce the Federal Lands Act Forest Health Amendments of 1995.

Mr. President, for some time I have attempted, along with others, to bring to the attention of this Senate the serious deterioration of this country's forest lands from a variety of ills, including drought, insect and disease attacks, and natural wildfires. We have come to understand that these problems, in combination, affect millions of acres of Federal, State, and private forest lands, and they have advanced to a point that they simply demand the attention of this Congress.

It should be no surprise to any of us. Numerous recent reports from the scientific community, one of them called "Assessing Forest Ecosystem Health in the Inland West" and the "Report of the National Commission on Wildfires," predicted intense wildfire events as a consequence of the forest health problems that this legislation will speak to. Many believe these costly fires will continue, unless there is an aggressive action by man to work with Mother Nature in attempting to deal with this situation. Scientists and forest managers met in Sun Valley in my State in 1993, and warned us with a very terse message, that we had "A brief window of opportunity, perhaps 15-30 years in length"—and in the life of a forest, that is but the blink of an eye—to reverse this very unnatural cycle of fire that we were moving into.

And, of course, last summer, it was so vividly dramatized in the inland West, as 4 million acres of unhealthy timber burst into fire, killing people, destroying homes, destroying ecosystems and wildlife and damaging riparian areas, and at a cost of \$1 billion to the Federal Government in its attempt to suppress these fires, when,