

the time. To facilitate the consideration of the crime bills on the House floor, H.R. 3 was divided into six bills: The Victim Restitution Act, which was passed; the Exclusionary Rule Reform Act, which was passed; the Violent Criminal Incarceration Act, which was passed; the Criminal Alien Deportation Act, which was passed; and the Effective Death Penalty Act.

Now before the Congress is the Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grant. Today we continue to solidify the Republican approach to battling crime by considering that H.R. 728 measure, which is designed to place control of Federal anticrime dollars where it belongs, in the hands of the local law enforcement officials who are at the front line in the battle against crime, to decide for themselves where the funds should go for local programs.

H.R. 728 replaces major portions of the President's crime package which passed last year. While the Clinton bill set up categorical grants with no local flexibility, this new legislation solves that problem by establishing block grants to help units of local government improve public safety.

Use of funds under H.R. 728 can include the hiring of police officers, training and equipping law enforcement officers and support personnel. It can also be used to enhance local school security or establish crime prevention programs which directly involve law enforcement personnel such as community policing, town watch, drug courts, special programs to stop crimes against senior citizens, or prevention programs to stop abductions and exploitation of our children. This new bill does not affect in any way the police funding already established in the 1994 crime bill.

The bill authorizes \$10 billion for law enforcement block grants over 5 years with \$2 billion to be distributed each year from 1996 through the year 2000. Most importantly, this bill allows localities greater flexibility responding to their own crime problems. Our own Chief William Kelly of Montgomery County, PA, has had programs instituted with community policing, which are really the outstanding ones of Pennsylvania and the country, I believe. District Attorney Mike Marino's outstanding community program with DUI offenders that pick up the litter all across the county have been the model for Pennsylvania. While crime statistics show that crime has been on the upswing, we know that we can with this bill make a real difference.

The overwhelming incidence of crime occurs within State-level jurisdictions, so these authorities bear the primary responsibility for combating this mounting crisis. However, the Federal Government cannot abrogate its responsibility. Through the Contract With America, Republicans recognize that the best thing we can do is to allow the local authorities, through block grants, the opportunity and flexibility to fight crime in the manner

best for each community by providing them with those block grants.

The Clinton approach to battling crime was very different. After nearly a year of congressional hearings, mark-ups, and floor votes, a delayed recess and weekend votes, the best the previous Congress could do was come up with expensive, Great-Society-type programs. In this new bill before the House it repeals many of the social experiments and replaces them with solid funding which can be used by the local authorities in the manner they think best to fit their needs. This represents a commonsense approach to battling crime on this Nation's streets.

Finally, Congress is listening to the experts in law enforcement and have given them the tools they need to fight crime at home.

Back in my home district of Montgomery County, PA, I have an anticrime advisory board which advises me on the best ways to battle crime locally. They have counseled me on how the Federal Government can assist them in their efforts without bankrupting this country. When they spoke, I listened, because they are the ones who are putting their lives on the line every day. They are the ones that see the damage that crime can cause.

I applaud this new effort on crime as we set forth in our Contract With America. We may face criticism from those who are naysayers, who would rather keep this massive bureaucracy in Washington, which has actually hindered some of our anticrime efforts. But as long as I represent the people of Montgomery County, I will take my directions from them, not from the bureaucrats in Washington.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### DEBATE TIME ON NATIONAL SECURITY REVITALIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I take this 5-minute special order this evening to partly respond to some of the rhetoric that we heard on the House floor earlier, primarily coming from the minority side, on the allocation of 10 hours of debate on the National Security Revitalization Act which we will have on the House floor Wednesday and Thursday of this week. While I am not going to get into all the details and implications of that piece of legislation, I do want to respond to several of the issues that were raised here tonight by the leadership of the minority side.

□ 2240

Mr. Speaker, we heard it said that when President Bush was in office we had extensive debate before our troops were asked to go into Desert Storm, and that, in fact, is correct, because it was asked for by President Bush and this Congress responded.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues on the other side, where was that same debate when all of us jointly asked for a debate on sending our troops into Haiti. We had known we were going to go into Haiti for months at a time. Many of us had asked for a full and open debate of that issue where our troops were being put in harm's way. We were not given 10 minutes of debates on this House floor prior to sending our troops into Haiti.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, where was the debate on this House floor that now sees American tax dollars being used to pay the salaries, the benefits, the housing costs, and the travel for about 2,000 troops from Third World nations that are currently providing protection inside of Haiti? Where was the debate so the American people could vote on that issue before that action took place? Where was the debate on Bosnia, so we could fully debate the President's policy? We never had any debate on Bosnia prior to Presidential action.

Mr. Speaker, I say with a great deal of concern, where was the debate in this House on the President's decision to go in and bail out Mexico? He wanted to do it to the tune of \$40 billion but could get no support. Then unilaterally he sent a \$20 billion loan guaranty. Where was 10 minutes of debate on this House floor before the action?

Mr. Speaker, where was the debate in this House, on this House floor, prior to President Clinton or even after President Clinton changing our policy in terms of national ballistic missile defense? Prior to President Clinton taking office, we had an aggressive program that was also attempting to protect the American people as well as our troops. When the President took office, he unilaterally, without any debate on this House floor, changed that policy.

Mr. Speaker, we are giving ample opportunity for debate. We want bipartisan support. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Technology of the Committee on National Security, I reached out to my colleagues on the other side. We forged a bipartisan national security bill. This bill, when it was reported out of committee, passed by a vote of 41 to 13. Eleven of our colleagues on the minority side supported that piece of legislation.

In the committee, Mr. Speaker, many of us acknowledged that there were key Democrats who were at the forefront of the defense debate, both in the past, today, and in the future. So that bill, when it came out of committee, had strong bipartisan support, and, in fact, 11 Democrats voted with us.