

the U.S.S. *Santa Fe* as it cruised off the coast of our eastern shore.

Mr. Speaker, the role of submarines has become an essential asset to the national security of the United States. In today's world of regional conflicts and crises, the presence of forward deployed U.S. submarines has given us the leading edge in deterrence and quick response.

The crew of the U.S.S. *Santa Fe* knows how important their role is in service to our free country. I was truly impressed by their patriotism, skill and professionalism. The display of unparalleled excellence which I observed aboard the U.S.S. *Santa Fe* is a model for others to aspire to.

I wish to specifically recognize for their leadership the ship's executive officer, Lt. Comdr. Douglas Smith and Command Master Chief Robert Brown, the chief of the boat. Furthermore, I would like to recognize those officers and crew who briefed me on their areas of the ship concerning their duties and responsibilities.

To all of the officers and crew of the U.S.S. *Santa Fe*, I say "thank you"—not only for your hospitality, but for your service as ever-watchful guardians of the United States of America.

HUMANITARIAN AND CORRIDOR ACT

(Mr. TORRES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, today, I join my colleagues, Representatives JOSEPH KENNEDY and CHRISTOPHER SMITH in introducing the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act.

This bill would withhold U.S. assistance to any country which blocks the delivery of congressional approved U.S. humanitarian assistance to another country.

The need for this legislation, Mr. Speaker, is clear. It is a serious threat to the integrity of American foreign policy when any nation—especially one that is also a recipient of U.S. aid—forces our Government to waste taxpayers' money on transportation costs instead of putting that money toward the humanitarian goods specified for delivery.

Let me site a specific case: Since April 1993, our ally, Turkey, has closed its border to all cargo, including United States humanitarian assistance, going to the land-locked Republic of Armenia.

Because of this blockade, America is forced to ship its aid around Turkey, through the Black Sea, to ports in war-torn Georgia.

The closing of the Turkish border to United States assistance meant for Armenia has slowed delivery of this aid, skyrocketed transportation costs, and in some cases caused the loss of aid to thieves and saboteurs.

Allowing our allies to deny U.S. humanitarian assistance to people in need discredits our Nation's foreign aid program, results in in-

efficient use of U.S. taxpayers' money, and ultimately sets a precedent for abuse by other nations.

I ask my colleagues to support the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act, and to ensure that U.S. humanitarian assistance will not be exploited for political purposes.

THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

(Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, today is the 75th anniversary of League of Women Voters. Created in 1920, in anticipation of passage of the 19th amendment, the league was created as a nonpartisan organization to promote political responsibility through informed and active participation of citizens, both men and women, in government.

I am proud to have been a member and president of my local League of Women Voters in Johnson County, KS, before I served on the Overland Park City Council, the Kansas Legislature or the U.S. Congress. It was an education.

The league gave me a grounding in a wide variety of issues, encouraging me and women like me to become more than silent bystanders. The league has a proud legacy which I am honored to acknowledge from the floor of this people's House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

The Kellogg Foundation in Battle Creek, MI, the director is leaving, Russ Mauby. I would like to acknowledge him. There are Kellogg farmers in the gallery today, and I would just like to say we appreciate them being there.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEREUTER). Members should not refer to people in the gallery. That is inappropriate.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

(Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, on this day 75 years ago, the League of Women Voters was formally established. The League of Women Voters of Rhode Island grew out of the Rhode Island Equal Suffrage Association and was organized on October 8, 1920. The first year was spent uniting all suffrage groups in Rhode Island and recruiting new members.

In the league's second year, units were set up in most Rhode Island communities in order for women to con-

duct study meetings and take local action. Some of the issues the league got involved in at the time were the child labor Law, equal pay for equal work, and equalization of educational and economic opportunities.

In 1945, a move was begun to make units into independent local leagues and with that leagues were born all over the State of Rhode Island, including in Providence, Newport, South Kingston, Narragansett, Barrington, East Providence, and Bristol.

Mr. Speaker, in Rhode Island the league has worked along with other groups, and it is important that today we recognize their efforts.

□ 1130

LOCAL GOVERNMENT LAW ENFORCEMENT BLOCK GRANTS ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEREUTER). Pursuant to House Resolution 79 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 728.

□ 1131

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 728) to control crime by providing law enforcement block grants, with Mr. GUNDERSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Monday, February 13, 1995, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] had been disposed of, and the bill was open for amendment at any point.

Five hours and twenty minutes remain for consideration of amendments under the 5-minute rule.

Are there any further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCOLLUM

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Is the amendment printed in the RECORD?

Mr. MCCOLLUM. The amendment is not printed in the RECORD, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCCOLLUM: On page 10, line 20, strike "45" and insert "20".

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this is a simple and pretty much technical amendment. Under the bill as written, the chief executive officer of every State has not less than 45 days to review and comment on an application for a grant submitted to the director. We would like to change that. This amendment changes that to 20 days.

We have no basis for wanting the States to have any more time than necessary to delay the possible getting

the money by any city or county that is supposed to get the funds. In fact, I am not even sure 20 days is a magic number of days, but the objective here, since we have a complicated formula, is to let there be at least a certain amount of time out there for the situation to be observed and acted upon in cases where we have to have cooperation between the local unit of government and maybe a sublocal unit, such as the city and county situation, where the formula has to be adjusted to take into account some diverse interests in some parts of the country.

There needs to be some time here. The thinking is that 45 days is too long, and 20 days is more reasonable, for the Governors to have this sitting before the director to disburse the money, to comment on it or to have some reaction to it.

I would urge my colleagues to adopt the amendment. I do not think it is controversial in any way.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen this amendment on our side. We have no problems with it, and I urge its passage.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHUMER

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the amendment printed in the RECORD?

Mr. SCHUMER. The amendment is not printed in the RECORD, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHUMER: Page 2, line 6, insert after "amended" the following:

"by redesignating that title as title XXXIV and a new title I is inserted in that Act"

Page 8, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 9, line 2, and insert the following:

"(1) \$150,000,000 for fiscal year 1996;

"(2) \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 1997;

"(3) \$300,000,000 for fiscal year 1998;

"(4) \$300,000,000 for fiscal year 1999; and

"(5) \$1,732,000,000 for fiscal year 2000."

Page 21, strike line 17 and all that follows through page 22, line 7.

Page 26, strike line 9 and all that follows through line 11.

Mr. SCHUMER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment on behalf of myself, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN].

Mr. Chairman, Speaker GINGRICH has been talking about his Contract With America. We made a contract with the American people last year, as well, a contract to put 100,000 new police officers on our streets. We cannot and must not break our promise so that Speaker GINGRICH can pass a bill written by pollsters and pundits who said it would be popular. Under the crime law we passed last year 100,000 new community police officers will be put on the streets of America. Under Speaker, GINGRICH's bill, not one new police officer must be hired.

Speaker GINGRICH said last year, Mr. Chairman, that sending a blank check to cities would result in a pork barrel boondoggle. Today Speaker GINGRICH is not only defending this blank check approach to crime-fighting, he is, unfortunately, championing it.

Last year's crime bill, Mr. Chairman, guaranteed 100,000 new police for our streets. Speaker GINGRICH's bill guarantees billions of dollars of pork, like tanks, useless studies, or this airplane, bought by the Governor of Indiana in the 1970's.

It is a simple, simple choice, Mr. Chairman: Do we want police, or do we want pork? That is the choice of the Schumer-Conyers-Chapman amendment. It cuts clearly to the difference between the super pork barrel block grant program, and the bipartisan commitment this Congress made last year to the American people.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment unequivocally preserves, protects, and defends the promise we made to America less than a year ago. Passing this amendment will show the American people that this House is not a Chamber that lightly throws away such solemn promises, particularly when that promise is to put 100,000 new cops on America's streets. Passing this amendment will show that Members of this House on both sides of the aisle can think for themselves, that they are not mindless puppets who march in lock-step simply to fulfill the promises of a poorly drafted political document, hastily written in the heat of a political campaign, because that is what H.R. 728 is.

Passing this amendment, Mr. Chairman, will keep faith with the hundreds of thousands of men and women who are police officers, who, at this very moment, are walking America's streets and need our help.

Every major police organization in this country has had the courage to go on record. They want the cops on the beat program saved exactly as it was passed last year, and that is what this amendment does. It fully restores the cops on the beat program, and leaves a net balance of \$2.5 billion for the block grant purposes already outlined in H.R. 728.

Mr. Chairman, we should not let anyone tell us that the cops on the beat program is not working. It clearly is. As of last week grants have been

awarded that will put over 16,000 new police officers on the streets. Think about that, Mr. Chairman, 16,000 new police officers provided in less than a year, in a day when government bureaucracy seems to overwhelm us. This is almost a modern miracle. Why are we pulling it back?

This fact alone, Mr. Chairman, disproves the repeated misstatement we have heard in this Chamber that the cops program will not provide 100,000 cops. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, this program is being implemented without a lot of red tape or complicated applications.

Here is the application for this program, Mr. Chairman. Look at it, I would ask the Members. It is simple, straightforward, no nonsense, that anyone worthy of leading the smallest police department of a sheriff's office can fill out in a few minutes.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this program is flexible, and being administered in a sensible way. It is true that the law requires the local community to put up a 25 percent match. We all know from our experience if we just give free money with no strings attached, it is much more likely to be wasted.

However, the law also recognizes that sometimes there should be waivers when communities cannot afford it. It allows the Attorney General to waive the match, as she has done for communities all over the country. I have here a list of the Attorney General waivers of the 25 percent match. It includes police departments in California, Florida, New Mexico, Iowa, Michigan, Montana, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Oregon, South Dakota, Washington, and West Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, the plain fact is that any community with a good cause and the determination can help solve its own problems by qualifying for these funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SCHUMER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. SCHUMER. What has H.R. 728 to offer in place of this proven working program that America's cops and America's people want? The biggest pork-laden boondoggle in the history of this Congress since the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration disaster upon which it is modeled.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to keep faith with the American people, keep faith with America's cops, and show their thoughtful independence on both sides of the aisle. Vote for the Schumer-Conyers-Chapman amendment.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, what we have just heard is an explanation of the pivotal amendment on this entire bill.

□ 1140

It is an amendment which would restore to its full funding the entire presidential cops-on-the-street program from last year's Congress, a program that thousands of communities have found is not of any benefit to them, a program that is not working but a program that is a pet project of the President, upon which he threw down the gauntlet, the veto threat this past Saturday during his radio address if we are to disturb it in any way.

I would suggest that what the gentleman from New York is stating, while I know his sincerity is there, is simply not representative of the reality that America finds itself today, nor the reality of this bill.

The primary concern of Americans today is to fight crime on the streets in their local communities and to stop the onslaught of violent crime. There are myriads of programs out there that are important to them to do this. What is good for one community in one corner of the country is not necessarily good for another. Some communities need new police officers, some do not. Some would take advantage of this money that is now on the table in the old bill. Some cannot afford to.

The simple fact is that the cost of hiring a new police officer is nowhere near the base figure being used for the grants match or otherwise that are in the current law. The cost of a new police officer instead of being \$20,000 to \$25,000 a year which is what the base figure is for taking the 75-25 match moneys that are involved in that bill, that is simply the hiring cost for the average new police officer for his salary for the first year. Instead of it being that figure, it is closer to \$60,000 or \$70,000 a year to put a new police officer on the street when you consider training, equipping him, et cetera.

This bill, in addition to not getting anywhere near that for 1 year, expires at the end of 3 years with any Federal money. Consequently, local communities are often finding this a pig-in-the-poke and a very bad program.

I would like to call attention to my colleagues to the editorial in today's Washington Post that has not always been known for its endorsement of Republican initiatives.

"The President," it says here in the editorial, "wants at least to preserve the mandatory funding of what he says will be 100,000 new cops on the street."

"When last year's bill was enacted, that 100,000 figure was cited as the most important feature of the law. Almost immediately, though, it was challenged by law enforcement experts and some local officials. In fact," the Post says, "the law created a 5-year matching program during which the Federal Government's share diminished and eventually disappeared, leaving localities with the full cost of maintaining the new officers. Since the maximum Federal contribution could not have exceeded \$15,000 a year per new hire, the program would never have supplied

enough to pay salary, benefits, pensions and other costs, so the cities would have had to come up with a lot of up-front money many say they don't have."

"So put aside," the Post says, "the 100,000 figure and the issue boils down to whether decisions about the expenditure of law enforcement dollars are best made locally or nationally."

Skipping a little bit down in the editorial, the Post goes on to say, "Our sense is that the world won't end if local authorities are given more flexibility. In some cities, like this one, the greatest need may not be additional police on the roster, but better equipment, specialized training or even midnight basketball. What's wrong with letting them use Federal funds for less expensive but still effective programs rather than for costly hiring? But if cities already have a drug court, as Washington does, and a fully staffed police force, what's wrong with using Federal funds for social workers in juvenile detention facilities, or for improving computer systems to track parolees? One hundred thousand cops sounds good, but congressional failure to include that mandate is not worth a presidential veto."

The long and the short of it is that the Washington Post recognizes as we do on this side of the aisle that flexibility is the key to this. We do not want to hamstring the local communities around the country with the type of program that is in existence today. We need to give them maximum flexibility.

I also have a copy of a letter from the U.S. Conference of Mayors dated February 10 signed by Victor Ashe, the mayor of Knoxville, the President, and Norman Rice, the mayor of Seattle, its Vice President, addressed to the Honorable RICHARD GEPHARDT, the Democratic leader, expressing concern. I will quote only part of the letter, and I will later submit the whole letter for the RECORD:

"As President and Vice President of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the 63-year-old bipartisan organization which represents mayors and local governments throughout the Nation, we are writing to express our concern about your recent comments on the ability of local governments to manage block grants. At your February 7 press conference, you said:

"These crime bills want to just turn the money over to the local governments without any strings, and we are likely to wind up where we were back in the 1970's when we had some local jurisdictions using the money for tanks and fixed-wing airplanes and all kinds of wild things that didn't have much to do with really fighting crime."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MCCOLLUM was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MCCOLLUM. "First of all, this comment is factually incorrect. The LEAA program to which you were referring provided funds to the States, not to the Cities."

They go on then, and I will skip some of this.

"Second, we are distressed that you seem to have so little confidence in the integrity and administrative ability of local government officials. Your statement of February 7 is in direct contrast to what you told the mayors on January 27 at our Winter Meeting at the Capital Hilton in Washington:

"If we're going to block-grant money for prevention and for police, I want that money to go to you, the cities of this country, and not somewhere else. You're the ones on the front lines. You're the people that have got to show results, and I think you're well-equipped to try to figure out what to do with the money."

"We prefer to believe that this is really your assessment of local government officials today. With all due respect, we believe that because of the leadership position you hold, it is important that you clarify the trust you have in the mayors, city council members and county officials throughout our Nation."

I would suggest that the comments of minority leader GEPHARDT clearly indicate from what he said to the mayors and their quoting of him on their winter meeting date of January 27 that there is no question that he recognizes that local communities do act responsibly and they are the best ones to make these decisions. It should be a bipartisan effort today to mold a flexible local community block grant program here that takes care of both the cops on the street and the prevention and lets the local communities decide for themselves. We should not be holding back and trying to preserve an old and clearly debunked program for cops on the street simply because the President wants to hold up the political image of having completed the hiring or providing for 100,000 new cops. It sounds great, but there will never be 100,000 new cops provided under his program. Many communities will not apply, cannot accept if they are given the grants, do not have the money to do that, and would not want the police even if they did because there are other alternatives they would prefer.

It was an interesting idea. It is not the best idea. The best idea is in this bill for local block grants.

I urge the defeat of the Schumer amendment as a result of that. I think it is an ill-conceived amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the letter referred to is as follows:

THE U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS,
Washington, DC, February 10, 1995.

Hon. RICHARD GEPHARDT,
Democratic Leader, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GEPHARDT: As President and Vice President of The U.S. Conference of Mayors, the 63-year-old bipartisan organization which represents mayors

and local governments throughout the nation, we are writing to express our concern about your recent comments on the ability of local governments to manage block grants. At your February 7 press conference you said:

"These crime bills . . . want to just turn the money over to the local governments without any strings, and we are likely to wind up where we were back in the '70s when we had some local jurisdictions using the money for tanks and fixed-wing airplanes and all kinds of wild things that didn't have much to do with really fighting crime."

First of all, this comment is factually incorrect. The LEAA program to which you were referring provided funds to the states; cities received only a small portion of those funds and generally their purposes were dictated by the state government. It was state governments, not cities, which would have purchased tanks and fixed-wing airplanes. Such purchases are specifically prohibited by HR 728.

Secondly, we are distressed that you seem to have so little confidence in the integrity and administrative ability of local government officials. Your statement of February 7 is in direct contrast to what you told the mayors on January 27 at our Winter Meeting at the Capitol Hilton in Washington: ". . . if we're going to block grant money for prevention and for police, I want that money to go to you, the cities of this country, and not somewhere else . . . You're the ones on the front lines. You're the people that have got to show results, and I think you're well equipped to try to figure out what to do with the money."

We prefer to believe that this is really your assessment of local government officials today. With all due respect, we believe that because of the leadership position you hold, it is important that you clarify the trust you have in the mayors, city council members and county officials throughout our nation.

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR ASHE,
Mayor of Knoxville,
President.

NORMAN B. RICE,
Mayor of Seattle, Vice
President.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, on yesterday we attempted to restore the prevention part of this crime bill the way that it was written in 1994 and approved in a bipartisan fashion.

Today our attempt is to restore the community police program and restore that in the original form in which it was passed only several months ago.

Nothing has more symbolized the Federal Government's commitment to fighting crime than the President's program of putting 100,000 policemen on the streets. If there is anything that most people dislike about Washington, it is the breaking of commitments. That is exactly what the Republican block grant program deliberately does. It breaks a commitment to put 100,000 policemen on the street, folding it into a block grant program, knowing that thereby they will dilute or destroy both the prevention program and the police program.

So we should not break this promise. This amendment, Schumer-Conyers-Chapman, is an attempt to fulfill that commitment by restoring the funding for the cops on the beat program by re-

serving \$7.5 billion for the block grant for the program.

When we want to fight crime on Capitol Hill, we should listen to those who work in this field, work on the front lines. The Fraternal Order of Police, the National Association of Police Organizations, the Sheriffs Association, the Black Police Association, the Police Executive Research Forum, the California Police Chiefs have all endorsed this amendment. We have met with their leaders. They are still on board and they are still hopeful that common sense will prevail in the Congress today with reference to our efforts to have a community-based police program of 100,000 police officers emanating from the Federal Government.

They support it because they understand the Republican block grant. They realize that the Republican proponents say it may increase the overall number of cops on the beat, but they will not put any guarantee in writing.

There is no guarantee, as a matter of fact, that a single police officer would be put on the beat, despite the wide consensus in city after city and State after State for more community police. There is no guarantee that the funds will result in any crime reduction whatsoever. There are no performance measures written so that we can measure the effectiveness of the bill in later years. Its formula does not take into account the adequacy or inadequacy of existing police staffing levels in particular areas, or the ability or inability of such areas to effectively utilize additional police resources.

The proposal could deny needed funds to hard-pressed areas that would otherwise receive funding under the existing program. Simply put, it is a total abdication of responsible legislation and thoughtfulness.

In fact, the program of theirs is nearly identical to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration grants that we are reminded of merely by the similarity in programs. We know what happened, the inefficiencies, the waste, the abuse, and worse.

We are replacing an existing, proven police program and an existing prevention program which is widely popular at local levels with failed programs. Is that what the contract of America is about?

Mr. Chairman, the program of cops on the beat has already been successful. Seventeen thousand have already been put in place. The President announced 7,000 for small communities just last week. Over half of all police districts nationwide have received or will shortly receive new police.

In this body, we can write all the tough laws we want, all the death penalties, all the mandatory minimums, but this is the test of whether we really want to have community policing at the national level. Support this amendment.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Mr. WYNN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I rise this morning to strongly support the Schumer-Conyers-Chapman amendment.

I recall last year when we had a really good crime bill that we had a proper balance, somewhat like a 3-legged stool. We reflected the 3 P's of crime fighting: crime prevention grants at the beginning of the process to prevent crime, police to both prevent crime and apprehend criminals, and prisons to house prisoners and to keep violent offenders off the street.

Unfortunately, that delicate and, I think, very sensible balance has been disrupted in the Republican-sponsored bill we have before us today. What they have done is disrupted this balance by being too heavy on prisons, the part of the process at the very end, and creating a very heavily funded dysfunctional leg for prisons, then trying to merge prevention and police into one also dysfunctional leg. It is very unfortunate.

I want to commend all of those who tried unsuccessfully yesterday to restore prevention funds. But today I want to talk specifically about the ground troops in the war on crime, and that is police.

We say it is a war on crime, and in any other national defense circumstance it seems to me we would advocate national decisionmaking and national priority setting. This is the only one in which we say the most important thing is local decisionmaking.

We need to assure that the ground troops necessary to fight the war on crime are in place and that means we need more police.

Every single law enforcement entity has said community policing works. Every local neighborhood, neighborhoods who never before had positive relationships with their police departments said, "Yes, if you bring a law enforcement official into our community not as a storm trooper but as someone who can work with the community, work with young people, identify local problems, this works."

"Yes, if you have consistent patrols that can walk the beat and get to know the community, we can solve crime."

□ 1155

The Republicans, unfortunately, do not believe that this makes quite as much sense, and that is why they have taken away our opportunity to guarantee these police forces.

I believe we do need national priority setting on this issue. We do need to ensure that we here in the Congress provide the ground troops in the war on crime.

We have an interesting situation here: We have the Republican judgment that we do not need these police or to let the locals make the decision, but we have the law enforcement community saying across the board—major

city police chiefs, International Brotherhood of Police Officers, Law Enforcement Officers Association, Fraternal Order of Police, Black Police Officers, Black Police Executives, National Troopers Association, the Police Executive Research Forum, and the Police Foundation—all say they support the police program. They support the current COPS program to guarantee 100,000 police. They say that it is essential in our efforts to taking back our streets.

So we have in this corner the Republican judgment, "Let the locals decide." You have in this corner the judgment of our law enforcement community, the people that we ask to defend our streets, who say the top priority should be the retention of the COPS program.

Now, I am not here to object to local decisionmaking. As a former State official, I believe in it. But the fact remains that if we send these grants down to the local level, they will be caught up in competing interests.

One gentleman got up yesterday and suggested, "Well, we are going to need a road to connect one prison to another." Another one wants lights. Another group may want sports. Another may want other activities. These are all legitimate activities and all contribute to fighting crime.

But the issue before us today is whether we in the U.S. Congress take a stand with law enforcement officials across this land and say that police ought to be our top priority.

I can tell you in the State of Maryland we have already received 284 officers. My district has received 55 more police officers. You know what, Mr. Chairman? It is working.

My small town mayors, my county executives are all saying this is what we need, additional police.

So I want to say emphatically that local decisionmaking has its place, but if we are in a war in this country on crime, it seems to me we need to make some national decisions, and that national decision ought to be to strongly support the cops on the beat.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, a vote for the Schumer-Conyers-Chapman amendment is a vote of no confidence in the local public officials. Your mayors, your township officials, your municipal officers elected by the voters to make decisions at their level on what is best for their streets, for their neighborhoods, for their public safety contingents, this constitutes no confidence in them and, as a matter of fact, a condemnation of their abilities to govern their own municipalities.

That is the difference that we are trying to determine over on this side when we offer this elastic, flexible program which will allow these local officials to respond to their local voters and taxpayers.

Now, what is the difference between what we are attempting to do here and

what occurred under LEAA? That was a bipartisan measure, as I remember, and that served its purpose at that time. If there was any difference between that and this which you now decry, you on the other side of the aisle, it might be this: that today we have the expanded coverage of C-SPAN, we have total communications from individual Members of Congress to their constituents and vice versa. And the likelihood of the local public officials taking this money and using it for automobiles or some of the other wild stories that we have heard about, misuse of the LEAA funds, simply cannot happen except at the risk of the people involved back home.

This program of flexibility on the part of local government is no more subject to corruption or waywardness of funds than is the 100,000 police officer part that is in the former crime bill. What is to prevent special favoritism on the part of anyone making the selection of the communities that are to receive this largess?

So it is confidence that we have in the local officials that drives us in this direction. Your program signals no confidence at all in local public officials.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, this clearly is not a partisan issue. I am wearing a badge today, a badge that talks about 100,000 cops and reminds Americans that we should not go back. The hiring of 100,000 new police officers should not be a partisan issue. It is very interesting, as I listened to the gentleman who just spoke, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. GEKAS' district liked this program enough to apply for and get some 23 new officers on the street.

Again, this is not a partisan issue. Hiring officers is not an issue that should divide us; it should be one that brings us together.

What we are doing with H.R. 728 is throwing money, with no specific direction, in the name of flexibility.

Mr. Chairman, I come from local government, I respect their decisionmaking powers. I know they work. But there is no guarantee that these dollars will get down to the local police jurisdictions and municipalities. These dollars may ultimately go to our States and then have to have the continued massaging at to where these dollars might end up.

The COPS program, in particular, responds to the public's demand that we use tax dollars to make our streets safer. The COPS program requires a commitment to increasing their force size by requiring them to come up with at least 25 percent of the cost of hiring new officers.

It establishes a working relationship, a partnership. The COPS program's

local matching program with the declining Federal share over the course of the grant encourages and prepares local jurisdictions to pick up the tab in 3 years or so.

H.R. 728, on the other hand, does nothing to prepare them. It drops the ball. You go off the side of the Earth. There is no commitment. There is no planning.

And most of all, this program helps the needy jurisdictions. It helps our communities who need cops the most. People are looking for safer streets. They are asking us not to be partisan in this. It is interesting that we would put such extreme restrictions on requiring our jurisdictions to get prison dollars, some 85 percent requirement under truth-in-sentencing, which requires the different jurisdictions to have prisoners incarcerated up to 85 percent of time given, and yet when we talk about police officers—where you stop the criminal activity along with prevention, where you allow for community policing—then we throw all reasoning to the winds.

This is not a partisan issue. We are required, if you will, to look at this from the perspective of the American people. The American people who embraced this wholeheartedly in the 103d Congress, in that bill, the omnibus crime bill of 1994, the American people supported this and stood up for it.

Mr. Chairman, today is Valentine's Day, and I simply ask that we, the U.S. Congress, send a valentine to the American people. That valentine is safer streets; that valentine is embracing the idea of 100,000 police officers. That valentine is recognizing that the American people want tax dollars to be used to provide the opportunity for police officers in their communities.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Schumer-Conyers-Chapman amendment making our streets safer and supporting 100,000 police.

Mr. HEINEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. HEINEMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HEINEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have been in committee, the Committee on the Judiciary, with my colleagues here, and I have come to respect the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] and her positions on law enforcement.

I think what we are talking about here is we are talking about just what I mentioned last night, a philosophical difference of where we want to go, whether we want to dictate to local law enforcement and the States as to how much money should be spent and where it should go. We on this side of the aisle seek flexibility at the local level in that regard. And I say that there is nobody in this Congress—not even myself, who has been a police chief for 15 years; in fact last year at this time I was in that position—that know better how to use money at the

local level. I can say I knew for years exactly how to use grant money at the local level, because I was there. I cannot tell you now that I know better than the police chief of Raleigh, NC, at this point how best to use that money under a block grant. They know. One size does not fit all, I can tell you that.

Rudy Giuliani, Mayor Giuliani's name was mentioned here several times as not being in favor of more cops but of equipment. He knows better, his police chief knows better. Nobody in this Congress knows better how to use that block grant money than the people at the local level.

LEAA has been brought up several times as a Dunkirk when it came to funding at the local level. I cannot argue with that. I was in law enforcement at that time, big-time law enforcement. I know there was waste. But this bill, hopefully, provides a framework under which Dunkirk will not reoccur.

But there is a raging fire on the streets in this country today, right now. As a matter of fact, since last Thursday, at 1:21 p.m., when we started debating prison grants, up to now, the FBI will tell us that 357 Americans were murdered in that time up to now. We are chasing the clock as it relates to this. I think our intentions are all in the right direction. It is just how are we going to get there. We had hearings in the Committee on the Judiciary, where people pleaded from the local level, pleaded with us for help, pleaded with us to send help to the local level, where prisons are concerned, and law enforcement as well.

I do not want to hear LEAA being brought up again. We did bring into this bill safeguards; that is, accountability at the local level. It does set up an advisory board. It does provide for the chief executive within 45 days to respond. Three percent of the moneys is provided for oversight, oversight hopefully, not to repeat the LEAA boondoggles.

I tell you, when I gave testimony today that the best knowledge of how to use that money will come from the local level and the local level will provide law enforcement officers; it is built into the bill.

So if you know best, if you know better than local police officers at the local level how to use the money and how to dispense it, then do not vote for this bill. But as far as the Schumer amendment, I rise to defeat that amendment on the basis of the fact of what I have said, and also stressing, as best I can, that let the local level determine where the money should go.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEINEMAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I too appreciate very much the very clear insightfulness that the gentleman brought to the deliberation in the Committee on the Judiciary.

I think all of us have made every effort to be as effective for the broad views of Americans.

I only raise a concern. I appreciate the gentleman coming from the police perspective, and in a discussion that we had on the floor yesterday when, I think, in another bipartisan effort we suggested a very small modification that would not allow these dollars to be used for road and highways. Again, we thought that that was fair, if you will, a striking of a balance of how those funds may ultimately be used. We did not win that. The Republicans voted against that.

That is the concern I raise, coming from local government, respecting local government, local police chiefs, that because of the lack of clarity, in the name of flexibility, that we would have the occasion to use very precious dollars that should be used for our police officers and to use them for things like roads and highways. I have that great concern. That is why I raise this issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEINEMAN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HEINEMAN was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEINEMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just wish to bring to the gentleman's attention, because the major of New York City, Mr. Giuliani was mentioned: The major, when the original bill was drafted would only allow cops on the beat, and the mayors in New York and Los Angeles, and some others have said, "What if we want to put in a computer? What if we want to put in overtime? What if we want to put in civilians?"

□ 1210

A compromise that was worked out, which is now in the law, says very simply that, as long as it will increase the net number of cops on the beat, they can do that. So, our bill has a great deal, the present law does have a great deal of flexibility which would be restored by the Schumer-Conyers-Chapman amendment; not in my judgment too much flexibility that they could do anything, but it would certainly allow police departments to pay for other types of things provided, as a result, there were new cops on the beat. I would argue to the gentleman that is preferable to that proposal. I would not want to see them put in a computer and not have new cops on the beat, but, if they want to use it to put in a computer, free up people with desk jobs and have them start walking the beats, great.

Mr. HEINEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and let me at this point say this is a bipartisan effort, as I see it, and I thank my col-

leagues from law enforcement on both sides of the aisle for going to bat and swinging the bat at the ball to get him the help they needed. We heard it in committee. We heard the mayor, Mayor Ash, we heard the DA's, we heard the judges asking for help, and I think we are really moving in the right direction. It is just a matter of how are we going to get there and who knows best.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, there is an implication here that the Members of Congress, and there are many on both sides of the aisle, that are the most grass roots representatives matching any local officials in their communities, and let me just say that I will match my access and knowledge of what my constituents want over 2,000 town meetings in 12 years, and I think this is matched by many here. The implication being: that it is local officials that know what is best.

Let me say that what worries me about the Republican plan is that there are no guarantees that even one police officer is going to be hired. We already have a plan underway. Let us not mess with it. We have grants for over 17,000 new officers in cities and small towns across the country. Half of all the police departments in the country have applied for a cops grant.

Law enforcement and the American people want more police, and my colleagues are trying to dismantle it. The only thing that this bill guarantees is fewer new police on the streets of America. There will be fewer police to build partnerships with communities, fewer police to work with residents to reduce and control crime, and fewer police to keep our streets safe for law-abiding citizens.

What we are also doing is taking a walk on accountability to the American taxpayer. This is super pork of the highest order. No strings attached. Do whatever you want with this money. That is basically what we are saying. While we have banned tanks and airplanes, how many thousands of ridiculous uses have not been explicitly prohibited? How much money is going to be spent of thousands on wasteful purposes rather than on police officers? There is no accountability for the \$10 billion. What we have is a choice between police versus pork.

What we did was in the crime act, we paid for this program. We paid for it by reducing the size of the Federal Government, and the President rightfully has said that under no circumstances, he did not fight 100,000 bureaucrats so we can trade them in for an old-fashioned pork barrel program. What we have is a bunch of hoops, hurdles, and fits for local governments ruder than forging a partnership with them.

What we are doing is building road-blocks to crime fighting, creation of local advisory boards, new layers of bureaucracy, new applications. Under the present plan we have a one-page application. Mayors would have to defer to Governors on crime fighting strategies even though mayors, police chiefs, and community leaders already know best what works for their community, and, rather than receiving grants directly to meet the particular needs, small towns and rural communities would have to seek their portion of Federal dollars from a pool distributed by the Governors of their State. What we have is replacing crime fighters with administration. The court program under the crime act is efficient, and it is centralized in distributing grants for 17,000 police officers. In just 4 months Mr. Chairman, the cops office is under budget and ahead of schedule. Yet the proposed block grant would move slowly. It would delay crime fighting and would shave off more of the taxpayers' money to pay for its administrative costs.

Mr. Chairman, let us put police over pork. Let us deal with a program that has enormous public support. Let us deal with a program that already is underway, community policing, grass roots police.

I have small towns in New Mexico that have received one cop. We have had grants awarded to 6,500 small communities, 7,100 cops. Why are we going to mess with a program that is working for reasons of politics?

Let us give the President credit for a program that is working. Let us not mess with this program, and if it passes the Congress, rightfully the President should veto it.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I mean no disrespect, but there is an incredible arrogance; I suppose it is an unconscious arrogance; in the position that Washington knows best. Yes, there is a police program in place. That is the problem. It is their program instead of local government's program.

This bill that we are advancing provides for local advisory boards.

Now the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] said he has held 1,000 town meetings and he knows best. Well, I am not sure that I would have the, I do not know another word, arrogance, to say that I know more about every nook and cranny of my district and its needs for public safety and fighting crime than the local police, and the sheriff's office, the local prosecutor, representatives from the local court system, representatives from the local school board system, representatives from community groups. I mean, a little humility. These are the people fighting the problem in their front yard.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out that I think the gentleman's point is right, that we should not in Washington be making these decisions, but in fact we are saying we are listening to the order of police, the sheriffs, the black police officers. They are the ones who are saying that they want to keep this program, not people in Washington who are not on the front line.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I am terribly sorry, but I just do not agree. I do not think they understand that their program is seed money and, after a few years, it evaporates, it disappears, and the local unit of government is left to absorb all of the costs. I do not think they are thinking in those terms, but it is a fact that it is virtually illusory.

We are talking 20,000 policemen, fully paid for, not 100,000. Those figures have been worked out, and they are not too obscure. The fact is we have a program that is animated by the philosophy that local government knows its problems and how to deal with them. All wisdom does not reside in Washington.

Now to call it super pork is really to insult thousands of local officials who must face the same taxpayers we face only in a more immediate fashion. They come out to the meetings and eyeball these people. There is going to be supervision over how its spent through the U.S. Attorney General's office having a program of oversight, and so it just seems to me a little trust, a little faith, a little humility, that we do not know it all, that the people in the front lines do know it all, and let us give them the resources.

□ 1220

Now some say, no more policemen, that they do not need policemen. Maybe they want technical help; maybe computers are what they need; maybe prosecutors; maybe jails; maybe policemen. But let them make the call, not from here hundreds or thousands of miles away in Washington.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. HYDE. With pleasure, I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, it is my local police chiefs and my local sheriffs who have called me to say they like the crime bill of last year, that it is working, and they are getting new police officers. It is the local law enforcement people who call me, the Oregon State Patrol. They have called and said they do not like the changes; they want the bill that was there last year. I think they do not know what is going on. I think we should trust them.

Mr. HYDE. Well, the city council in Cincinnati thinks just the opposite. There are plenty of municipalities that understand that this is illusory, that in the first year, 25 percent of the cost is going to have to be assumed by the local units of government; by the second

year 50 percent; by the third year 75 percent; and by the fourth year it is gone.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. Of course, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I make two points. First, the argument that our program expires and the block grant does not, that is totally false. Both are based on the trust fund. Ours goes 6 years.

Mr. HYDE. I did not say the block grant program expires. These are the gentleman's words.

Mr. SCHUMER. The program expires, so local communities would be on their own under either bill; is that not correct?

Mr. HYDE. Yes, but we are not promising them 100,000 policemen, which are not in the cards by anybody's computer. The gentleman knows that. Will you concede that?

Mr. SCHUMER. If the gentleman will yield, there are already 17,000 police officers. If you take the prorated amounts spent and look at how much more is left in the pot, we are easily in reach of the 100,000 police officers. Last year the gentleman may have had an argument, but seeing what has happened this year, it is obviously clear that there will be 100,000 police. This is a well-administered program.

Mr. HYDE. This gentleman knows they are rushing out the police now before we vote on this, but that is not going to last long.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] has expired.

(On request of Mr. SCHUMER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HYDE was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is overly generous in getting more time for me, and I continue to yield to him.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the gentleman for his generosity as well.

Mr. Chairman, the other point I make is that the gentleman is saying, let us leave it to the locals. I think ask the American people, "Who do you want to leave it to, your local police chief or your local politician," they would say—

Mr. HYDE. Not the local police chief.

Mr. SCHUMER. If I could, I would just like to finish my point.

Mr. HYDE. Yes, but do not misstate.

Mr. SCHUMER. That is why I gave the gentleman 2 minutes more, so I could finish my point. That is more generosity.

Mr. HYDE. The gentleman anticipates interruption; is that it?

Mr. SCHUMER. I always do.

The local police are for our proposal, although the mayors have not taken a position and the counties have not taken a position.

Mr. HYDE. The Governors have.

Mr. SCHUMER. The Governors have, but we know them.

I would make one other point: It is not just we Democrats who say we should not be trusting the local politicians.

Mr. HYDE. The gentleman is saying that, though. Will the gentleman concede he is saying that we cannot trust the local politicians?

Mr. SCHUMER. We cannot trust all the local politicians, agreed. Let me tell the gentleman who agrees with us.

Mr. HYDE. How many percentage-wise? How many would you say can be trusted?

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, let me read a quote.

What I cannot defend is sending a blank check to local politicians across the country for them to decide how to spend it.

That was said by your Speaker, then minority whip NEWT GINGRICH, on this floor on June 23, 1994.

So will the gentleman concede that there must be some grain of truth to what we are saying if someone as exalted as your own Speaker, who seems to state things in unequivocal terms, said that?

Mr. HYDE. I would accept that as gospel if you would accept the other things he says as gospel.

Mr. SCHUMER. That is not a fair deal.

Mr. HYDE. But you pick and choose, I say to you, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of talk this morning, very understandably, about this issue of H.R. 728 and the broader issue of how we are going to provide the support to law enforcement that they need, whether it is through the approach reflected in the 1994 crime bill or the approach in H.R. 728. The issue is whether this is a partisan issue or not, and distinguished Members on both sides of the aisle within the last several minutes have said, very properly so, that it is not a partisan issue.

However, Mr. Chairman, it is an issue of credibility, and it is an issue of honesty and an issue of forthrightness in how this matter is presented to the people of the United States of America. I think, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary just noted, any way you slice it, any way you cut it, any way you dissect it, there is not sufficient funds in the crime bill that was passed last year to come anywhere near 100,000 police officers on the street. If you add up the figures just cited by the distinguished gentleman from New York, you reach a figure that is much beyond the \$8.8 billion, and one might ask him, "Where are those funds going to be coming from?"

What I think, Mr. Chairman, is that we have to get away from the use of some of these statistics, some of the figures here, and remember that, as I think former Secretary of the Treasury

William Simon said, "Statistics are used like drunks use lamp posts, for support rather than illumination."

Let us get away from these figures and focus on what the issue really is here.

Mr. Chairman, it is a philosophical approach to governing. It is an approach that is reflected on one hand, as reflected in the proposals and the opposition to H.R. 728 by Members on the other side of the aisle that say we in Washington know best, we in Washington know what strings to attach, that we in Washington know how to micromanage. On the other side of the aisle, the aisle from which I am speaking at the moment, Mr. Chairman, is the philosophy that says to the greatest extent possible, keeping in mind sound physical principles which are contained in H.R. 728 in terms of the accountability and the reporting requirements for communities that received money under H.R. 728 is a principle that says to the greatest extent possible those members of the community, and in this instance we are talking about the municipalities and the counties all across this great land of ours, and the officials who are on the front line fighting the battle against crime, your police chiefs and your county commissioners making those allocations and having to answer to the citizens who are the victims of those crimes every single day. They are the ones who should be making those decisions. They are the ones under H.R. 728 who would be making those decisions.

So I think the time has come, Mr. Chairman, to get away from a lot of partisan rhetoric, to get away from the smoke and mirrors that we have seen coming out of the White House by rekindling the mantra of 100,000 police officers, 100,000 more police officers, et cetera, et cetera, and talk about the philosophical approach, the very real approach, the very honest approach to law enforcement and funding the law enforcement needs in communities that is embodied in H.R. 728. It is the right thing to do, it is the right time to do it, and now is the time to take that right vote.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman. I wanted to bring to his attention a letter that I think was written to the Department of Justice in support of policing grants, and I want to quote from that letter because I think it is particularly appropriate in the context of what the gentleman has said. The letter reads in this way:

I know, as do you, how important to the overall enforcement effort effective community policing programs can be.

I am familiar with the LaGrange Police Department Community Policing Program, and with the desperate need for more law enforcement officers in the City. The time and effort designing and implementing its Com-

munity Policing Program, and the initial results have been outstanding.

This letter was written by the gentleman from Georgia in support of community policing community grants, and I would just ask the gentleman, in the context of the statements he has made while he was supporting these community policing grants in the past, now it seems that he is taking a different position, but at one point the gentleman from Georgia was certainly supportive of the crime bill and its effort in the community grants that are providing police all over this country, at least as it applied to the LaGrange Police Department.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and let me reclaim my time.

When the crime bill was passed in 1994, I think all of us as supporters of the local law enforcement units would have been remiss if we had said that simply because we do not like the President's approach we should not be supportive of local law enforcement agencies who view in that the only avenue with which to obtain very desperately needed Federal funds, that we would support them in those efforts. That does not, and I hope the gentleman is not suggesting that simply because there is one program available at one point in time, that if a better program comes along, as H.R. 748 is and would do, that we would be forever barred from saying this is a better approach and this is an approach that now we ought to move into to provide even stronger support for law enforcement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BARR was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for not objecting to the additional time.

Mr. Chairman, I think we would be remiss if we did not seize our opportunity to provide even better and stronger and more consistent relief for law enforcement, and I will look forward to writing an even stronger, more aggressive letter in support of my community down in LaGrange, in Troup County, GA, as soon as H.R. 728 is passed and those funds become available.

□ 1230

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman would acknowledge the current law, the COPS Program, has put 40 new police officers into his congressional district. That is what the Department of Justice statistics show. The gentleman wants to throw that program out and buy something in the form of a block grant that may or may not furnish police officers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. RIGGS and by unanimous consent, Mr. BARR was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I think what we are witnessing is some degree of sophistry, to say that again one program is good, but we cannot support a program that is even better, I think really obfuscates the real issue here. Whether the Department of Justice says that 40 new officers have been available or 30 or 41 really is not the issue. The issue is we have before us now a bill, H.R. 728, that would provide the greatest amount of flexibility, limited by sound accounting principles embodied in the requirements of H.R. 728 to provide the maximum, not the minimum as under the last bill, but the maximum amount of support and flexibility for those local communities, not only across the district in Georgia but across the districts in New York, New Mexico, Texas, and all the other States from which we have heard very eloquently speakers this morning.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, in the last week I have spent a lot of time on this Floor either during special orders, morning session, or, as we have brought this bill forward, to fight for certain aspects of the bills. As a member of the Democratic crime task force and having been a police officer myself for some 12 years where I have worked the road, and I would still be there but for some injuries I received in the line of duty, I have a very strong interest in what we are doing here, and this program in particular of allowing 100,000 more police officers.

When the crime bill came for the final conference report, I did not support it. I could not support all those programs in the final analysis of the crime bill last fall. But this was one I did support. Much like the so-called Contract on America, where you have six crime bills or six parts to your crime bill, I will vote for some of them, and I am going to vote against other parts of it.

Your H.R. 728, I am going to vote against it because I think it is wrong to gut a program. You say you want flexibility. Or do you want police officers, is really the question.

You say you are not against local control, but that we, because we oppose this bill, somehow we are against local control; we are afraid to let local people make decisions. We are not. We are afraid to allow you to make decisions on our program.

Yesterday the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT] offered an amendment which said we will not use money in this bill, this block grant, to build roads, and most of our friends on that side of the aisle voted to allow them to build roads with crime fighting money.

Where is the crime fighting element in building a road? A police car will go up and down the road? I mean, that is

where we have our problems. That is where we have differences of philosophy.

The gentleman from Illinois talked about arrogance on this side. I think the arrogance comes in when you take a crime bill and allow it to be used to build roads, when we have the highway trust fund, we have local funds, we have state funds to build roads in your community.

Mr. Chairman, local control, who applies for these police officers underneath the President's program? Who applies? Local officials. Do we force them to apply for this program? No. But across this Nation, every community that is less than 50,000 people, more than half have already applied for this program. No one forced them, no one said they had to. We said here is a program, apply if you would like. That is flexibility. That is local control. We did not make them apply.

Look, you are going to have an opportunity later today if you want other things. It is called the Byrne grants. If you look at the current crime bill, one of the problems I had is you take Byrne grants, 282 programs, which everybody has said is a fantastic program: 1995, we have \$580 million; 1996, it drops to \$130 million; 1997, \$100 million; 1998, \$75 million; all the way down to \$45 million. So later today we are going to have an opportunity to give you all the money you want for local people to apply for these programs in the Byrne grant. We will authorize \$450 million for the next 5 years.

Now, your leadership on that side tells us we cannot do that. Why not? Why can we not provide stable funding for 5 years in the way local people would like it? That is flexibility. We are putting forth the money for communications, wherever you want to use it for. But, no, you say we are going to oppose that program.

So there is flexibility there. There is plenty of flexibility there. We made a promise 4 months ago that we would put 100,000 police officers on the street. We are trying to achieve that. Suddenly now, because there is a change in the election, you do not want that program. You are destroying the program. So where is the flexibility now? What happened in 4 months that suddenly a program that was supported in a bipartisan manner, somehow we have lost that?

It is just strictly politics. And having been a police officer, I know the gentleman from North Carolina and some of the others, police officers, quite honestly are sick and tired of being played with in politics. It is a great issue to run a campaign on, but it is not fair to the police officers or the local communities to say here is the program, here is 100,000 cops over 5 years, but because of a philosophical change, we will now play politics and take the program away. Take it away. And, by the way, you can go ahead and build roads with it, as you voted to do yesterday, instead of fighting crime.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STUPAK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. I think the gentleman makes an excellent point here, and that is that we have had a dramatic reversal. A program last year supported by so many of you, a program that you wrote in favor of, a program that is bringing hundreds and hundreds of cops to each State, is now no good and the blank check to local politicians across the country decried by Speaker GINGRICH 6 months ago is now the right thing, the best thing to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER and by unanimous consent, Mr. STUPAK was allowed to proceed for an additional 30 seconds.)

Mr. STUPAK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Let us admit what is going on here, and that is you just want to say there is a different bill. And let us admit another thing, that your bill is not as good as this one.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. STUPAK was allowed to proceed for an additional 30 seconds.)

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, in summation, H.R. 728, your bill right here, you want flexibility. There is not one program in there to guarantee one police officer. Not one police officer. You are going to take away the local control to apply for the Clinton COPS Program. We want cops, we want cops. We do not need politics, we do not need the so-called flexibility. You have the Byrne grants for your local control.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time I will enter into the RECORD an editorial from the Fall River Herald News, a city which I represent in part. They are a very independent paper, and they make an excellent point in the editorial.

In my district, as in districts all across the country, police officers have already been hired by local governments which took the word of the Federal Government that funds would be available for hiring police officers. What this bill would do would be to disrupt a process of hiring police officers that is already underway.

I think the approach that we have in the current bill is better than this one, but that is not even the issue we are talking about. We are not here deciding between two variants of how to approach this. We have a program underway. It was passed last year. The Republican Party tried very hard to stop it, but it passed. President Clinton and the Justice Department have been

doing an excellent job of getting these funds out there.

Communities came to plea and said this bill says we can have the police officers in 3 years. We are worried about that. Is that good? I said I cannot believe Congress will disrupt that. Well, I underestimated the extent to which my colleagues on the other side were prepared to put partisanship ahead of sensible law enforcement.

□ 1240

Because their bill will undeniably disrupt that process. There is no logical match between the distribution formula in this bill and the one under which police are being hired. There is no way at all to guarantee that the communities which in good faith have already hired police officers will be able to maintain those commitments.

Now, if we were starting from scratch, if this were a new bill, I would understand their preference, although we ought to be very clear, the Republican Party in this House is for States rights on Tuesday and Thursday. But they are for Federal dictation on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday. Because when it comes to telling the States what product liability law should be, they are eager to preempt hundreds of years of State jurisprudence. When it comes to telling States how to sentence criminals, members in the Committee on the Judiciary said, the States do not have the courage to do the right things. We better tell them.

So I am not pretending one way or the other to be motivated by a general preference for the State or a general preference for the Federal Government. It is my colleagues on the other side who have decided that States rights is a water faucet, and they can turn it on sometimes and they can turn it off the other.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois to turn it on.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend. I am going to try to turn it on. I am willing to accept the thoughts and the pronouncements of the gentleman's leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT]. I am willing to accept what he says, every jot and tittle.

I quote from the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] on January 27, at the Capital Hilton, to the U.S. Conference of Mayors, no little group. Here is the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT]:

If we are going to block grant money for prevention and for police, I want that money to go to you, the cities in this country, not somewhere else. You are the ones on the front lines. You are the people that have got to show results. And I think you are well equipped to try to figure out what to do with the money.

I rest my case.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. The gentleman rests his case because it is

Tuesday. But last week, he was dictating to the States. And tomorrow he will be dictating to the States. In fact, he has a quote of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], although he does say, "if" we are going to block grant it.

I am going to finish my response to the gentleman. He said, "if" we block grant it. If means maybe we will and maybe we will not.

First let me say, I also have a quotation, though, which is much more to the point, from the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], which takes exactly the opposite position. We have Mr. GINGRICH saying:

If we have to choose between paying for directed purposes, such as building prisons, I can defend that. What I cannot defend is sending a blank check to local politicians across the country for them to decide how to spend it.

So you have a conditional statement from the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT]. I have a flat statement from the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH]. I think in the trade the gentleman owes me an inconsistency to be named later.

The point is that the Republican position on this is wholly inconsistent. It was one thing on prisons. It is another with regard to liability and tort law. And the gentleman will be bringing to this floor a bill which flatly says it preempts State law with regard to punitive damages. It preempts State law with regard to joint and several liability. It preempts State law with regard to statutes of repose, because the business community wants them to preempt State law. That is a reasonable position.

But when they are about to preempt 200 years of State commercial law involving product liability, please do not put on your Thomas Jefferson outfit and say "Oh, but I am great believer in States' rights." Say what you want to say, which is, you do not want to see the program that we adopted last year go forward and so you will take a very inconsistent position from what you are doing on the rest of your program in this regard.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the gentleman does not recognize an Abe Lincoln outfit when he sees one. I just want to suggest to the gentleman that product liability crosses State lines and is an entirely different breed of animal than what we are talking about.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] has expired.

(On request of Mr. HYDE, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I continue to yield to Abe Lincoln.

Mr. HYDE. We are in the anomalous situation, Mr. Booth—

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. The gentleman would have to turn around to make that analogy better.

Mr. HYDE. All sorts of things occurred to me.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. None of them occurred to me, I would assure the gentleman.

Mr. HYDE. I hope not. I certainly hope not.

I just suggest to the gentleman that we are in the anomalous situation of the gentleman espousing what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] says and we espousing the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT]. And this time, and this time alone, I think the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] has the better of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I am espousing neither as a philosophical principle. The inconsistency is wholly on the gentleman's side. Members on our side have not claimed to be all for States' rights. And I appreciate the gentleman's acknowledging the inconsistency here.

We have said we will make policy according to what we think is the best public policy. And we do believe, and this is the key point, when police officers have been authorized and have been hired and when this program is at work and going forward to come in now and disrupt this process and to say to communities, I know you have hired police officers, but too bad, because there has been a partisan change and we are going to disrupt that ongoing process, we are not content to do a new program and then we will call it States rights to make ourselves feel better.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is really misstating what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] said. He said, "if" there is going to be a block grant, he would rather it go to the mayors than the Governors. But he did not say he supports a block grant, the way Speaker GINGRICH said he unalterably opposes—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the very language, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] says, and he is a man of honor and integrity, "you are the people that have got to show results and I think you are well equipped to try to figure out what to do with the money."

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Now the gentleman from Illinois has added—

Mr. HYDE. Words to live by.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. The words to live by include the one the gentleman from Illinois so conveniently forgot to mention, "if", as the gentleman first read it. It said, if we are going to block grant it, I want to do it for you. Saying "if we block grant it, I want to do it his way" is not saying "I want to block grant it." The gentleman has, of course, testified to the importance of that "if" by quite consciously and deliberately leaving it out. So what we have is the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] saying if we block grant it, we give it to the mayors.

And what we still have is a partisan effort to disrupt an ongoing program with a transparently inconsistent obeisance to States rights which the Republicans will be violating tomorrow.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to make clear at this point in the debate that really the debate is illustrating the fundamental differences, the ideological and philosophical differences between the two parties in the House of Representatives. First of all, we think a better approach is a streamlined, simplified approach to providing Federal resources to local communities in fighting crime. Therefore, we decided that we wanted to take a block grant approach.

Second, we believe that the best way to combat local crime problems is to emphasize a bottom-up, rather than a top-down process. That is what our bill attempts to do.

I do not think any of us can question that local approaches to local problems is the best way to get at local solutions.

Now, we have, it is nice to sort of have a law enforcement fraternity reunion here on the floor with my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, the gentleman from Michigan, myself, all of whom have served time working on the streets. In fact, I recalled the other day, as I had the extraordinary privilege and honor of presiding over the first portion of the crime bill debate, that in a relatively short time span in my life, I had gone from graveyard shift patrol to being able to preside over the House of Representatives.

My point is, I have harkened back to my law enforcement experience. In fact, after working the street for a number of years, I was finally talked into taking an administrative position in crime prevention and community relations. And it used to be my job to travel around to all the different neighborhoods within the jurisdiction of the law enforcement act agency I worked for, the Sonoma County Sheriff's office in Sonoma County, CA and conduct neighborhood watch type of meetings.

The whole emphasis behind neighborhood watch was to promote the idea of citizen involvement and neighborhood participation in combating crime problems. The first step of which was to identify what those particular crime problems are related to the neighborhood, the demographic markup of the neighborhood and the nature of local crime problems in those neighborhoods. That is what we are attempting to do with this bill. We are attempting to make sure that this legislation, by putting in one block grant for police and/or prevention programs for local communities, becomes a bottom-up process, not a top-down, federally mandated process.

□ 1250

I do not think there is any doubt, again speaking directly to my colleagues with former law enforcement experience, there is no doubt what the chief law enforcement administrators of law enforcement agencies around this country would prefer. They would prefer to get, if we are going to go ahead and provide Federal taxpayer resources to combat crime in America, they would prefer to get that money in the form of a block grant so that they, in consultation with local citizens and local elected officials, and through the advisory boards, through the legislation, can determine the best approach in fighting crime locally. That is what we are attempting to do here.

This process, this debate, has become far too politicized as it becomes apparent that the minority is going to try to protect a program that, frankly, I think we can all expect to see in the President's reelection platform.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

That is exactly what police representatives, one of them from seven organizations, said yesterday: "It is time to stop the politics and continue the program" that they are getting.

Second, the gentleman has gotten 36 policemen to date, in 4 months. Could I ask the gentleman why he would want to cut off the rest of them?

Third, the Neighborhood Watch Program is included in the amendment we bring back restoring the 1994 crime bill cops on the beat program.

Mr. RIGGS. Reclaiming my time, let me first of all, Mr. Chairman, speak to the fact that, having reentered the body, I think some of the applications for the local law enforcement funds under the gentleman's version of the crime bill the last session were already well underway by the time that I returned to the House, although we hasten to point out that it is not our intent here to jeopardize funds that have been committed. Our intent here, though, is to maximize flexibility and local decisionmaking on the part of those individuals who are closest to the

problems in their local communities. That is the thrust of this legislation.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. I do not understand the point, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] said there are 36 police officers in the district of the gentleman from California. The riposte of the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] said "Those were probably applied for when I was not yet in the Congress." What is the difference who applied for them and when? They are walking the streets, they are in the cars, they are protecting the people, as they are through all the other districts in America. We are not trying to play politics with them and say "You did, you did not." We are trying to keep cops on the beat. I want to know what the difference is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RIGGS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, the idea again here is by creating block grants for local law enforcement, and I do not know how many times we can say it on this side of the aisle, to maximize discretion and decision-making on the part of local elected officials. Really, they are the ones who ultimately have to be responsible to local citizenry. Those local elected officials in almost every community across the country, with the exception of elected chairs, appoint the chief law enforcement officer of the community.

It is our desire, again, Mr. Chairman, to empower local governments and their individual communities and to return decisionmaking to the most effective, that is, the local citizenry, and to return that decisionmaking back to the people who most directly represent local citizens. That is local elected officials. That is exactly what our legislation will do.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Ms. ESHOO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I just want the former speaker to realize that the block grant program is a copy of the Local Partnership Act that I introduced into the crime bill that was so widely lambasted by Speaker GINGRICH, the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], and the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILL MCCOLLUM].

Therefore, to keep referring to the block grant program, that is a small part, with total flexibility, that was in the previous bill and is in the amendment that is now before us.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge Members to support the Schumer-Conyers-Chapman amendment, and to oppose any legislation which would cut last year's funding for community policing. In my view, Congress should listen to local officials.

There is, I think, some confusion here when we talk about "local." The bill that became law, that was signed into law last year, came about as a result of the Congress listening to local officials when it came to fighting crime on our streets.

I think that there is a blind march going forward to fulfill an ideological agenda dictated from Washington, and I do not think that is what people in our local communities want or need.

Mr. Chairman, according to a recent National League of Cities survey, municipal officials, those people closest in our communities, the ones that are elected and serve closest to the crime problem, believe that last year's crime bill is better than the alternative that is being offered.

Their executive director, Donald Borut, summed up the survey results by saying "Municipal officials believe that last year's Crime Bill struck the right balance. There is serious concern about the current efforts at revision under consideration in Congress."

I am continuing this quote: "Last summer's bill has been in effect barely four months, and we believe it should be given a chance before attempts are made to tamper with it."

Mr. Chairman, instead of listening to local officials who have first-hand experience with community policing and crime prevention programs, some or our colleagues are busy essentially telling them what they think is best. It is on its head. It is turned the wrong way.

As a result, Mr. Chairman, Jerry Abramson, the mayor of Louisville, KY, and the former chairman of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, recently said:

What many in Congress refuse to understand is that the police chiefs and their departments are even more vehement for prevention programs. Again and again, I have heard police chiefs tell Congressmen that the police would infinitely prefer to work with 6-year-olds in a gym or a church rather than wait 10 years and have to fight them in an alley.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican mayor of Fort Wayne, IN, Paul Helmke, agrees. He stated that

During the fighting over last year's bill, you heard a lot of talk from the opponents about how when they call 911, they don't want the phone answered by a social worker. In my city, folks would prefer a situation where they didn't have to call 911 in the first place.

Not only is it a critical mistake to restructure the crime bill, as is being proposed, but I believe it would be disastrous to reduce the amount of money that is targeted for community policing and is already working. These funds mean more cops on the street, police, not pork.

The math is strikingly simple: more cops means less crime. I believe the administration has moved aggressively to get these funds to our communities, and it is already working. It is working in the communities that I represent.

I recently received a letter from the county sheriff in San Mateo County, CA, talking about the additional deputy sheriffs that have been hired as a result of this, and looking forward to placing more local money, which is accountability, in my view, and I come from the board of supervisors, local government, with the Federal dollars.

Just last week we received word that there are more small communities in my district that are willing to put up this money and to make use of this for community policing. Why? Because they know it works, and it is what people in the community want.

One of those small communities, Mr. Chairman, is East Palo Alto, CA. It is a town that bore the distinction, unhappily, of being labeled the murder capital of America in 1993, because it had the highest per capita homicide rate of any city in our country.

However, thanks to the efforts of community policing, more cops were put on the beat and the math worked. It worked. It worked. It is still working. East Palo Alto's homicide rate dropped from 42 murders.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ESHOO] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. BERMAN and by unanimous consent, Ms. ESHOO was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. ESHOO. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BERMAN. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to add a point to what the gentlewoman said. Before we get too crazy about worshipping at the altar of local government, I just want to tell the story of Los Angeles, the most under policed major urban area anywhere in the United States by far, an area with twice the geography and one-half the population of New York City, that has less than one-quarter of the uniformed personnel on the streets.

In the area of the San Fernando Valley that several of us represent, an area of over 1.2 million people, there are less than 100 uniformed police officers on patrol at any given time. How did this situation come about? Somehow over the last 20 or 30 years the mayor and the city council of that city over the years allowed that situation to develop.

□ 1300

We are talking here about wiping out the most important anticrime measure that could possibly be offered to the city of Los Angeles, a chance for them to receive a substantial amount of Federal funds if they start prioritizing and

making tough decisions in order to get a local match which will put hundreds and hundreds, I would say thousands in the end, of more police officers on that street.

This is a city that has suffered riots, where the drive-by shootings and the gang killings, stories of them have been carried all over the United States. This is a city where people live in palpable fear, where more and more people are thinking of carrying a gun on the street as the only protection they have. This is a city that desperately needs to increase its uniformed personnel to have any chance at the economic recovery that it has not enjoyed, as the rest of the Nation has rebounded from the recession of the early 1990's.

As sure as I stand here, without the cops on the street program as passed and signed by the President last year, without the local match required in that program with the Republican substitute that they are offering here to wipe out that program, there will be less police, substantially less police on the street than there would have been with this program.

The mayor and the city council may not prefer this. They would love the block grant.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ESHOO] was again expired.

(At the request of Mr. BERMAN and by unanimous consent, Ms. ESHOO was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BERMAN. If the gentlewoman would continue to yield, I would appreciate it.

The mayor and the city council may love the local block grants. I know what is going to happen. Each council member is going to want to take part of that money for programs they think are worthwhile in their own districts. The mayor will have his own ideas. We will eliminate the impetus for them to make the cutting decisions to provide the local match. At the end of the day there will be substantially less police on the streets. The efforts of Los Angeles to recover will be set back.

I think the gentlewoman is absolutely right in her case. I thank her for yielding.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ESHOO] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. ESHOO was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to summarize by saying this is not an issue that should be fought on the backs of those that are elected to serve in local government. But there have been sins of the past, the LEAA program. I think it is important to point out how those dollars were misused.

I would like to show this. I would rather have community police than this. This is what Federal dollars were spent for in the past.

I would like to show this. I think the people in my community would rather have police in their automobiles, community policing and working with the community. This did not work. This was pork.

We have a decision to make today by supporting the Schumer-Conyers-Chapman amendment and saying that we want police and not pork, we want to retain what works, and we want to listen to law enforcement, schoolboard members, those that serve in local government to make optimum use of our Federal dollars for community policing.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Would the ranking member answer a question for me, please?

Mr. CONYERS. I would be delighted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], like a lot of Members, I have been back and forth between committee hearings, meeting with constituents and having other meetings. I want to be sure where we are in this bill.

Are we now discussing the diminution of the number of police that would have been made eligible under the crime bill that passed last year?

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. We now have 17,000 policemen on the job or are in the process of being hired throughout our large cities, and then around through the smaller cities, and there are more on the way.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This would reduce the overall number of police?

If the bill that the Republicans are proposing here was accepted without this amendment, it would reduce the number of police in our cities and towns?

Mr. CONYERS. It would do more than that. It would destroy this program. It would end the current crime bill law which is the law of the land as we speak.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If I may ask the distinguished Member from Michigan one additional question: Is this the portion of the bill that President Clinton has said would raise a veto by him?

Mr. CONYERS. The reason the President has said that he is going to veto anything that disturbs his community policing program is that he made the commitment 2 years ago. He got the bill through on the bipartisan basis last year. It was enjoyed 5 months' worth of great success. We had eight police organizations that represent four-fifths, or certainly two-thirds of all the police in America all supporting strongly the program.

He feels that he has no other alternative but to resist any attempts by the new majority to destroy a program that is eminently successful, as we speak here today.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the ranking member.

Let me say to my colleagues on both sides, but most particularly to our colleagues on the right that may be resisting this amendment.

This President, it is clear, is determined to not only cooperate, as Speaker GINGRICH has said he is willing to do, but this President is willing to compromise, which is something as you recall Speaker GINGRICH said we will not catch him doing.

This President, I believe, is going to use his veto pen very sparingly, but I would say to my Republican colleagues, if you are serious about getting this bill passed, then you ought to listen to this President's determination about vetoing this bill unless the current amendment is accepted.

In other words, my colleagues, if you do not accept this amendment, I think you are wasting your time. President Bill Clinton intends to keep his word and the word of this Congress to the people of this country, to the city officials of this country, that they are going to have more cops on the beat. Anything that creates a diminution of that promise will be vetoed by this President. This amendment is to save this bill. If you do not accept this amendment, I think you will have no bill, because I believe Bill Clinton intends to keep his and the congressional promise about more cops on the beat.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and at this time yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR].

Mr. BARR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, there has been some discussion over the course of listening to the last several speakers about funds that have already been made available through grant programs, and I think focusing on that really misses the mark to some extent, that those funds will continue that have already been appropriated, for example, those under the cops program and under the prevention programs under the bill last year. So raising the specter of all of these programs all of a sudden being defunded, I think, is somewhat of a red herring.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I am reminded of something that occurred during the campaign last year in my district down in Georgia just a few days before the fall election. We had received word that one of our county governments had been approved for a grant under the 1994 just-then-passed crime bill, and the county officials came to me somewhat mystified because they had not applied for any money under that 1994 bill.

What had happened is, they had applied for some money, Mr. Chairman, under a previous program and insofar as the Clinton administration wished to move forward, for whatever reason,

not impugning their motives as political at all, they had wished to move forward under the new 1994 bill, they had on their own considered the previous grant application under the 1994 bill and passed it.

I have every confidence, Mr. Chairman, that the Department of Justice will continue to exhibit that sort of flexibility when this new bill is passed.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my good friend the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to emphasize once again, that our bill, H.R. 728, does not, I repeat, does not strip funding already awarded under last year's cops on the beat program. These local communities will continue to receive every cent already granted to them, including payments for years 2 and 3. That defeats the argument made a few moments ago by the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] that somehow our bill might jeopardize funds going to hire additional police officers. That is not the case at all. If the local elected decisionmakers in those communities deem it worthwhile to hire additional police officers, they will have maximum authority and latitude to do so under our bill.

□ 1310

It is hard to understand that convoluted logic coming from the other side of the aisle during this debate. Here we have Members of the minority suggesting that the Federal Government, the model of fiscal propriety for the rest of the country can best determine how to spend these monies and in fact ought to dictate to State and local officials how these monies be spent.

Well, far be it from me and my colleagues on this side of the aisle to impugn the motives of State and local officials. We truly believe they are closer to the crime problems in their communities and far better able to determine the proper community-wide or State wide response to those crime problems. So we can either stand with our colleagues in State and local government or we can stand against them.

I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], if the gentleman has a point.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I was just going to ask the gentleman from California which local officials he means. Does he mean the local police chief who supports our proposal or the local politicians, the elected officials who seem to support that approach, although I must say neither the mayors or counties or Governors have taken sides on which approach they prefer?

But I would ask the gentleman which local officials?

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RIGGS. I mean both, Mr. Chairman. I do not know of too many police chiefs who are in their own right local officials. They are normally appointed. In fact I do not know of a single elected police chief in the country. They are appointed by the local elected officials.

Mr. SCHUMER. If the gentleman will yield, I am aware of that. All he is saying is send it back to the local officials. Our bill has the support of all of the local police officials because they know if they just leave it up to the politicians they will not get the same amount of money for cops on the beat that our bill provides.

Mr. RIGGS. If the gentleman from Texas will yield, let me say this: I want to stop just short of suggesting that perhaps scare tactics have been used in this debate. Local officials need help we all admit from the Federal Government in fighting local crime problems, and the burden in hand is, of course, the funding under last year's crimes bill. All we are saying is we think we can take a better approach and actually maximize discretion and decision-making in our bill. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Reclaiming my time, what just absolutely screams and jumps in this debate out of the debate itself is the inconsistency of the point the gentleman makes, and I understand the gentleman's point, but the inconsistency of the point the gentleman from California makes in the context of the position of the majority on the prison portion of the bill last week in which the majority was perfectly willing, in fact did pass legislation which imposed strict plan dates, strict rules, strict requirements, truth in sentencing, 85 percent hurdles for local and State officials to qualify for prison funding.

It is mind-boggling to me that what was good a week ago is no longer good, and I cannot understand. I opposed and offered an amendment in fact to moderate the community position on prison funding, but no, the majority insisted that we have strict truth in sentencing guidelines even though the Department of Justice told us not a single State could qualify under the law, that only three States potentially could qualify. Yet we set the bar so high we have effectively denied prison funds to the States, because we seat specific rules, we dictated, the majority dictated in that legislation what the States would have to do to qualify for the funds, and now we have done a total 180-degree turn 1 week later in which we are wanting to send a blank check to the cities and the States.

It is inconceivable to me when every major police organization in America supports current law, when every major police organization says the cur-

rent law is working, when the gentleman's district, my district, districts all across America are receiving policing, cops on the beat, it is working and the gentleman made a point in debate a few minutes ago, and a good point I might add, about streamlining the process. My goodness, cops on the beat, the cops program is an one page application. There is nothing more streamlined than the Federal Government to acquire access to funds that will fight crime than this program.

I just sit and listen as an ex-district attorney and this district attorney had a 99-percent conviction rate over 8 years and prosecuted death penalty cases. I do not believe anyone in this Chamber is tougher on crime than this Member and has a history of being tougher on crime than this Member, and to sit with a program that is working, to have every major police organization in the country supporting it, to sit and know that cops are going on the beat in communities across this country, it is making a difference, and listen to the position of the majority, the politics scream at you, the politics scream at you.

If you are for block grants why did you oppose the Local Partnership Act in the last crime bill? The Republican majority last year, when we had a block grant program, offered by the gentleman from Michigan as a part of last years crime bill, the Republican now majority violently opposed that program, said it did not belong in the crime bill, made all of these statements that we have seen quoted on the floor here today from now Speaker GINGRICH to other Members, a block grant program last year was an evil, it was a sin, it was the devil reincarnated and yet today it is the answer to crime you tell us.

I cannot imagine the inconsistency of the majority position on this. We ought to keep a program that is working. That is why this amendment ought to be passed and that is why it is important.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the Members' attention, members of the Judiciary Committee on both sides of the aisle, that we have gone on at some length on this amendment, this debate, primarily, perhaps exclusively, between Members of the Judiciary Committee. I assume this matter has been debated in committee as well. The result of all of this may be that Members of the House, not members of the committee, will have no opportunity to offer their amendments.

I understand that on the minority side there are at least three or four members of the committee who have amendments, and since we have approximately 3 hours left, that will mean a Member of the House, not a member of the committee, will never have an opportunity to offer an amendment.

So I would hope that as we proceed here, this debate has exhausted the arguments, pro and con, in short order, and we might have an opportunity to proceed. Otherwise, I would ask for a little discretion on the part of the members of the committee who have amendments to permit those of us who do have amendments that are perhaps noncontroversial to have a chance to offer them.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEREUTER. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. The gentleman has read our mind on this side because we realize the hour is growing late. I am now constrained to offer a unanimous consent request that all debate ends at about 1:55 on this amendment, because there will be at least an hour on the amendment of the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], there are probably four to six other amendments remaining, and I think the best way we can accommodate that is to make such a restriction.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would ask the distinguished ranking member this question: For those amendments that may well be noncontroversial from nonmembers of the committee, could some discretion be given for us to stand up, offer an amendment, dispose of it quickly, and proceed back to the more controversial amendments that some of the members of the committee have to offer?

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEREUTER. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I believe what the ranking member was suggesting is a unanimous consent request that debate on this amendment close at 1:55, that there be 1 hour of debate on the Schroeder amendment, and that would leave us more than one and one-half hours for all of the other amendments that might exist, and I think that would meet the problems.

We still have a good number of Members.

Mr. BEREUTER. Could I ask the gentleman from New York or Michigan, in fact are there other amendments from members of the committee beyond those he has just mentioned that would also eat into that hour and one-half?

Mr. SCHUMER. There might be. There are a few I think from Members who are not here. I know that there are.

Mr. BEREUTER. This Member's patience is not inexhaustible, and I want to be cooperative, but eventually I think we ought to have some time for nonmembers of the committee.

Mr. SCHUMER. I would say to the gentleman, since we go back and forth on minority and majority amendments, the gentleman would have a chance to offer his noncontroversial amendments before those extra amendments would come.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to point out that, among Members who have caused their amendments to be printed in the RECORD, the Chair would, in accordance with precedents in the Committee of the Whole, recognize members of the committee, regardless of party, before he would recognize Members not a part of the committee.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, you understand the difficulty, I would say to the gentleman from New York. I can stand here all day, and even though we are rotating back and forth, as long as there are amendments from members of the committee I will not have an opportunity to offer mine.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEREUTER. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, we are prepared to have a unanimous-consent request that would incorporate en bloc all of the amendments to which there is agreement on both sides. I am going to very shortly propose, and will do so now if the gentleman will continue to yield, that all debate on this amendment, the Schumer-Conyers-Chapman ends at 1:55.

□ 1320

We think that that will facilitate the gentleman's request. Does that accommodate the gentleman?

Mr. BEREUTER. I understand what the gentleman is offering. It is not objectionable to this Member. I hope the gentleman will examine the amendment that I have pending.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman suspend? Did the distinguished ranking Member, Mr. CONYERS, make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. CONYERS. I will make a unanimous-consent request. I ask unanimous consent that at 1:55 all debate on this amendment end, and that unanimous-consent request includes that all motions to which there is agreement be offered.

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair suggest he make one unanimous-consent request at a time?

The gentleman has asked unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto cease at 1:55 p.m. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, might I inquire of the other side if they do in fact have an additional 30 minutes of debate on this amendment now pending?

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The answer is "yes."

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] is recognized for a further unanimous-consent request.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment of the gentlewoman from Colorado that will be offered directly after this one be limited to 1 hour of debate, with the time being equally divided and controlled.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has asked unanimous consent that debate on the Schroeder amendment, if offered following the amendment presently before the committee, be limited to 1 hour of debate time thereon and on all amendments thereto equally divided between the proponent and an opponent of the amendment?

Mr. CONYERS. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do so only to ask the gentleman to make his motion to include all amendments thereto.

Mr. CONYERS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I believe the Chair stated that.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the Chair, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all amendments that are agreed to by proponents and opponents be able to be offered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would suggest to the gentleman that he withhold that request until there is agreement as to which amendments are or are not included in that request.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, we will do that.

I withdraw that unanimous-consent request, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we really should not be here having this debate. We have to work out the time here and the time there. Frankly, just last September Congress settled a 6-year debate over crime policy by passing legislation that combined the best elements of punishment and prevention.

The package President Clinton signed into law will put 100,000 more cops on the streets, build more prisons, fund educational and recreational programs, and provide alternatives to crime for young people, demand tougher sentences for violent offenders.

And a bipartisan majority of the House and the other body concluded, after so much time of arguing, that the

time was at hand for action. As Senator ARLEN SPECTER of Pennsylvania, Republican and member of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, said, "If the President deserves the credit, so be it, let us put aside politics and take a stand against violent crime." That is exactly what Congress did.

Now this new Republican Congress wants to radically change this bill, driven by focus groups, political polls.

Ladies and gentlemen, my colleagues, as a former first deputy assistant district attorney in Middlesex County, who managed a caseload of 13,000 criminal cases a year, fighting crime is serious business. You do not fight crime by reading political polls or looking at focus groups or getting elected to political office. That does not make one law enforcement professional.

In order to fight crime you have to study and know what works and what does not work. I had 54 cities and towns in Middlesex County, where I was the first assistant. I worked with every police department and local officials all over that county. You know what? Some of them knew something about what the cutting edge of fighting crime was, and others did not.

What do we do in this crime bill, the Attorney General, the President, and Congress got the experts on how to fight law enforcement together. And all the evidence is overwhelming that community policing works if community policing is done correctly, by forging the partnerships required to be formed. It works.

In my home city of Lowell, MA, the police chief there instituted a community policing program. And after 1 year of community policing, they issued a report that is very specific about what the effect of community policing is in that community.

Now, this is not a political poll, it is not a focus group. This police chief did not stick his finger in the wind and say what is going to work in the next election. These are facts, what works and what does not. The facts show that in 1 year of community policing, burglaries are down by 34 percent. The facts show that residential burglaries are down 32 percent. The facts say that business burglaries are down by 41 percent. The facts show that larcenies are down by 23 percent. And the facts show that car thefts in that community are down by 20 percent.

You want to know what a police chief said who instituted community policing? That police chief said that what we accomplished in Lowell, MA, should serve as a model for the rest of the country because it works.

So what we ought to be doing is taking a program that works and making it a national model by instituting this program all over the country.

I hear debate on the floor over the last couple of days about what a county commissioner might want, is what the city council might want, someone elected to this or to that. Fighting

crime is serious business. You take the data you have to institute programs that work, and community policing works. And to go backward to another era of providing block grants to local communities to use however they decide, when we know the evidence is clear that 33 percent of those moneys are likely to be used for administrative costs. We know the evidence is clear that a high percentage of that money will be used for pork and waste in programs that do not work. This is what works: community policing. It will work all over America.

In just a very short time ago, all of us agreed in a bipartisan way. But now, because of quick sound bites and a political campaign and focus groups and political maneuvering, we are going to step backward rather than forward.

We should not be debating this bill at all today. We are debating a bill tomorrow on national security that is, frankly, something we ought to have more time on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MEEHAN was allowed to proceed for an additional 30 seconds.)

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, we should not have to have this debate, because fighting crime is a bipartisan issue; it is not an issue that should be pitting Democrats against Republicans or having Republicans concerned because President Clinton got too much credit in the last campaign.

Let us take this program that works and let it be implemented all over America, and let Republicans and Democrats alike stand up and say we created a program that worked, that reduced crime. This is what we ought to be looking at, hard cold facts, not sticking our fingers into the political wind to determine what people might think.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I believe it preserves the preventive focus of these dollars, and I think it preserves also the best thinking of members of both parties. It preserves for example, the block granting of prevention dollars. It adopts the block grant structure in the Republican bill to govern all those dollars that are going to fund community-oriented prevention programs, things that communities will plan that they will tailor to their particular needs and that will realize our vision of a Federal/local partnership that truly will be more prevention-oriented.

□ 1330

However, it separates out the cop dollars. I think that is important for reasons of accountability, but it does several other things in regard to those cop dollars. It allows them to go directly to the police, and I think that is

important, I think that size a grant for police particularly ought to go directly to the department. It continues to require a local match. I think that is better policy.

In my own hometown, one that is very strapped financially, we went through a very rigorous, very public debate when we decided to come up with a match dollar for the cops program, and through that debate we were able to demonstrate to all the people in town that at the end of 5 years this grant would not increase our local property taxes, but would enable us to restructure our police force so that it would have more cops and fewer administrators. In fact, these Federal dollars leveraged change in the healthiest kind of way, and by keeping them separate, and by making those grants go directly to the police, we maintain a level of accountability that simply is not possible by simply block granting a merged fund of cops dollars and other preventive program dollars.

So, I think separating the cops dollars is better law, better policy.

Last, the formula through which these funds are distributed is a formula that I think is healthier because it allows communities to prevent crime. It does not distribute the moneys simply on the basis of what are your crime statistics. It allows small cities like I represent that are, frankly, on the verge of a real explosion of crime to get the critical dollars they need to prevent that explosion.

I know we are turning the corner on prevention. We are getting control in the small cities of this terrible gang problem, and we are doing it by increasing resources, dedicating cops, increasing community focus. But we do need resources to maintain this effort and to get us through to where this is a controllable and affordable problem for a force based on local property taxes, and I think the distribution formula that segregates and guarantees a certain amount of money to towns under 150,000 where the problems are just developing and where we can prevent an increase in crime statistics is terribly important. It is the only way that the small cities that I represent are going to get the kind of significant dollars they need, and it is a key reason why I think this amendment is in the interests of my people and good policy.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the granting of time.

Mr. Chairman, we should be a bit consistent in our positions in this organization, and I would like to quote from last year's debate on the crime bill:

If they say to me in the name of fighting crime "Will I stand a \$2 billion check to cities, many of which have destructive bu-

reaucracies, to let the local politicians build a bigger machine with more patronage?" My answer is no.

That was then the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], now Speaker GINGRICH, on the issue of broad grants of authority without effective controls from the Federal Government.

The point is, Mr. Chairman, we need more police, and, if we do not specify that the money will be spent on police, it will be spent as it was under LEAA, on armored tank carriers, on dual-engine planes for local bureaucrats.

I trust my communities, and they have done darn well under the President's plan. Twenty-four police officers are coming to work in my district that would not have been there without President Clinton's plan.

I did not support the crime bill last year, but I said the 100,000 police I do, and I say to my colleagues, If you want to preserve that promise, if we want to enhance that promise, we have to defeat this move by the Republicans to gut the 100,000 new police officers for America.

Mr. HINCHEY. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, last year the 103d Congress passed perhaps the most forward-looking and comprehensive crime bill in the history of the country. Among its most important provisions were those that focused on the need to prevent crime, and among those were provisions to ensure that we placed community police officers on the streets of communities across this country, large and small.

Now there were Members, who are now the majority party, inexplicably who were opposed to those crime prevention measures, and they are trying now in this bill to defeat those crime prevention measures, and that is why it is so important for us to pass this amendment which adheres more closely to the original bill.

In my district alone in the last several months we have 35 new police officers in rural communities and cities stretching across a district that runs 250 miles across New York State. This program is supported by mayors, by town supervisors, and by police chiefs, and they support it because they know it is effective, it works.

Now we are asked to harken back to a program that was thrown out in the early 1980's, during the Reagan administration, because at that time it was recognized that that program was replete with fraud, and abuse and waste of taxpayers' money. That is what we are asked to do in the bill before us. That is why it is so important to pass this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we want to turn our backs on wasting the taxpayers' money, we want to turn our backs on fraud and abuse, and we want to turn toward a program that we know is going to be successful because it is going to place community policemen, and already has, in communities all across this country.

That is why this amendment is so important. That is why it needs to be passed.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, the choice on fighting crime is clear. We need to send a valentine to our cops by supporting cops on the beat. I have checked with my local officials, and cops come first.

I voted for last year's crime bill with full support from local law enforcement. Funding for cops on the beat is working in my district, and we need to keep it working.

The Schumer-Conyers-Chapman amendment would also leave intact \$2.5 billion in block grants to localities. I am for these block grants because they give the localities flexibility. I am against prescriptive amendments to tell localities how to spend money to fight crime.

Last year's crime bill carefully balanced funding for cops, punishment, and prevention. We are too hasty to undo the cops on the beat program. We have made a commitment to local law enforcement. Let us not go back on it now.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ].

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, Let us not have a St. Valentine's Day massacre on the crime bill.

Last July I stood on this floor to urge Members to resolve their differences on the crime bill and to fulfill their promise to the American people to wage a war on crime and to put more cops on the streets of their communities. Yet today we are further away from attaining that goal. The Republican law enforcement block grant does not guarantee that even one more cop will be policing America's streets. Today we must move beyond partisan squabbling.

□ 1350

We must put on a badge of courage like police officers who patrol the streets of our communities every day and vote for what we know will be a more effective measure in fighting street crime, which is more police officers through community policing. That is exactly what we seek to do in this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me close by saying to the Members, You can't go home and say you passed the toughest, smartest crime bill possible if you walk away from your responsibility to make certain that this money will put real cops on real streets.

Mr. Chairman, let's not have a St. Valentine's Day massacre on the crime bill. Last July I stood on this floor to urge Members to resolve their differences in the conference on

the crime bill and to fulfill their promise to the American people: to wage a war on crime and to put more cops on the streets of their communities. Yet today we are farther from attaining that goal than we were last July. The Republican law enforcement block grant does not guarantee that even one more cop will be policing America's streets.

Earlier I heard a Washington Post editorial be quoted in support of the Republican position on the crime bill; however, that same editorial also noted the hypocrisy of the Republicans who put all sorts of restrictions on the use of prison construction money, while simultaneously handing out funds with unlimited restrictions for law enforcement. Today, we must move beyond partisan squabbling. We must put on a badge of courage, like police officers who patrol the streets of our communities every day, and vote for what we know will be the most effective measure in fighting street crime, more cops.

Since the passage of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, the Federal Government has helped localities put nearly 15,000 police officers on the streets in 8,000 communities nationwide, thanks to the Community Oriented Policing Services, or COPS, grant program.

My home State of New Jersey has received funding for 546 new officers, and the 13th district which I represent has received funding for 95 new officers under this program.

Let me repeat that: thanks to the COPS program, local governments have gotten grants that will put 95 new cops on the beat in my district.

That's a program that works, and if you have any doubts, just talk to some of the residents of my district about what a difference it makes to see an officer patrolling their neighborhood on foot, where they once used to roll by in a squad car.

The bill before us seeks to change all that. While we recognize the validity of the theory that says that localities know best what their law enforcement needs are, let us not lose sight of the fact that the 103d Congress created a program which works. The drive for change was never intended to dismantle what works, only to rethink what does not. The Democratic crime bill put cops on the street, to be there when we need them, to come to know the residents, and to make them feel more secure in their homes.

Tell me, Mr. Chairman, where the Republican agenda differs from that goal. It is fair to say that it does not. Street crime is combated in only one of two ways: by preventing it from happening in the first place, or by arresting criminals and putting them in jail. It's simple mathematics. If you want to stem the tide, you need more cops on the beat.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of tough talk on crime lately, but when you strip away all the rhetoric, only one reality remains: combating crime requires both cops and cooperation. Nobody wins the war on crime when the door remains open to cut corners, shave edges, and shift funding. Every Member has been perfectly clear about his or her intent to stem the tide, and bring crime under control.

The desire of local governments for flexibility is admirable. But we on the Federal level would fail to hold up our end of the bargain if we did not require localities to pursue policies that work. You can't go home and say you passed the toughest, smartest crime bill pos-

sible if you walk away from your responsibility to make certain that this money will put real cops on real streets.

Sleep well tonight knowing that you did the smart thing. The amendment is a reasonable compromise that is tough on two key points—it puts more cops where we need them, and still allows local governments the flexibility they need to support them.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN.

(Mr. GENE GREEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York, for yielding me this 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Community policing works. It works in Houston, TX. It works first in my State house district, my State senate district, and now in my congressional district. We have at least two substations. One is not too far away from my district office on West 19th Street, and there is one on Nordling, where people meet every month. We get 100 people to meet with our law enforcement officers every month. We are getting these citizens concerned with professional law enforcement officers to lower the crime rate, and it works.

The crime bill we passed last year helped us in our local effort. There was opposition to the crime bill last year, and I was part of it, but I ended up voting for it. The opposition was because of the gun issue.

Let us be honest with our constituents and say, sure, the gun issue was controversial, but let us not take cops off the street. This is prevention for our young people, more border patrol, and prison construction. Let us stop this smoke screen and get back to what the issue is. If it is guns, let us fight it out, but let us not hurt our crime fighting that is working in Harris County, in Houston, and in Pasadena, TX.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that this is one issue that is going to be very hard for the other side to cover up. They can be tough on crime all they want, they can say all they wish to say on all the talk shows, but it is going to be hard for them to explain why they are turning their backs on local communities and turning their backs on cops.

This is the simplest issue to understand. If you believe that we have to do something about crime, then we have to help the people on the front lines, and that is the police officers in our communities.

They continue to say that they are for fighting crime, but now they have the opportunity, and what do they do? They turn against a good program, a program that can only be restored through this amendment. That is why I rise in support of this amendment for

police officers, against this decision to turn our backs on them, and to say that this is an amendment we can vote for. They may control a lot of talk shows, but they will not control public opinion when they turn their backs on the police departments in our communities. And lastly, they will gain a Presidential veto, and on cops the communities will stay with us on that issue.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard an awful lot of talk on the House floor about violent crime. I know something about violent crime. The fact of the matter is that if we want to see violent crime controlled in this country, we are not going to do it by just asking people at the local level what it is that a particular police chief might want. It would be one thing if the Democratic Party came out here with some approach that said that every police chief is going to have to go out and buy a particular type of police car or they are going to have to buy a particular kind of computer system or they are going to have to buy infrared glasses or they are going to have to buy a certain type of rifle.

That is not what this bill says. This bill says we are going to put more police officers on the streets in this country. It says that plain and simple. That is the cutting edge. That is where we need to invest in the fight against crime in America.

I believe very strongly that if we are going to take back the streets of this country, we have got to empower the people of the communities, of the neighborhoods of America. We have to give them the sense that there is going to be a police officer out there if they are willing to come forward and name names, if they are willing to establish neighborhood crime watches, if they are willing to put themselves on the line and say that they want a country whose future they can help determine. That is what this bill is all about. It is to give the very resources that our country needs so desperately on the front lines of the fight against crime.

So, Mr. Chairman, I ask the people of this country to support the crime bill that has been offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] and by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] and support the Democratic position.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this very important amendment to a very bad bill.

Earlier today I heard my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, criticize the President's support for more police officers, calling it a pet project. Legislators and Presidents have had a lot of pet projects through the years, and my colleague is right. Many times what

pet project means in plain English is simply more pork.

But today the pork is not in the President's frying pan. It is sizzling on the other side of the aisle, and it is called H.R. 728, a terrible bill that represents a huge step backward from making our communities safer.

The argument in favor of this amendment is very simple. Will we put 100,000 new police officers on the streets, or will we not? If we pass H.R. 728, we side with chance, we side with luck, and we side with crossing our fingers and worrying about whether these block grants will make our communities safer.

If we pass this amendment, we side with confidence, we side with safety, and we side with knowing that \$7.5 billion is headed toward our communities for the single, specific purpose of putting more police officers on our streets.

We do not need hope or luck or worry. We need police officers walking our streets. All across our cities, all across our country, more police officers are making a difference. Community policing has meant that finally a connection has been made between neighborhoods that are living in fear and police officers who are pledged to protect them.

Instead of impersonal, infrequent visits by patrol cars, people now see and talk to real police officers.

The passage of President Clinton's crime bill meant that neighborhoods like the ones I represent knew that more help was on the way, that the kids who worry about walking to school and the senior citizens who worry about riding the bus could count on more police officers. It meant that people who tell me again and again to bring back more help and resources from Washington in their fight against crime were finally getting another weapon in that battle.

Finally, instead of more promises, Congress was sending more police, but thanks to H.R. 728, we are retreating again. Unless we pass this amendment, the seniors and the young families and working people in American are getting another big batch of rhetoric out of Washington, DC. Here is some money. Maybe it will help, but maybe it will not. But whatever you do, I say, don't look out your front window for the cop on the beat. Don't look to the corner store for an extra police officer, because the Contract With America has called them home.

H.R. 728 says that you do not really need those police officers after all. But if you are concerned about crime, stay on the lookout for some money that might help you sometime, somewhere, for something. That is our choice. Do we want a real contract for more police officers on our streets, where we need them, helping to keep our communities safe, or a fake contract of more empty promises out of Washington?

Mr. Chairman, we can fulfill that contract by passing this amendment. Support safety. Support real crime

control. Support more police officers. Support this critical amendment.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, during the last couple of days I have been spending quite a bit of time talking to folks on the front line, folks in Kalamazoo, MI, and all across southwestern Michigan, in terms of what they think would be the best choice as we fight the tough issue of the crime problem. As I have talked to every one of my folks, prosecutors, judges, police chiefs, and community activists, they have all said, "FRED, we want flexibility. We want to be able to decide in our community what is best. We don't want all these strings coming from Washington," and the way this bill has been crafted is exactly the way they would support it on the front line.

This is the right bill. We should allow the flexibility at the local level so that they can decide what is best for their communities.

□ 1350

I would urge that we vote "no" on this particular amendment, and vote in favor of it when it comes on final passage later this evening.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPTON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I very much am pleased with what the gentleman has to say. I have been listening to the other side of the aisle have a long litany of things that they have been making comments about and so forth.

My judgment on this is like yours. This is maximum flexibility. There is no way anybody loses. Everybody gains by this. Local communities get to decide this themselves, rather than our making those decisions for them. Yes, as I heard one of the gentleman over there say, I did say earlier that the 100,000 cops on the streets appears to be the President's pet project. If there is any politics in this, it is trying on his part and on some of the Democrats' part trying to keep that 100,000 cops on the street image out there.

In reality, there never were going 100,000 cops anyway, because most communities in this country cannot afford to pay the additional cost it takes to get that kind of police officer on the streets. They do not have the money to do that. And in the end, the net result is what we are proposing today, to let every community share in this, if they are a high-crime-rate community, particularly, to do it if they want to do, they can get a cop if they want, they can get a police car if they want, or they can use it for prevention if they have a desire to do that, instead of getting a policeman, which is a much preferable way, and that is the way the Washington Post editorialized that way this morning, saying let us not hang up on this, on politics, on veto, et cetera. The commonsense thing to do is

to let the flexibility reign, which is what we do in our proposal.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would like to make two points in terms of flexibility here. First, I am a very strong supporter of the drug courts. In my district we have two drug courts acting very properly and very well organized, and I was delighted that the subcommittee under the gentleman from Florida's initiative has allowed drug courts in fact to be an eligible activity for the funds that are used.

Second, I must say I have a community, Benton Harbor, MI, which has been designated as a weed-and-seed community, yet they did not receive any funds from the Department of Justice when they applied with other communities across the country. It is my understanding in fact the procedure they have undergone over the last couple of years, that this would in fact be an eligible community function with a board that has been established with members from both the law enforcement community as well as those very active in terms of prevention and community activists, that even though they were denied by the Justice Department to receive funding, in fact that this would be an eligible activity under the \$10 billion fund.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPTON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is 100 percent right. The local community would make this decision itself. The county and city commissions that get these moneys would make this decision. They would have advisory groups that we set up that would have to advise them, which would include local prosecutors, local police, local school system representative, somebody from the courts, so the drug courts can be protected, and so on. I think you would find the community would much prefer it, because you are right, they could get the weed-and-seed money they would want.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, so whereas we have been denied in the past, this would be an avenue of actually receiving funding to go on the frontline for prevention and deal with the problem of crime that we have in communities both large and small.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPTON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I understand the points the gentlemen are making, but I believe the cops on the beat are critically important total law enforcement. My chief of police in Prince Georges County strongly supports it, my police in Maryland support, and I rise in strong support of the Conyers-Schumer amendment.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Maryland a

quick question: I saw in one of the papers yesterday the police chief in Washington, DC, close to Maryland, has in fact supported the underlying bill and therefore would be opposed to this amendment. Does the gentleman know why?

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman will yield further, I think I do know why. You heard frequently of Speaker GINGRICH's quote of June 23, 1994, in which he says he does not want to send blank checks to local officials. Some officials want blank checks. Now he wants to send it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would point out that under the unanimous-consent request, there are 2 minutes remaining in debate on this amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we have 5 minutes each additional under this amendment on each side.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to object, but I would just like to make sure I understand what the request is. It is for a total of 10 additional minutes the gentleman is requesting, in addition to the 1:55 drop-dead date we had earlier, 5 minutes to your side and 5 minutes over here to our side.

Mr. CONYERS. That is correct.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, if this unanimous-consent request is granted, would it still be true that this side would have the right to close?

The CHAIRMAN. There is no right to close under the 5-minute rule, but if time is controlled under the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Michigan, then the gentleman from Florida would have the right to close.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, with that understanding, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. In order to clarify it, this will supersede the previous agreement. Is that the intent of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, continuing the time that is left under the original agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. It will apply to all amendments thereto.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the scheduled debate, there will be 5 minutes allocated to each side for further debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time on the previous agreement has now expired.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BISHOP] who has been waiting patiently, be allowed to proceed for 2 minutes, in addition to the 10 minutes just agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, when Sheriff Carlton Powell of Thomas County in rural south Georgia called our Washington office yesterday to inquire about the cops fast program, he commended Congress for helping to fight the war against crime in a very effective way. He said there is nothing Congress can do that is more effective in the fight against crime than to increase the number of law officers available at the local level.

Congress, he said, is finally helping to concentrate more of the country's limited anticrime resources where they are needed most, on the front lines. Sheriff Powell also expressed a concern. He is concerned that Congress is about to take a tremendous step backward. If Congress junks the program designed to expand police forces throughout our communities, then we are sending a blank check block grant program back which will, in his words, kick police off the porch.

When are we going to learn? When are we going to have enough good sense to listen to community law officers, who have been leading the charge against crime every day?

State, city, and county crime officers like Sheriff Powell have been telling us for years more police over on the street should be the top priority. But until the last term of Congress little has been done at the Federal level to assure that critical need. Expanding prisons and the judicial system is good. However, spending for the number of police officers per 10,000 citizens has not kept up. We have got to do what is necessary to put our police officers on the street.

Mr. Chairman, let us listen to what local law enforcement communities have been telling us, and to continue to move forward, rather than backwards, at this critical, critical need. Let us have enough good sense to preserve the one program that is working effectively and efficiently. Let us stay on target. Let us pass the Conyers-Schumer-Chapman amendment and continue putting more police officers on the streets to guarantee that our communities will be safer tomorrow than they are today.

The fact is, our area of Georgia has been at the very cutting edge of the Cops-on-the-Beat Program. In Columbus, Police Chief Jim Wetherington was one of the first to receive funding, local funding, and now he has nine new federally funded officers now in the police academy and soon to be deployed on the streets of his city. In Albany, Chief Joseph Lumpkin has already deployed new officers in

his neighborhoods—and he reports that in less than a year it has already measurably reduced Albany's crime rate. In Valdosta, Chief Charlie Spray says there is a new rapport between the community and his police officers because of the additional police on the streets. In the town of Vienna, Chief Bobby Reed says the program has already helped deter crime, and he, too, is seeing an immediate impact on his community's crime rate. Some of our law officers say they like the idea of more flexibility. But, overwhelmingly, they do not want the Cops-on-the-Beat Program dismantled.

During the 1980's, the emphasis was primarily on expanding prisons and the judicial system, and spending at the Federal and State levels climbed rapidly in these areas. At the same time, however, spending for the number of police per 10,000 citizens barely increased at all. While the number of violent crimes leaped by an enormous 37 percent over the last half of the 1980's, the total number of police increased by a relatively meager 16 percent.

When the administration and Congress enacted the bill that created the cops fast and cops ahead programs this past term, we were finally paying attention.

These programs have already deployed 17,000 additional police officers in cities and towns across the country and will add 83,000 more over the next few years.

We are doing this efficiently, making sure the money goes for crime fighters and not bureaucrats by spending less than 1 percent of the funding for administration.

We are targeting our limited resources for a purpose that is certain to produce positive results.

We are doing what an overwhelming number of our community law officers tell us we ought to be doing.

Mr. Chairman, the war against crime is just that—a war. And to fight a war we must have soldiers. Like any way, it is impossible to fully calculate the costs in terms of human misery. But it is possible to figure out how much it costs in dollars. Economists say the cost of crime to our society totals about \$674 billion a year—more than twice the amount the Federal Government spends annually on defense. Many things need to be done to fight this war. We need more prisons, tougher and longer sentences for violent criminals. We also need closer monitoring of criminals on probation. We need to attack drug and alcohol abuse. We need to help people become employed and remain employed. We need to keep young people in school and out of youth gangs.

We most certainly need more—not fewer—police officers on our streets.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the previous unanimous consent agreement, a Member in support of the amendment will control 5 minutes, and a Member in opposition to the amendment will control 5 minutes. Who will control the time in support?

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I will control the time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Who will control the time in opposition?

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I will.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, this is the most important amendment in this whole block of crime bills that we are considering. As you consider it, I want to take you back in time a few months to the period when we were working on the crime bill, after we had lost the ability to bring it up in the House and we had a bipartisan agreement with Republicans and Democrats, negotiating to bring about a bill that we could pass last fall. Those negotiations went on between my office and now Speaker GINGRICH's office, and we arrived at a bipartisan agreement that ensured that we would get 100,000 new police, community police, on the streets of America.

We made that decision. In my district, 80 of those police are now on the street.

□ 1400

Seventeen thousand across the country are already out either being trained or already on the street preventing crime and cracking down on crime. One of the reasons Government gets a bad name today is that we make decisions often in a bipartisan way, as we did last fall. And then before we even have a chance to see if the action will work, we pull back, we change. We say, we did not want to do that. We want to do something else.

It would be a tragedy, after we have made this decision, to now back up and say, no, it is a no-strings block grant, you can do anything you want.

I was in my district over the weekend. I went out with the community police that had been hired. And all of them asked me, is this funding going to be taken away? Are new decisions going to be made?

The chief of police of St. Louis asked me,

Are we going back to the way you did it in the 1970's, with LEAA, when a no-strings block grant built alley lights in St. Louis and a new promenade in front of the Mississippi River, rather than flesh and blood police who could walk through communities?

And there I stood on Sunday with Officer Vise, in front of the head of the neighborhood association. And she talked about what it meant to have on the streets on a daily and nightly basis this young man who was a newly trained policeman that all of the people of the neighborhood could relate to and talk to and give information to. And she said how wonderful it was to create the confidence of the people in that community to fight crime. And now, just 2 weeks after this young man is on the beat stopping crime in that community, are we going to take him away? How wrong that would be.

We have got a block grant for prevention. We put it into the bipartisan bill. We can keep that in. But let us not back up on this decision on police. The

American people believe crime is the No. 1 problem in the country, and they want to stop crime from happening in their communities. And police are known, community police especially, as the best way to prevent crime.

Let us keep it moving. Let us keep going forward. Vote for this amendment. Vote again for the bipartisan bill we passed last year, and let us stop crime in America in the best way that we know to do it.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have just heard an impassioned speech from the minority leader about why we should keep the cops on the streets program alive. I would like to simply correct a couple of thoughts that were put out that I do not think are quite accurate.

No. 1, nothing in the bill that we have before us today would destroy a single police officer that has been designated that a community is going to get under the current year we are in, the current fiscal year we are in, by the Attorney General.

If a community gets a cop during the course of this fiscal year with the money that was appropriated already, then that cop is going to stay there, the money has been protected in this bill. So that the Attorney General may reserve money under this appropriation this year for the full three years so there is nobody going to lose any police officer anywhere in the Nation that has already been designated or will be designated, for that matter, during the remainder of this fiscal year until October 1.

Now, we are down to one simple issue. Do you believe that it is better for the Federal Government to tell you, communities, how you should proceed to fight crime in your community with the money that comes from Washington, or do you believe it is better that you, local communities, decide for yourselves how to spend that money? That is the sole question.

We have a chance to move forward from this year forward in the remaining years of our crime legislation and correct the deficiencies of the last few paragraphs of last year's crime bill by giving that flexibility to the cities and the counties, and that is all this bill does that we propose today.

We propose to take roughly \$10 billion and say to every community that has a high crime rate throughout the Nation, city, or county, you decide how you want to spend it, whether that is for more cops or whether that is for police cars or whether that is for a prevention program. That is common sense.

The mayors like it. The mayors even quoted the minority leader in a letter dated February 10, I have a copy and I quoted it earlier today, as having said at that meeting on January 27,

You are the ones on the front lines. You are people that have got to show results, and

I think you are well equipped to try to figure out what to do with the money.

Now, I also have today the editorial that I quoted earlier from the Washington Post. There is no question that it is pretty universally accepted that many communities cannot use the current cops on the streets program.

And they say here,

Almost immediately, though, it was challenged by law enforcement experts and some local officials. In fact, the law created a five-year matching program during which the Federal Government's share diminished and eventually disappeared, leaving localities with the full cost of maintaining the new officers. Since the maximum federal contribution could not have exceeded \$15,000 a year per new hire, the program would never have supplied enough to pay salary, benefits, pensions and other costs, so the cities would have had to come up with a lot of upfront money many say they don't have. So put aside the 100,000 figure, and the issue boils down to whether decisions about the expenditure of law enforcement dollars are best made locally or nationally. In some cities, like this one—

Washington, DC, they are saying.

the greatest need may not be additional police on the roster but better equipment, specialized training or even midnight basketball. What is wrong with letting them use federal funds for less expensive but still effective programs rather than for costly hiring.

I say what is wrong with letting the local communities decide what to do with the money that we give them. They know best how to spend that money. They are at the front lines, as the minority leader said in his comments to the mayors just a few days ago. They are the ones that can best decide at the local level how to fight crime.

There are thousands of options that are out there, not just the ones Washington may dream up as to what is best for one city. It might be one thing that is good for Sacramento, CA and another good for New Brunswick, GA and another for Madison, WI. Who knows what is best for those communities?

That has been the problem with the Democrats over the past 40 years controlling this Congress. They believe that Washington knows best. We believe that the local communities know best in these cases and the money should go back to them to decide how to fight crime in their communities. Ninety percent of the crime in this country is local, local crime, not Federal crime, not under the Federal laws. It is State and local.

The decisions on how to spend that money to fight crime are clearly best made by the cities and the counties of this country, not by the Federal Government.

I urge a no vote on this amendment today, a no vote against a way of doing business that has long since been debunked in this country of the Federal Government saying Washington knows best. Let us let the citizens of this country at the local level of government make these decisions once and

for all. Let us keep the underlying bill intact. Let us, under the circumstances today, go with the local grant programs in this bill and not go back to the same old business as usual, Washington knows best approach of the cops on the streets program, just for the sake of allowing this President to be able to claim a political victory.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Conyers-Schumer amendment to preserve the current community policing initiative that we instituted in the 1994 crime bill.

Last year, Congress passed the largest anticrime package in history, and it is working. Last year's crime bill demonstrated a balanced approach of police, punishment and prevention. While many of these programs have not yet gone into effect, the COPS Program has. Thousands of grants have been awarded to small towns, medium size towns and to our Nation's cities. With the recent announcement of grant awards under the COPS FAST Program nearly 17,000 new police officers are or will be hired. In my home State of Connecticut over 150 new COPS will be funded. This is needed relief for local law enforcement agencies across my State and for that matter across the country.

The Law Enforcement Grant Program that is included in the Contract With America does not continue the successful COPS Program that was instituted as part of last year's crime bill. In fact, it does not guarantee that one additional police officer will be placed on the street. We have all heard the horror stories of the wasteful and unaccountable spending of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, including the purchase of a tank, and a \$140,000 aircraft. These type of block grant programs do not work. The Conyers-Schumer amendment is smart, it protects funding to put more COPS on the beat. And unlike the Law Enforcement Block Grant Program it guarantees that more COPS will be on the beat working to make our streets safe.

We can try criminals, we can put them in prison, but without additional police we do not have the resources to arrest them and start the judicial process. Let's continue to move forward with a program that works, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment that will protect the important funding for the COPS Program.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Conyers and Schumer amendment and in strong opposition to H.R. 728. Last year, Congress voted for an anticrime strategy that struck a much-needed balance between law enforcement and swift punishment, and innovative prevention programs. Now, we are in the midst of dismantling the crux of last year's crime bill by eliminating both the COPS on the Beat Program and crime prevention programs.

The COPS Program promises to place 100,000 more police on our streets. The COPS Program already has made an impact in my district of Dayton, OH. In the last several months, my district has been awarded 23 police officers. New officers have been placed not only in the urban areas of Montgomery County, but also in the rural areas which are often passed by for federal and State funding. The COPS initiative makes our communities safer through community policing efforts, but it

also makes the job of police officers easier and safer because of the interaction between law enforcement officials and community leaders.

Unfortunately, the broad language contained in H.R. 728 does not guarantee that the funds obtained through block grants will be used to hire more police officers. In the past, many well-intentioned grant programs, such as the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration [LEAA], failed because the broad language allowed funds to be diverted for other purposes. The American people want accountability for how Federal money is going to be spent, and they expect results. This open-ended grant program will not bring the results the public wants, and it will not target areas which need the most attention, particularly youth violence and street crime.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the American people are asking for the elimination of the COPS Program or of the crime and drug prevention programs included in the 1994 crime bill. Instead, my constituents are calling for both more police officers and programs that increase youth employment and educational opportunities. Let us not dismantle these programs. We worked long and hard on them, and these programs need the chance to succeed. This is the least our young people deserve, who too often are neglected and witness the horror of violence at an early age.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" for the Conyers and Schumer amendment, and vote "no" on H.R. 728.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, the county sheriffs, chiefs of police, and prosecutors who deal with crime on a day-to-day basis told us that community policing would make their jobs easier because police officers who are visibly involved in their communities are one of the best deterrents to crime.

According to the National Association of Police Organizations, "We need all the help we can get in our daily work, and putting more cops on the streets will help us do our job."

And that is what the crime bill delivered. The COPS-FAST program, which targets small jurisdictions, had a one-page application that was due by December 31. No redtape. no bureaucracy. Just an announcement a little over month later that communities in my district would receive a total of 17 new police officers. These are officers who will not just walk a beat, but work closely with the citizens and communities they serve.

Community policing has proven to be effective. It is widely supported by law enforcement across the country. Why kill it in favor of block grants—funding which guarantees nothing and is likely to result in an overall reduction in dollars targeted for police and prevention?

When we asked for help in developing the crime bill, local law enforcement answered. We listened to them, and then responded with cops-on-the-beat. Why are we putting them through the wringer again? Support the Schumer, Conyers, Chapman amendment and perpetuate this fine crime law offered by President Clinton.

Ms. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman I rise today to support the Schumer amendment to H.R. 728. The question of Federal involvement in the fight against crime at the local level is one of resources. We all want to do our utmost to help our constituents retake their streets and

neighborhoods from criminals. The preamble to the Constitution lists "ensuring domestic tranquility" as one of the defining goals of our Republic.

With the Federal budget mired in red ink, however, we need to prioritize who we can help, and how best to help them. Congress has already spoken against unfunded mandates, now we must stand against block grants that disperse our limited resources without a single word of advice or oversight on where the money goes. We need more genuine Federal-local partnerships like the Community Policy Program of the 1994 crime bill.

If a municipality provides a community policing plan that is innovative and reflects the crime-fighting needs of the community, the Federal Government will provide the bulk of the funds necessary to hire, train, and pay the law officers needed to carry out that plan. The application is 1 page long, and 16,000 officers have already been approved by the Justice Department. This program is working, and it has the support of the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Sheriffs Association, and the Major Cities Police Chiefs.

It has been argued that community policing is a result of Federal coercion. In fact, community policing is a priority because it helps communities that need Federal help fighting crime. We could approve block grants, and dispense funds to affluent towns that want helicopters, Tasers, new patrol cars, and fancy radios. But for every block grant we make to a town that can afford its own officer we take an officer away from a city or small town that is broke and desperately need our help.

Simply put, community policing is tough on crime. And we need to be tough on crime. We must also crack down on the causes of crime. We have already eliminated specific funding for Drug Court programs like the highly successful one operated by the prosecutor in my home of Jackson County. Other popular programs, like the Mayor's Night Hoops in Kansas City, will also be in danger.

The 1994 crime bill was the result of years of sometimes acrimonious debate. When finally passed, it was a program of police, prevention, and punishment. This bill has had neither the depth of consideration or the breadth of scope. Even if a community wants a portion of the block grants authorized in this bill, they must first convene an amorphous committee of law enforcement, social service agencies, elected officials, and other interested parties. This bureaucracy could turn the fast track to cops into the slow train to nowhere.

Most cities in my district have received community policing support. They need it because crime in our region is a serious problem. My constituents can attest to the crime that plagues too many of our neighborhoods. But these citizens want to work with their government and their police to create a safer environment to live, work, and raise their children. The 1994 crime bill gave them that opportunity.

While last year's crime bill was a solemn contract with citizens to lay the cornerstone for a safer society, this bill invites waste, fraud, and increased crime. Rarely has this House had a clearer choice in the fight against crime. Never has our duty to our constituents been so clear. Join me in opposing the wasteful, bureaucratic aspects of H.R. 728 by supporting the Schumer amendment.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman and colleagues, I rise today in strong support of the Schumer-Conyers-Chapman amendment to maintain the Cops on the Beat Program.

I have spoken several times now in support of the Cops Program, but it cannot be emphasized enough: Community policing works.

The COPS Program will put 100,000 police on our streets—police that are involved in their communities and committed to keeping our families safe. COPS responds to the demands by the American people that we in Congress must do something to fight crime and violence. COPS is supported by virtually every national law enforcement organization.

We must protect one of the strongest weapons we have in fighting crime: community oriented policing. If we truly want to take back our streets and improve the quality of life in our cities, police officers cannot do it alone. Local residents cannot do it alone—they must work together.

That is exactly what community policing does—it allows police officers to work together with local community residents to fight crime.

Now, certain Members of Congress want to eliminate this critical approach to crime prevention. I strongly oppose any efforts to cut community policing programs, and I ask my colleagues to take a good hard look at exactly what community policing does for our towns and cities.

Community policing works—and it works because it asks the experts to create crime-fighting strategies. When I say experts, I am not talking about bureaucrats in Washington offices. When I say experts, I am talking about the people who actually live in neighborhoods plagued with crime—and I am talking about the police officers who patrol those neighborhoods every day.

So when the crime bill says it will put 100,000 new community police officers on the beat, we must remember that those officers will know both the neighborhoods they patrol and the people in them.

I personally have seen community policing work. As a city councilman in San Diego, I have worked hand in hand with neighborhood residents and community policing teams—and I have personally seen the effect that this partnership has had on crime. The police officers become real human beings to the neighborhood residents—and the people who live in the neighborhoods become real human beings to the police officers there to protect the peace.

Mr. Chairman, these tactics work. The city of San Diego has established neighborhood policing teams in even the neighborhoods with the highest crime rates—and a recent study pointed out that overall crime has been reduced in the city by 10 percent.

Yes, we need to be tough on crime. We need stiffer penalties, and we need to make sure that criminals serve the full jail sentences they deserve. But we also need to work together as communities. And what the crime bill proved last year was that Congress was serious about fighting crime and that Congress had enough forethought to make it a comprehensive fight.

Let's not move backward this week. I ask my colleagues to understand the central role of community policing in fighting crime. And I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this important amendment—and protecting this effective crime prevention program.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Conyers-Schumer amendment. We did the right thing in last year's crime bill. We did the right thing when we created a balance between tough law enforcement measures, like a sensible version of three-strikes-you're-out—and crime prevention.

As part of that balance, we did the right thing when passed a law which wrote into law the goal of putting 100,000 new police officers on the street. But, as I said last week, this bill, called the "Taking Back Our Streets Act," will hand the streets back over to violent crime.

We need to preserve the balance between punishment and prevention. This is not a Democratic concept. Republican President Bush knew that prevention is important when he gave one of his Points of Light Award to a midnight basketball program in Glenarden, MD.

This is what the Republican mayor of Fort Wayne, IN said: "It's crucial we have money for prevention. It's a lot better to spend money on the front end instead of just building a prison cell for them."

Mayor Helmke is right, and so are his fellow mayors who told a League of Cities survey what would help them fight their wars on crime. 48.4 percent say that jobs programs would help; 39 percent say that more cops would help; 30 percent say that recreation would help. Only 8.4 percent say that more prison money would help. But this bill turns its back on the mayors, and the cops, and the community groups who are fighting the war on crime.

The Conyers-Schumer amendment makes sense. It restores the money we voted to provide to States and local governments last year. It preserves the community-based COPS Program which is working so well in all of our districts. It maintains the balance between prevention and tough punishment. It retains flexibility for cities. And, by separating the grant into two separate funds, prevents police and prevention from cannibalizing each other.

Don't just listen to me. Before you make this vote, I urge you to call the police chiefs and mayors in your district. I urge you to support the Conyers-Schumer amendment.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Conyers-Schumer-Chapman amendment to restore the Cops on the Beat Program. Just a few short months ago, we were on this floor making a commitment to the American people to place 100,000 additional law enforcement officers on the streets of our communities, and to provide the means to our communities to support important prevention programs to help give our kids an alternative to drugs and crime.

But, here we are today with a proposal before us to undue our good efforts. Efforts which have already paid off in community after community. Four of the five counties within my congressional district have already benefited from the Cops on the Beat Program, some as recently as last week. What you are now telling these jurisdictions, is that they have no guarantee that the support guaranteed under the 1994 bill will continue, to pass unamended, that my communities may be forced to reduce their police.

Last year's crime bill was funded by a reduction in the Federal work force. That hits hard in my district. But, my constituents and I recognized and supported the need for additional police. We are not willing, however, to

support an effort which will not put cops on the streets in the towns in my district and in yours. As President Clinton said on Sunday, he fought to cut the Federal work force for 100,000 police officers, and nothing less.

Crime is a national problem, and we need a national commitment to the problem. That is why it is so essential that we do not break our commitment for police in our communities and on our streets.

Under this Republican proposal, my communities have no guarantee that while they are dedicating their resources to putting cops on the street and to effective prevention programs that the community next door or across the river will be holding to the same standard. In the Washington area, crime is a regional problem. We must have coordinated efforts to fight crime. The law we passed did that. The proposal before us today would replace a guaranteed initiative with a block grant program with no guarantees at all.

Many mayors around the country support the amendment before us today to keep intact the Cops on the Beat Program. The mayor of the largest city in my State, Mayor Kurt Schmoke, has written to me supporting today's amendment. Mayor Schmoke writes that "community policing is the keystone of our crime prevention strategies." And, that he is opposed to the effort before us today to abandon the goal of 100,000 new police officers.

Mayor Ed Rendell of Philadelphia wrote to the Speaker of the House in support of the Schumer-Conyers amendment. While he supports some of the improvements in H.R. 728, he states that the "block grant would be even more effective if the Congress adopted the concept contained in the Schumer-Conyers amendment."

Mr. Chairman, more than half of the police departments in America are now scheduled to receive police hiring grants. It makes no sense to stop this successful program in midstream and give the criminals even more chances to terrorize our neighborhoods and seduce our children into a life of hopelessness.

We are in a state of national emergency. On this floor today, it is time to void the contract and pass the Schumer-Conyers-Chapman amendment and keep the police on the streets.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 235, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 124]

AYES—196

Abercrombie	Bishop	Chapman
Ackerman	Blute	Clay
Andrews	Bonior	Clayton
Baesler	Borski	Clement
Baldacci	Boucher	Clyburn
Barcia	Browder	Coleman
Barrett (WI)	Brown (CA)	Collins (IL)
Beilenson	Brown (FL)	Collins (MI)
Bentsen	Brown (OH)	Condit
Berman	Bryant (TX)	Conyers
Bevill	Cardin	Costello

Coyne	Kanjorski
Cramer	Kaptur
Danner	Kennedy (MA)
de la Garza	Kennedy (RI)
Deal	Kennelly
DeFazio	Kildee
DeLauro	Klecza
Dellums	Klink
Deutsch	LaFalce
Dicks	Lantos
Dingell	Laughlin
Dixon	Levin
Doggett	Lewis (GA)
Dooley	Lincoln
Doyle	Lipinski
Durbin	Lowe
Edwards	Luther
Engel	Maloney
Eshoo	Manton
Evans	Markey
Farr	Martinez
Fattah	Mascara
Fazio	McCarthy
Fields (LA)	McDermott
Filner	Mohale
Flake	McKinney
Foglietta	Meehan
Ford	Meek
Frank (MA)	Menendez
Frost	Mfume
Furse	Miller (CA)
Gejdenson	Mineta
Gephardt	Minge
Gibbons	Mink
Gonzalez	Moakley
Gordon	Mollohan
Green	Montgomery
Gutierrez	Moran
Hall (OH)	Morella
Hamilton	Murtha
Harman	Nadler
Hastings (FL)	Neal
Hayes	Oberstar
Hefner	Obey
Hilliard	Oliver
Hinchey	Ortiz
Holden	Orton
Hoyer	Owens
Jackson-Lee	Pallone
Jacobs	Pastor
Jefferson	Payne (NJ)
Johnson (CT)	Payne (VA)
Johnson (SD)	Pelosi
Johnson, E. B.	Peterson (FL)
Johnston	Peterson (MN)

NOES—235

Allard	Coburn
Archer	Gillmor
Armey	Collins (GA)
Bachus	Combest
Baker (CA)	Cooley
Baker (LA)	Cox
Balenger	Crane
Barr	Creameans
Barrett (NE)	Cubin
Bartlett	Cunningham
Barton	Davis
Bass	DeLay
Bateman	Diaz-Balart
Bereuter	Dickey
Bilbray	Doolittle
Bilirakis	Dornan
Bliley	Dreier
Boehlert	Duncan
Bono	Dunn
Brewster	Ehlers
Brownback	Ehrlich
Bryant (TN)	Emerson
Bunn	English
Bunning	Ensign
Burr	Everett
Burton	Ewing
Buyer	Fawell
Callahan	Fields (TX)
Calvert	Flanagan
Camp	Foley
Canady	Forbes
Castle	Fowler
Chabot	Fox
Chambliss	Franks (CT)
Chenoweth	Franks (NJ)
Christensen	Frelinghuysen
Chrysler	Frisa
Clinger	Funderburk
Coble	Galleghy
	Ganske
	Gekas
	Geran
	Kolbe

Pickett	LaHood
Pomeroy	Largent
Poshard	Latham
Quinn	LaTourette
Rahall	Lazio
Rangel	Leach
Reed	Lewis (CA)
Reynolds	Lewis (KY)
Richardson	Lightfoot
Rivers	Linder
Roemer	Livingston
Rose	LoBiondo
Roybal-Allard	Lofgren
Rush	Longley
Sabo	Lucas
Sanders	Manzullo
Sawyer	Martini
Schroeder	McCollum
Schumer	McCrery
Serrano	McDade
Sisisky	McHugh
Skaggs	McInnis
Skelton	McIntosh
Slaughter	McKeon
Spratt	McNulty
Stark	Metcalf
Stokes	Meyers
Studds	Mica
Stupak	Miller (FL)
Tanner	Molinari
Tejeda	Moorhead
Thompson	Myers
Thornton	Myrick
Thurman	Nethercutt
Torkildsen	Neumann
Torres	Ney
Torricelli	Norwood
Towns	Nussle
Tucker	
Velazquez	
Vento	
Neal	Visclosky
Oberstar	Volkmer
Obey	Ward
Oliver	Waters
Ortiz	Waxman
Orton	Williams
Owens	Wilson
Pallone	Wise
Pastor	Woolsey
Payne (NJ)	Wyden
Payne (VA)	Wynn
Pelosi	Yates

Oxley	Smith (WA)
Packard	Solomon
Parker	Souder
Paxon	Spence
Petri	Stearns
Pombo	Stenholm
Porter	Stockman
Portman	Stump
Pryce	Talent
Quillen	Tate
Radanovich	Tauzin
Ramstad	Taylor (MS)
Regula	Taylor (NC)
Riggs	Thomas
Roberts	Thornberry
Rogers	Tiahrt
Rohrabacher	Traficant
Ros-Lehtinen	Upton
Roth	Vucanovich
Roukema	Waldholtz
Royce	Walker
Salmon	Walsh
Sanford	Wamp
Saxton	Watt (NC)
Scarborough	Watts (OK)
Schaefer	Weldon (FL)
Schiff	Weldon (PA)
Scott	Weller
Seastrand	White
Sensenbrenner	Whitfield
Shadegg	Wicker
Shaw	Wolf
Shays	Young (AK)
Shuster	Young (FL)
Skeen	Zeliff
Smith (MI)	Zimmer
Smith (NJ)	
Smith (TX)	

NOT VOTING—3

Becerra Crapo Matsui

□ 1426

Mrs. CHENOWETH and Mr. HEFLEY changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. SKELTON changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. SCHROEDER

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. Schroeder: Page 4, after line 5, insert the following:

"(D) Enhancing health care clinic security measures to protect against violence directed against the free exercise of constitutional rights, including—

"(i) overtime pay for law enforcement officers;

"(ii) security assessments by law enforcement officers;

"(iii) when recommended by law enforcement officials, purchases of materials to enhance the physical safety of clinics, including, bulletproof glass and security cameras."

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the committee earlier today, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] will be recognized for 30 minutes in support of her amendment, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I seek the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] will control the time in opposition.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

□ 1430

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am very sorry we have to do this. I had hoped this would be solved in my attempt to make this amendment in the committee; we were thwarted and it was the other side who wanted to make this an issue.

Ladies and gentleman, antichoice violence is on a rampage in this country, and this is a federally protected right, federally protected right. But we are asking local law enforcement to protect it, and local law enforcement has become overwhelmed.

Let me show Members this chart. All the red areas are States where reproductive clinics have decreased in the last 10 years. Decreased. And why would they not decrease when people who work in these clinics have been under siege, and when we have at the desk, and I hope every one of my colleagues comes to look at every incidence of violence we could find in each individual State that has been documented just in the last 2 years, just in the last 2 years. It goes on and on and on and I would take my full hour or more to read it all.

But this kind of violence is absolutely intolerable, and it seems to me if we are sending Federal money to localities, the one thing we should do is say to localities that they will be able to utilize this money to protect federally protected laws and federally protected rights.

Think about this. If in the civil rights debates during the 1960's we were sending block grant money to different cities, but we did not say to localities that they could use that money to help in civil rights demonstrations, what an omission. How terrible. And what if we said that about voting problems that we were so worried about federally? This is a federally protected right, this is Federal money. Last I looked, women Federal taxpayers were charged the same as men, and if we do not put this in here clearly, then I think localities that have been afraid to stand firm on this will continue to. If we send the money and we say this is allowed, I think we take those excuses away and hopefully we begin to turn around the numbers on this chart.

I know the other side is going to stand and say that the amendment they adopted yesterday by the gentleman from New Mexico takes care of this, and what is the gentlewoman from Colorado talking about.

Well, they showed their hand yesterday. If Members will look at the RECORD from yesterday and look at the distinguished chairman and what he said, he said that he was backing that amendment because he thought it would be okay that local officials could do this if they wanted to do this. And the amendment does not specify family planning clinics, it kind of says facilities, which is a very broad-based thing.

We must send a much clearer message if America's women think we are serious about protecting their rights. We have winked at this, we have ducked, but let me tell you what is happening. The rights that they have not been able to roll back since Roe versus Wade was adopted, those rights that they could not roll back they are rolling back in an entirely different way by tolerating violence, by allowing it to go unabated as we have in our list, by seeing what is happening across this country, and that is how they are taking these rights away from women.

Either we stand here and say this is a right and it is a real right, and if we are going to send Federal money out to localities they ought to be told to help, or we do not mean it. So it is choose-up-sides-time today and I think America's women are going to be listening very carefully.

What does my amendment do? It says it would allow localities to help pay overtime for police in guarding these facilities or guarding some of the doctors and the health-care workers who have been under siege. Many have been shot, some have died very unfortunately, as Members well know. It also will allow, if the police think it is necessary, other additional security measures that they think would help, and would help them in their job. That to me makes an incredible amount of sense.

This bill does that in re schools, it does that in re all sorts of other things. You will hear people say well, we should list some things but not all things. Why are we afraid to say this? Why are we afraid to say that we ought to be protecting these rights?

Let us grow up and let us stand up and let us say that these billions of dollars ought to go out there, they ought to be protecting the women that are sending them to Washington and we ought to get very, very serious.

I urge every Member to vote for this amendment. And I think that it is really time that we stop this reign of terror that we have been too casual about.

I also think it is very important to notice this amendment would monitor what we are seeing happening now with the Justice Department as they are meeting with local law enforcement officials trying to end this reign of terror. They are all telling them they need this kind of help.

Let us give it to them. Let us give it to them and let us stop the violence.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we all abhor and condemn the violence against these clinics. We do not favor anybody committing violence or the kind of crimes we have seen, including one in my home State where recently we had somebody convicted and sentenced to the death penalty in the State for killing somebody at one of these clinics.

But the fact of the matter is the gentlewoman's amendment today, not the issue, but the amendment is much ado about nothing. The truth of the matter is that nothing that she is suggesting nor has been debated on this issue in this bill has anything to do with a binding effect on the local community in deciding what it is going to do with its moneys. This is a provision that she would insert into the part of the bill that is where we have suggested here are possible things, examples of things you can use your money for, but the preceding language to the entire section says including but not limited to, allowing maximum flexibility to the city and county commissioners and local government units that are going to decide how to spend their money to fight crime in their communities.

In yesterday's amendment the gentleman from New Mexico made absolutely sure that law enforcement officials got the message that we were interested in their making protective statements and doing what they needed to enhance security measures in and around schools and in and around any facility or location which is considered by the unit of local government to have a special risk for incidence of crime.

What the gentlewoman is doing today is trying to modify that further by specifically saying that she wants us to encourage the local police, and that is what we would be doing, we are encouraging the local communities to enhance health care clinic security measures by specifically naming health care clinics in here to protect against violence directed against the free exercise of constitutional rights, including overtime pay for law enforcement officers, security assessments by law enforcement officers when recommended by law enforcement officials, purchases of materials to enhance the physical safety of clinics, including bulletproof glass and security cameras.

I might say there is nothing here lest it be the purchase of these items of bulletproof glass and security cameras, that are in any way an expansion of anything in the bill currently. I cannot see any reason for offering this because the right is there right now to do all of this, save for the fact that it is inflammatory and it gets a good debate going on the abortion, choice, life question, and that seems to be what is going to ensue here today, is a debate on that subject, and I think that is unfortunate because none of us are opposed to the prime objective of stopping violence and allowing local police to use whatever resources in their community, local cities, and counties to protect a clinic as much as they protect any other structure, buildings, or community interest that is there.

□ 1440

But it should be their decision. We should not be in there trying to specify this particular type of thing, health care clinic, name it, in the bill. I do not

see any reason to be inflammatory. I find great concern with the idea of law enforcement deciding they are going to purchase bulletproof glass and security cameras potentially for a privately owned building.

We worked with the gentlewoman in committee to make sure if it was a public clinic or publicly owned building, indeed, certain materials and equipment could be added and purchased with the moneys in this bill, but it is contrary to the intent of this bill to have moneys that are being spent being sent to the local communities to enhance the physical properties of any privately owned building. It makes no sense at all to do that. We do not generally do that. We certainly do not want to encourage that.

Am I to say you cannot do that? Well, obviously we have got a lot of latitude in the bill. I do not want to put my name on any proposal that encourages or gives encouragement to a local community to enhance physical characteristics for security for a private building, whether that is a health care clinic, whether that is a Wendy's restaurant.

I do not think that is the business of the local community doing that. I would encourage them not to do it. I do not prohibit them in the bill from doing it.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks, but I also want to remind the gentleman when I first offered this in committee the gentleman was receptive to it. It was after we went away for a vote and there appeared to be a caucus on that that they attempted to fight it.

The gentlewoman hoped that this could be adopted in the committee. I did not want to make this a big high-water mark, and I salute the gentleman from Florida, because I know he has been from a State where there has been incredible violence, and you were very sensitive at that time. There was a change of mind. I am sorry there was a change of mind, but I just want to point that out.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Reclaiming my time, I must say I never agreed to this. You had initially come forward with an idea of putting "public" instead of "private" clinics in here.

This does not today say anything about public. In addition to that fact, I recall very distinctly having told you I had reconsidered this, having thought about it. I thought this was inflammatory and ensuing, and afterwards an unnecessary debate on abortion clinics that I do not think needs be addressed. We cover that anyway. We do cover them.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. If the gentleman will yield further, I really do not think it is inflammatory, and I think it is very, very important that we communicate to local officials who have been

hesitant to stand up and be counted, and I think the gentleman knows that from Florida.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I don't impugn the motives of the gentlewoman, but I definitely do believe that the debate that ensues around this by carving out all the language and doing things I suggested are not very acceptable to most of us and encouraging local governments to do it is in its own right inflammatory.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Chairman, on the day the Nation was horrified by the death of two young women in Massachusetts and the wounding of five others, we in Connecticut were much more fortunate. The accused individual who carried out these murders, when he was arrested, was found to have the name of a Hartford, CT, clinic in his pocket. Hartford is in my district.

Were we going to be the next ones? We do not know. We have no idea. We do know we have come to the point now when someone trying to exercise a constitutional right, might just be by chance be murdered.

We do know also that any town or city that has a clinic in it is forced to spend additional tax dollars for protection of this clinic. The police chief in that town needs all the help he can get. The neighbors that live in an area, want dollars spent for public safety. The citizens going to that clinic certainly say they have a constitutional right to protection.

So today, I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado for putting in this amendment. I do not think these citizens, these neighbors, these police chiefs, these individuals exercising their constitutional right are asking whether it is a public clinic or a private clinic. They are only asking for protection.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF].

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Because my name has already come up in this debate, I wanted to speak as to my amendment yesterday and why I opposed the amendment from the gentlewoman from Colorado.

First of all, I do want to acknowledge that in some portions of the country we obviously have had a very serious problem with violence at reproductive clinics. Everybody knows that. That is not in dispute.

I would like to take it a step further in that I was persuaded last year that in some localities, in some localities there was a problem with local law enforcement which could not or did not act adequately to protect these clinics or to prosecute individuals after violence has occurred and, therefore, I supported the bill which became law in

the last Congress which made it a Federal offense to have violence at a reproductive clinic.

I have to add though this is a subject again perhaps for another day.

Based upon what I know of the Justice Department's enforcement of that act, I have been very disappointed, because the cases that I am familiar with at least where they prosecuted under this act under Federal law, there was a simultaneous State prosecution. I do not understand why the Justice Department would prosecute and use Federal resources where there is already, in fact, a State prosecution. That is not the kind of situation we were told necessitated that Federal law.

Nevertheless, coming to this particular bill, H.R. 728, it is important to emphasize that the operative language is already there. This is a block grant. The locality can already use these funds to enhance security at reproductive clinics if that is what they want to do.

It was suggested in the Committee on the Judiciary that was not good enough, that we should provide more illustrations, and that is all these are in illustrations, to local law enforcement to show them what we are getting at, since we had mentioned schools by way of example to enhance security. I offered an amendment to H.R. 728 that was accepted by voice vote yesterday that is proposed as an illustration using the funds to enhance security measures in and around schools and in and around any other facility or location which is considered by the unit of local government to have a special risk for incidents of crime.

So we have made the point in this amendment that local government can use these funds wherever they have a special risk of crimes. This can include a reproduction clinic, if that is, indeed, a problem in a particular area.

But here is what is wrong with the gentlewoman's amendment. These illustrations are trying to send a message, and the fact of the matter is, although there is a dreadful problem with violence at some reproductive clinics, not at all reproductive clinics, and to cite this as one, as an example, sends a message to local law enforcement that even if they have a greater threat to people's safety elsewhere in their community, the Congress thinks they should beef up security at one particular area even if their crime threat is elsewhere.

That is why the amendment should be defeated.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO].

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentlewoman on this amendment, because she has made a splendid case on behalf of protection of a Federal right, a constitutional right, that women have.

But I would like to add to that my thought that this is also an issue that should concern men, not only because we should be concerned about protecting women's rights, but also because men are not safe from this violence. Many of these clinics offer services that are necessary for men. A man walking into one of these clinics to learn more about communicable diseases or about reproduction choices for people in the community or just to accompany someone is a target for this kind of violence, and so I think, while it is important for us to stand up today for the rights of women, it is also important and intelligent for us to admit to the fact that some of the men and women who stand outside of these clinics and are willing to deal in violence have directed that violence at men, not only at women.

And so today I stand up on behalf of this amendment, because I believe it is the right thing to do, because I believe that this amendment does not interfere with anything that the majority party is trying to do. On the contrary, it reinforces their rhetoric that they are concerned about local involvement and local control.

Local control should be aided by us, by allowing and sending this signal, this clear signal, that these rights must be protected.

This is a unique situation, and unique problems need unique solutions and approaches.

What the gentlewoman from Colorado has suggested today is an approach that says that we can all get together and send a signal that this is a behavior we will not tolerate, not only by law, but that we will also make the funds available to carry this out.

Support this amendment. It does not interfere with anything you have in mind.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1450

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I could not agree more with my friend from New York. The greatest boon to men is abortion. Boy, does that take it off of their back, does that solve a big problem for them.

I want to make it clear, I do not and I do not know anybody that condones the vicious murders that have occurred within the last 20 months, 5 of them; vicious, they ought to be prosecuted for murder to the fullest extent of the law.

They have done incalculable harm to the pro-life movement. There is nothing pro-life about killing people, even

if they are participating in abortion clinics. So let us get that clear.

Let us also get clear the fact that the Schiff amendment covers this situation and more because it says enhancing security measures in and around schools and in and around any other facility or location which is considered by the unit of local government to have a special risk for incidents of crime. So this is not about the legal question, this is about the moral question of abortion.

This is an abortion vote because the gentlewoman from Colorado wishes to elevate to a position of special status abortion clinics. We do not call them that. As a matter of fact, we call them health care clinics. That reminds me of an old Italian saying, though, that, "You dress the shepherd in silk, he still smells of the goat." What we are talking about are places where unborn children are destroyed in their mothers' wombs. And a lot of people are very uncomfortable about that. Some people are driven to distraction for which the tragedy is compounded and for which I am sorry. And if protection is needed, they ought to have it.

But I am unwilling to take abortion mills and give them a special status over other places where more people are killed more frequently.

Now, I looked at the statistics for 1993, and they give you the statistics for 1992: 6 lawyers and judges were killed in that year, 7 teachers, elementary teachers, 86 cab drivers—86 cab drivers in this country. Also, 77 cashiers; fast-food employees, pizza delivery people—54. Should we have security cameras around convenience stores?

Twelve farmers, eight entertainers, fifty-eight cops. Fifty-eight cops. Now, bank robbery, let us talk about a Federal nexus; there is the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Interstate Commerce. There were 18 deaths in that year, the year of 1992. So if we are looking for where these deaths occurred, single out these places, there are lots of places to single out more dangerous, more vulnerable than abortion mills.

Now, I do not understand why anybody would feel comfortable elevating abortion mills to a place of special status. But some people do. So that is exactly what this vote is. If you think abortion clinics deserve to be singled out and to be protected specially over banks, over cab drivers, over schools, over the police themselves, why, go ahead and vote for the gentlewoman's bill.

But if you share with me an abhorrence, a condemnation of violence anywhere and everywhere, it is wrong, it is dead wrong and ought to be prosecuted. But if your sense of moral imagination encompasses the violence that goes on in abortion mills, euphemistically called health care clinics, not too healthy for the unborn, I might say; safe, legal, and rare. It is not safe for the unborn; it is terminal. Legal, but not moral and rare, no, not rare, if we keep sanctifying these places.

Now, I suggest that when it comes to protecting rights, there are more rights that are ignored and left unprotected in the abortion tragedy than there are protected. I want everybody to be able to exercise their constitutional right and if indeed the police or the local authorities think there is going to be violence at an abortion clinic, send the police there, by all means. But do not, in this legislation, which is a block grant, which is not categorical, which says let the local people decide, do not elevate it to a position of a cathedral-of-compassion abortion mills, where in this country 1,500,000 abortions per year go on. Include them generically, but not specifically. It is your choice.

I know how I am going to vote.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman yielding to me, and I appreciate the honesty of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE]. He has made it very clear that he thinks people should defeat this because he detests abortion, dislikes very much what happens in abortion clinics, disagrees that it should be legal, and therefore resists offering them this protection.

We are not singling out clinics in this bill, in the first place. The bill that the gentleman's committee brought forward singled out some places. Schools, he mentioned, they are already mentioned; drug courts are singled out; other places are singled out. We are not here doing anything differently than is already done in the bill.

Then the question is, if some things are going to be singled out, why should clinics where abortions are performed be singled out? The reason is not to elevate them above other places but to elevate them to the level that other places now occupy, because of all the places in our society that have been the victims of violence, abortion clinics have been the least protected because in many, many areas it is controversial to do it. The rhetoric of the gentleman from Illinois proves the point. You do not have people when they talk about protecting schools, protecting hospitals, protecting courtrooms, denouncing and vilifying the people to be protected. The gentleman concedes they should be protected, but he vilifies them and denounces them. In fact, in other places by people less sophisticated than the gentleman from Illinois, that becomes an argument against doing it.

The fact is if we follow the gentleman from Illinois and defeat this amendment because he says it is too pro-abortion, we then create a situation where we send an ambivalent message to local law enforcement, we will create a situation in which local people will find this controversial. We will create a situation in which there will be people arguing, "Well, the Congress

voted it down. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee said terrible things happen in abortion clinics. Don't elevate them." Abortion clinics are singled out, not in this bill but by those who commit violence against them.

There is an organized interstate national campaign of some crazy and vicious people to go after the clinics. Many people oppose that, on both sides of the issue of abortion. But there is an undeniably consistent attack.

In my own home district, two people murdered, police officers under strain. What we are saying is we want no uncertainty. We do not want people who share the gentleman's detestation of abortion to say, unlike him because he makes distinctions as a distinguished lawyer, "Well, maybe they shouldn't get it. Maybe Congress didn't want it."

If you had come with a clean block grant bill, you would have a consistent argument.

But having done these exceptions yourselves, the only argument for not including the clinics now, which is the subject of violence, is the argument made by the gentleman from Illinois, which is a dislike of what happens.

The point is very clear: If you want to ensure maximum protection for innocent providers, then it is important to put this into the bill.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARR. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. I thank the gentleman for yielding this 30 seconds to me.

I just want to respond to the gentleman who mentioned my name. I did not vilify anybody. If his attention span were not distracted today, he would find that I do not vilify anybody. I vilify the act of abortion, I vilify the fact that it occurs, bloodily occurs, against defenseless, unborn children, but I do not vilify people who engage in that—I pray for them.

□ 1500

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, despite the protestations to the author of this amendment that it is not her intention to engage in hyperbole, her words, which are used frequently by those in favor of abortion, such as using reign of terror, clearly are designed to inflame. Rather than present a chart, as the gentlewoman could have, that listed whatever information it is that she would want to portray and depict in the form of a chart, what we have is a map of the United States of America splashed with red all across it. Red is a color designed deliberately to invoke passion.

This is not simply another amendment to a bill designed to enhance the measures that we desire. What is at stake here, and what is really at issue here, Mr. Chairman, is not an effort to fine tune a bill talking about block grants to the States to ensure that the local law enforcement communities

have the tools that they need, but it is, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] so eloquently has indicated, another not so thinly veiled effort to raise and interject into the debate on a crime bill the issue of abortion.

It is a shame; I say, Mr. Chairman, a shame that we have to engage in this debate over, and over, and over again. It has no place here. Clearly it has no place here in light of the fact that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF] offered an amendment last evening which was adopted, not on a recorded vote, but by voice, which I say clearly, Mr. Chairman, encompasses what the gentlewoman says she is trying to get at here, and that is to ensure that there are no impediments in the block grants that are contemplated by H.R. 728 to allow local law enforcement officials, if they believe, and they certainly have an interest in ensuring the protection of all citizens in their community, if they believe there is an imminent threat at any institution, at any facility. Then the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF] makes very clear, if it was not before and I believe it was before, but this amendment makes very clear that what the gentlewoman is after here is covered, is contemplated and would be addressed on the block grant program.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am left with no other conclusion than that is not the desire of the gentlewoman from Colorado, but rather one in a series of efforts to raise the level of abortion beyond and over and above other legitimate issues.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR], if red incites passion, he has on a red boutonniere.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman, in red, from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, we are all aware of the escalating levels of violence directed at reproductive health facilities around the Nation. That is the shame. The violence has been elevated by the extremists, the radical right wing, not this debate.

The tragic murders in Brookline last December were just the latest and most horrible in a series of violent incidents that have left five Americans dead and nine wounded.

Every day reproductive health clinics and the doctors who staff them are subject to harassment and intimidation. In the last year alone over half of all reproductive health clinics in the United States experienced a violent incident. There have been literally hundreds of arson and chemical attacks and bomb threats against clinics around the Nation.

This nationwide terror campaign is clearly designed to undermine the constitutionally guaranteed right to choose. We must respond.

The Schroeder amendment would help address this problem by allowing local law enforcement to use a portion of their block grant to enhance the security of reproductive health clinics within their jurisdictions. Make no mistake: The Schroeder amendment would help save the lives of doctors and their patients.

To those who say that reproductive health clinics should accept routine violence as a cost of doing business, we say that organized terrorism and murder must never become routine in the United States.

Before my colleagues cast this vote I urge them to consider the hundreds of doctors in this Nation who wear bullet-proof vests to work every day. I urge them to think of the millions of American women who receive their basic medical care from reproductive health clinics every year. I say to my colleagues, "Don't turn your backs on them. They are our daughters, mothers, sisters, wives. They are in danger, and they need our help."

Mr. Chairman, a vote against the Schroeder amendment is a vote against protecting doctors and women. Let us help put the network of pro-life violence out of business. Let us pass the Schroeder amendment.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, this issue gets down to several basic things, and I do not think there is one in this Chamber that disagrees that violence in any form anywhere should not be tolerated. We do not want to tolerate it; we want to deal with it. In this legislation we are trying to provide control and flexibility to law enforcement authorities at the local level.

Now I happen to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF] yesterday which talked about schools and other facilities. I think amendments such as the gentlewoman from Colorado's and others' can be made on specifics. But what I do not want to have happen as a result of this legislative history is that law enforcement authorities feel that we are only concerned about schools or we are only concerned about health clinics.

So, regardless of whether this particular amendment passes or is defeated, a group of us, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY], the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON], myself, the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER], the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI], feel that we have to broaden the enhancing security measures section to say something like in and around schools, religious institutions, medical and health facilities including research facilities, housing complexes, shelters for women and children, or any other

facilities or surroundings where a threat to law and order exists. We do not claim to be exhaustive, but we do claim to be a little more general in nature. We do not say the Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Islamic or Buddhist schools, but what we try to do is cover some of those areas where we all know there have been unconstitutional violations of rights, and our concern is that where the threat of violence or other unlawful criminal activities, or in the opinion of State or local law enforcement authority requires the use of these funds for personnel, materials or other security measures, that may be construed as fulfilling the purposes of this act, they can order them used.

I am worried that the gentlewoman from Colorado's amendment is too specific on the limits. It mentions overtime and some materials, but not all possibilities. Our amendment is more comprehensive.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by my colleagues, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], should be supported by every Member of this body regardless of their view about abortion, because this amendment is not about abortion, it's about preventing crime, crimes like the 1993 murder of Dr. David Gunn, or the December 1994 murders of Shannon Lowney and Leanne Nichols. The level of violence and terror against law-abiding health professionals is not abating. One of the people I represent, Dr. Warren Hern of Boulder, is one of those on a reported list targeted for assassination by the extreme antiabortion groups at large in this country. We need more effective law enforcement to prevent the continuation of this kind of campaign of terror.

Members of the House should make it absolutely clear today that they do not support this kind of terror activity. This amendment is not about abortion. It is about taking action to prevent crime, to prevent murder and to prevent vigilantism in this country.

The amendment offered by Congresswoman SCHROEDER should be supported by every Member of this body, regardless of their position on abortion. Because this amendment isn't about abortion. It's about making clear that law enforcement can use the money in this bill to prevent crimes.

Crimes like the 1993 murder of Dr. David Gunn, who was shot to death in March 1993 at the Women's Medical Services Clinic in Pensacola, FL.

Crimes like the shooting of Dr. George Tiller in August 1993 at the Women's Health Care Services Clinic in Wichita, KS.

Or the murder of Dr. John Bayard Britton and James H. Barrett and the wounding of June Barrett in July 1994 at the Ladies Center in Pensacola, FL.

Or the December 1994 murders of Shannon Lowney, a receptionist at Planned Parenthood and Leanne Nichols at the Pre-term Clinic, both in Brookline, MA.

The level of violence and terror against law-abiding health professionals is not abating. One of the people I represent, Dr. Warren Hern from Boulder, was 1 of 12 doctors reportedly targeted for assassination by an extremist antiabortion group. We need more effective law enforcement action to prevent continuation of this campaign of terror.

A civil society depends on its citizens abiding by the rules. Abortion is a legal medical procedure. For those who disagree with the law, there are ways to try to change it. When those who are unable to change laws through lawful means decide to overturn the will of the majority—to take the law into their own hands—we need to call in the police. A civil society can't tolerate campaigns of intimidation, violence, and murder.

The money in this bill is supposed to be given to States for law enforcement. States can decide how to best use it to combat crime. The amendment offered by Congresswoman SCHROEDER will make sure that there is no confusion that the law enforcement funds in this bill can be used for overtime pay for law enforcement officers, security assessments, and when, recommended by law enforcement officials, the purchase of materials to enhance the physical safety of clinics.

Members of the House should make clear today that they do not support the campaign of terror against health professionals and health clinics. This amendment is not about abortion. It's about taking a stand against violence, murder, and vigilantism.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH].

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, in all the rhetoric we have heard today sometimes its easy to forget the real intent of the bill that is before us, the bill that we are debating. It is actually pretty simple. We want to let the local people decide how to spend their law enforcement dollars in the best way they can to defend all of the people, to protect all of the neighborhoods.

In the communities it is the police officer, it is the school board member, and it is the community activist who best knows where safety priorities lie. They are the ones who will be making recommendations in this bill on how to spend the funds under the bill. The original bill sets this function up. The question is:

"Do we ignore that fact and dictate to communities what their priorities are on protecting their citizens?"

□ 1510

That seems to be the thinking behind this amendment. The gentlewoman from Colorado says we cannot trust our local law enforcement and leaders. We must tell them to put their officers around abortion clinics or other types of bullet proof glass or security measures.

So instead of cleaning up gang ridden neighborhoods or protecting vulnerable citizens like our seniors, the locals are stuck with something passed down from Congress. Instead of us in our area being able to move people, law enforcement, into areas now starting to be over taken by gangs, we would be

told to prioritize to give an elevated status to abortion clinics.

Let us not have any mistake here. There are already local laws on vandalism. There are local laws and State laws on violence and against trespass. Police officers are already required to enforce those laws. We should do nothing to weaken the ability of local governments to defend their citizens.

In conclusion, you either trust the people that elected the locals, your voters, or you say you did not have enough common sense to elect local folks that can make the decisions. I believe the local folks can make the decisions, and Congress does not have a clue.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Schroeder amendment to allow local law enforcement officials to use funding under this bill to enhance safety at health care clinics, and I congratulate the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] for her leadership on this issue. It is perfectly appropriate, and it is one of the reasons we are here as people who serve in this institution at the Federal level; it is appropriate that the anticrime bill should help law enforcement agencies better protect patients when they seek medical care, including reproductive health care.

After the tragic events of the past few months where health care providers have been attacked and murdered, who can doubt the need for this amendment? Indeed, this amendment is the necessary next step to the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act that we passed in this body last year. We have traveled a long road to enact that measure. Now let us make sure that the promise of that new law can be realized. We need to do everything that we can to ensure women have access to the health care that they need, access free from threats, intimidation, or harassment, violence or even murder.

That is a proper role for a Member of Congress. It is outrageous that woman and health care providers fear for their safety and that of their families when they seek or provide constitutionally protected reproductive health services.

The opponents of this amendment believe it is unnecessary. They believe the language we adopted yesterday is sufficient to protect all facilities, including health facilities, threatened by crime or violence. I disagree. We must send a strong message to local communities that we will help them enhance health care clinic security.

So today, let us put teeth in that law we passed last year. Let us help local law enforcement agencies stop the killing, the violence and the fear-mongering. Let us pass the Schroeder amendment.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentlewoman for her statement, and I think you drew the distinction that the other side is not drawing. That is that this is a constitutional American right that is being criminally attacked, and this is trying to get resources to the local level. That is why it is different than the average shopping mall and other places where we want to help, too. But this should be done.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BRYANT], a member of the committee.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, before I get started, I want to first of all associate myself with the remarks of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], and also point out very clearly that this debate should not be framed in any shape or form as endorsing violence outside abortion clinics or any other place, for that matter.

But I see beyond the rhetoric of this debate two very real problems with this amendment, and I want to point them out for my colleagues who will look beyond again the rhetoric of the debate on abortion and whether you are for or against it.

This measure, first of all, clearly duplicates the amendment that was offered by our colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF], yesterday. It duplicates it in the sense that it talks about facilities that are public, and clearly the local law enforcement officials have an interest in protecting the security of such institutions.

Second, I see more of an alarming problem, in that this Schroeder amendment goes beyond the Schiff amendment in that it seems to give authority, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] has pointed out, to use public funds to go into a private business, if you will, and put bullet proof glass, security cameras or whatever. As I understand it, that is how I read that.

Certainly, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] so eloquently pointed out, there are other environments where murders are committed at a higher rate, and we are not authorized by law to spend public funds to put bullet proof glass in taxicabs or convenience stores that are robbed. I think one a night somebody is killed in those somewhere around the country.

Those particular issues, the fact that it duplicates the Schiff amendment and its seeks to authorize public funds in the private institutions, really bother me also.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. In the Schiff amendment, it does not say public facilities. It is exactly the same as mine.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Schroeder amendment. The violence and lawlessness surrounding these health clinics is getting out of hand and it must be stopped. I can speak from a personal experience because in the State of Oregon, an antiabortion group has created what they call a deadly dozen list.

On that list are 12 physicians. The escalating harassment that I will show as a result of this list is a coordinated effort, and it is led by extremists. Of that list of 12 doctors who are practicing legal medicine, three are in my home city, five of those doctors have already been either shot at or they have been shot.

This is extremism of the worst kind, because these extremists do not respect the law of the land. And it is fine for Members on this floor to talk about how concerned they are. But this amendment makes us put our money where our mouths are.

We must vote to protect our own constituents who are patients and doctors. They are exercising their constitutional rights. This will help our police forces do the job that they want to do, and this will mean that the women of this country can go to those health clinics without fear of violence.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment because I believe that the block grant format that governs the expenditure of these funds clearly allows communities to expend funds for the purposes encompassed in the amendment of the gentlewoman from Colorado.

On the other hand, I think her concern that we have not sufficiently addressed the problem of the kind of violence that is occurring at this time in our history around health clinics in certain communities is well taken.

Later my colleague, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY], will introduce an amendment that not only goes to the violence around medical facilities, but the violence that has plagued some health research facilities, that sometimes is a threat to shelters for abused women and things like that. That is a more comprehensive amendment that addresses the kind of violence that occurs at, in a sense, institutions that have become lightning rods in communities.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I hope the gentlewoman looks at what we did do in committee. One of the good things we did was we had added language that would allow money to go to help with domestic violence, violence against women,

and so forth, but we did not do this specifically. The thing that I worry about is when you look at that map, what we need is a clear message to localities to make them feel empowered to move on this.

So I really think that we listed everything, except we did not want to say the women's reproductive health care clinics. That was not listed specifically, and that is all we are trying to do in here, is give it the same leverage we are giving everything else.

So I think you will find most of the things that you listed would be covered. We just want this one to be specifically listed, because it is a Federal right and it did seem to be ignored.

□ 1520

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Certainly it is true that we have done a lot of good work on the issue of violence against women. It is not my understanding that there is a specific listing in this bill that addresses those kinds of institutions, and I think, we think that our amendment will be far more specific and cover the concerns that the gentlewoman has brought forward.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN].

(Mr. MEEHAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, the fact is, earlier this year two people were gunned down in cold blood and three were wounded at a family planning clinic in Brookline, MA. The suspected killer, John Salvi, is unrepentant, and he has been hailed as a hero by some antiabortion extremists. Outside of his holding cell in Virginia activists were chanting, John, we love you. Thank you for what you did.

When we look at the statistics for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, or talk to the staff of Planned Parenthood in our districts, we will see that the Brookline incident is not an isolated case of violence. Family planning centers across this country have become targets of an orchestrated campaign of arson, vandalism, and sniper attack, and our districts are no exception.

The threat is so serious that the Justice Department released security tips for clinics in response to the Brookline shootings, advising staffers to circle around the block once before going home to see if anyone is following them.

Clinic staffs are advised to check all packages for oily stains or peculiar odors of almonds or shoe polish. They are living in a war zone, for daring to protect a legally protected constitutional right for American women.

This amendment is not about abortion. It is about terrorism. It does not matter if one is pro-life or pro-choice or Democratic or Republican. If you believe in standing up to terrorists, vote for the Schroeder amendment.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY].

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think that violence is terrible. And to the best of my knowledge any time it is invoked unlawfully, it involves a violation of constitutional rights.

I am concerned about this amendment, and I speak in opposition to it. I think it is overly specific. I think it is restrictive of local and State authority and, frankly, I do not think it deals with the full spectrum of violence that needs to be addressed.

Where is the language about schools? Where is the language about religious institutions and hate crimes? Where is the language about public housing complexes and the terrible crimes that have been taking place in those areas? What about shelters for abused women or other facilities?

I think that the issue before us is adopting language that will be less restrictive in terms of the violence and interference with constitutional rights that it seeks to prevent and, furthermore, providing the broadest possible discretion to State and local law enforcement authority to take the preventive measures and actions that they feel are necessary.

On principle, I have had a great deal of difficulty supporting the issue of an expanding Federal involvement in the area of crime. To the extent that we are going to do so, I would rather see legislation that will empower State and local law enforcement authority to act on the broadest possible level and give them as much discretion as possible. On that basis, on the defeat of this amendment, we will be offering a substitute amendment.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. In a time when pro-life advocates seem to have taken it upon themselves to play God, this legislation could not be needed more. Five murders in Massachusetts, a bombing in Virginia, a violent assault on a doctor and his escort in Florida, a murder of a respected specialist in Florida—the list goes on and on.

These are just a few of the examples of the violence that takes place daily in family planning clinics all over this country. This amendment would help in preventing these terrorist assaults from occurring.

Now, some critics on the other side of the aisle might say that this amendment, itself, violates their first amendment rights to free speech and picketing. Well correct me if I'm wrong, but the last time I read the first amendment, it did not state that Americans had the right to burn, bomb, murder, and assault.

It strikes me as ironic, that these pro-life terrorists, whose soul purpose is to save a life, can so easily justify their reasons for taking one away. It is truly baffling. What most people don't know, is that these clinics are used mostly by women for mammograms, breast checks, pap smears, family planning information, and a whole range of services.

Mr. Chairman, pro-life extremists have left us no choice. These measures must be taken so that women all across the United States can take advantage of what is their constitutional right. I urge Members to vote in favor of this amendment.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI].

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Let me state as quickly as possible that I commend the gentlewoman from Colorado for doing all she can to focus our energies and our attention in using this crime bill debate to zero in on those areas of our Nation that need additional police protection and perhaps a consciousness raising of all our American community. And clearly, health care clinics hits the top of that list.

However, I do believe that in discussing that, in listing health care clinics and medical facilities, that we do make a mistake in not serving to expand that to include other areas like schools, as already in there, religious institutions, additional medical and health facilities, as my colleague from Connecticut mentioned, where valuable medical research oftentimes takes place and is plagued by random violence. Shelters that in some ways in the language are covered, but we need to get more specific to say that we need police protection in areas surrounding where shelters are for children of child abuse and women of domestic abuse.

We do need to focus. We do need to expand. We need to make sure that this crime bill sends a message to health care clinics and then beyond.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], the distinguished ranking member of the committee.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] for bringing this matter to the attention of the House.

I am speaking on this matter because I believe it is a civil rights matter as well. The Republican block grant sweeps the threat to doctors, clinics, nurses, and women who choose to elect their right to choice under the table. This brings it out.

I am hoping that regardless of where Members fall on the question of abortion, that this protection will be specifically delineated in the crime bill that comes out of this House.

I think it is time that we bring the protection of the law to all of the people. The medical profession is now being terrorized out of doing their job. There are doctors now that are afraid to work in these clinics because they know their life and their families are threatened.

Let us support their civil rights and all of ours at the same time.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time each side has remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I have one speaker remaining, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

□ 1530

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, as a previous speaker has said, it is a shame we have to raise the debate on abortion over and over and over again. The gentleman is right. It is a shame, but it is necessary. A constitutional right is not a right if it cannot be exercised.

The Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act, which I strongly supported, Mr. Chairman, was intended to guarantee the right to choose, but the resources to secure that right are lagging. That is why we need the Schroeder amendment.

The Schroeder amendment allows local law enforcement block grant funding to be used to increase security at our country's reproductive health care clinics. The amendment does not stand in the way of flexibility, it simply permits local law enforcement to allocate the necessary resources to stop violence at these clinics. In my congressional district, OB-GYN physicians who perform legal abortions have called on me to help stop the violence. By passing the Schroeder amendment today, we will take a critical step toward protecting these doctors, their families, their patients.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS].

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Schroeder amendment.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], for offering this amendment. Time and again she proves why she is a national treasure in protecting the safety and welfare of women, children, and families.

Throughout the week we have been talking about fighting violent crime, Mr. Chairman. I think murder would fall into that category. Roe versus Wade was handed down 22 years ago, but over the past 23 months, five people have been killed and countless others injured at abortion clinics.

Mr. Chairman, anti-choice extremists are attempting to accomplish through intimidation and terrorism what they cannot accomplish in a court of law. As a result, the constitutionally protected right to choose is being eroded away. A large majority of the American people support a woman's right to choose, but the right to choose is meaningless without the access to choose. In 83 percent of the counties across America, Mr. Chairman, not a single physician is willing to provide abortion services. Why? Because they fear for their very lives.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a question of whether we are pro-choice or anti-choice, it is a question of whether we are pro-violence or anti-violence. It is a question of whether we truly believe in law enforcement, or only enforcement of the laws we agree with. Support this amendment.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

(Mr. SANDERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Schroeder amendment. There are some Members in Congress who are pro-choice, and I am one of them. There are others who are anti-choice, but there should be no Member of Congress who is tolerating the kind of outrageous violence that is taking place all across this country against doctors, nurses, and personnel in clinics that are performing abortions.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is terribly important because it sends a signal to the entire country that the U.S. Congress will not tolerate for one moment the calculated and organized reign of terror which is existing today against those people who are helping women take advantage of their constitutional rights to choose abortion. That is what this issue is about.

Let us send a message loud and clear, Mr. Chairman, throughout this country that we will not accept this violence, and we will protect a woman's right to choose.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], a new member of the committee.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment sponsored by the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] because, Mr. Chairman, this is not a question of pro-choice, it is not a question of one's religious beliefs.

It is, unfortunately, a question of murder; of individuals who are not protected as they go about their responsibilities and their business in this Nation. It is just simply a reaffirmation that what is done at women's health clinics is legal. It is constitutionally legal. Yet, we have two young dead women. We have doctors who have lost their lives.

That, in fact, raises a question of being able to ask "Do we have a real crime bill, or do we have a make-shift paperweight, fearful of doing what is right?"

In October 1993, an arson and bombing attempt, West Loop Clinic, Houston, TX; July 1, 1993, bomb threat to North Park Medical Group; March 1993, chemical tear gas attack on Dallas Medical Ladies Pavilion; February 15, 1993, arson destroyed a reproductive services clinic.

Mr. Chairman, we need to have the kind of support that the Constitution gives. I support the Schroeder amendment. Let us vote for liberty and freedom.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Crime of the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. SCHUMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, let me compliment the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] for introducing this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me talk about it from two perspectives, one as author of the clinic access bill, which is now law, and second, as an active person on this crime bill.

Mr. Chairman, they say "Why do we need to mention the clinics specifically?" They say "Why not schools, why not housing projects?" I have heard all sorts of things.

I will tell the Members why. There is one specific reason. It has nothing to do with pro-choice, pro-life, et cetera. It is because there is a concerted effort in certain localities, in all the hearings we held in the Subcommittee on Crime in the last 2 years, there is a concerted effort by some localities not to protect these clinics. There is a concerted political attack that says "Don't protect them."

That is not true in 90 percent of America. In 90 percent of America, or 95, the localities are protecting them. It is a constitutional right. However, in some they are not.

I would argue to my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, that in those cases it is more important to specifically delineate a clinic and show law enforcement officers and others that this is perfectly acceptable, since there is a campaign of attack against them, since there is political resistance against them, than it would be anywhere else.

There is no resistance, there is no mass movement, that says "Do not protect housing projects." There is no mass movement that says "Do not protect schools." There are not people sitting in front and blockading animal clinics, even at this day. However, there is a concerted movement here. That is why we need this language.

I would urge support for the Schroeder amendment.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I end where I began, looking at this chart.

Mr. Chairman, the right to have access to family planning clinics is a Federal right. It is a constitutional right.

Mr. Chairman, I feel badly if we have violence outside clinics, but we are not protecting bunny rabbits federally. We are trying to do it federally, but not at the constitutional level. Besides, we do not see a huge national conspiracy around this.

We see all sorts of tap dancing around this issue, where nobody wants to really do the real thing, which is this amendment, and put it on-line.

What have we heard? We have heard, first of all, that some people do not like my amendment because it does not have the word "public" in it, and they are all saying they like the amendment of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF].

However, the amendment of the gentleman from New Mexico does not have "public" in it, either. It says "In and around any other facility or location." They say "facility or location," but they do not want to say "a clinic."

We know they can go to facilities or locations. That is what the block grant is about. It is to help localities fight generic crime. However, where we are really behind is supporting on this federally protected right that women have missed. Women know that if there is a right without a remedy, there is no right.

What we are seeing here is we are losing this right, because even though they cannot attack it head on, because they are afraid Americans would roll it back, they have found another way to wink at it. That is by allowing people who are taking the law into their own hands, by people who are intimidating, who are targeting violence, and I cannot believe that this body is not willing to deal with that.

□ 1540

All you have to do is put these words in, that a locality can use some of the funds to help protect women's reproductive health clinics that are under siege.

Please, please support this amendment.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my friend for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, every day inside abortion clinics throughout America, babies are dismembered and chemically poisoned and their mothers wounded emotionally and sometimes physically. Each and every day 4,000 children are killed by abortionists. I hate violence, Mr. Chairman, whether it be violence against unborn babies or the violence that is visited upon their mothers.

Even though I detest what they do, I nonetheless deplore any violence against abortionists.

Members might recall that I authored the FACE substitute last year that would have imposed very stiff Federal penalties against anyone who uses force or threatens to use force against abortionists, clinic personnel, or pro-lifers.

But let me make it very clear, Mr. Chairman, abortion mills are not privileged entities. They are not privileged characters. The purposes that are delineated in H.R. 728 relate to police who will serve the entire community, schools that also provide a basic service to a larger community, drug courts and neighborhood watch programs.

Abortion clinics, abortion mills, despicable as they are, are private facilities. 7-Eleven stores, grocery stores, and other private operations have a much greater exposure to violent activities than abortion mills. The statistics bear that out. My friend from Illinois and others have pointed this out during this debate. Abortion mills make millions of dollars. They don't necessarily need a huge Federal subsidy. Yet, and I want to make this very clear, under the terms of the amendment of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF] which was adopted yesterday, local law enforcement officials could enhance security measures around any facility, including an abortion mill, if the proper outpatients deemed to have a special risk for incidents of crime. If we are not singling out banks with their very high risk and grocery stores and, as has been pointed out, even taxicab drivers for special protection, I would submit it is entirely inappropriate to single out abortion mills for this kind of treatment. Special risks are going to vary from community to community. It runs counter to the purpose of this legislation to start itemizing, having a higher order, a pecking order, if you will, and

to say that some private facilities should receive public funding and others should not. That ought to be left to the local level.

I urge defeat of the Schroeder amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 17-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 164, noes 266, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 125]

AYES—164

Abercrombie	Furse	Owens
Ackerman	Gejdenson	Pallone
Allard	Gephardt	Pastor
Andrews	Geren	Payne (NJ)
Baesler	Gibbons	Payne (VA)
Baldacci	Gilman	Pelosi
Barrett (WI)	Gonzalez	Peterson (FL)
Beilenson	Green	Pomeroy
Bentsen	Gutierrez	Porter
Berman	Harman	Ramstad
Bishop	Hastings (FL)	Rangel
Blute	Hefner	Reed
Boehlert	Hilliard	Reynolds
Bonior	Hinchey	Richardson
Boucher	Horn	Rivers
Brown (CA)	Hoyer	Rose
Brown (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Roukema
Brown (OH)	Jefferson	Roybal-Allard
Bryant (TX)	Johnson (SD)	Rush
Cardin	Johnson, E. B.	Sabo
Chapman	Johnston	Sanders
Clay	Kaptur	Sawyer
Clayton	Kennedy (MA)	Schroeder
Clyburn	Kennedy (RI)	Schumer
Coleman	Kennelly	Scott
Collins (IL)	Klug	Serrano
Collins (MI)	Lantos	Shays
Condit	Levin	Skaggs
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Coyne	Lincoln	Spratt
Danner	Lofgren	Stark
DeFazio	Lowe	Stokes
DeLauro	Luther	Studds
Dellums	Maloney	Thompson
Deutsch	Markey	Thurman
Dicks	Martinez	Torkildsen
Dingell	Mascara	Torres
Dixon	McCarthy	Torricelli
Doggett	McDermott	Towns
Dooley	McHale	Velazquez
Durbin	McKinney	Vento
Edwards	Meehan	Visclosky
Engel	Meeke	Ward
Eshoo	Menendez	Waters
Evans	Mfume	Watt (NC)
Farr	Miller (CA)	Waxman
Fattah	Mineta	Williams
Fazio	Minge	Wilson
Fields (LA)	Mink	Wise
Filner	Moakley	Woolsey
Flake	Moran	Wyden
Foglietta	Morella	Wynn
Ford	Nadler	Yates
Frank (MA)	Neal	Zimmer
Frost	Olver	

NOES—266

Archer	Barton	Bono
Armey	Bass	Borski
Bachus	Bateman	Brewster
Baker (CA)	Bereuter	Browder
Baker (LA)	Bevill	Brownback
Ballenger	Bilbray	Bryant (TN)
Barcia	Bilirakis	Bunn
Barr	Bliley	Bunning
Barrett (NE)	Boehner	Burr
Bartlett	Bonilla	Burton

Buyer	Henger	Paxon
Callahan	Hilleary	Peterson (MN)
Calvert	Hobson	Petri
Camp	Hoekstra	Pickett
Canady	Hoke	Pombo
Castle	Holden	Portman
Chabot	Hostettler	Poshard
Chambliss	Houghton	Pryce
Chenoweth	Hunter	Quillen
Christensen	Hutchinson	Quinn
Chrysler	Hyde	Radanovich
Clement	Inglis	Rahall
Clinger	Istook	Regula
Coble	Jacobs	Riggs
Coburn	Johnson (CT)	Roberts
Collins (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Roemer
Combest	Jones	Rogers
Cooley	Kanjorski	Rohrabacher
Costello	Kasich	Ros-Lehtinen
Cox	Kelly	Roth
Cramer	Kildee	Royce
Crane	Kim	Salmon
Cremeans	King	Sanford
Cubin	Kingston	Saxton
Cunningham	Kleczka	Scarborough
Davis	Klink	Schaefer
Deal	Knollenberg	Schiff
DeLay	Kolbe	Seastrand
Diaz-Balart	LaFalce	Sensenbrenner
Dickey	LaHood	Shadegg
Doolittle	Largent	Shaw
Dornan	Latham	Shuster
Doyle	LaTourette	Sisisky
Dreier	Laughlin	Skeen
Duncan	Lazio	Skelton
Dunn	Leach	Smith (MI)
Ehlers	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Ehrlich	Lewis (KY)	Smith (TX)
Emerson	Lightfoot	Smith (WA)
English	Linder	Solomon
Ensign	Lipinski	Souder
Everett	Livingston	Spence
Ewing	LoBiondo	Stearns
Fawell	Longley	Stenholm
Fields (TX)	Lucas	Stockman
Flanagan	Manton	Stump
Foley	Manzullo	Stupak
Forbes	Martini	Talent
Fowler	McCollum	Tanner
Fox	McCrery	Tate
Franks (CT)	McDade	Tauzin
Franks (NJ)	McHugh	Taylor (MS)
Frelinghuysen	McInnis	Taylor (NC)
Frisa	McIntosh	Tejeda
Funderburk	McKeon	Thomas
Gallely	McNulty	Thornberry
Ganske	Metcalf	Thornton
Gekas	Meyers	Tiahrt
Gilchrest	Mica	Trafficant
Gillmor	Miller (FL)	Tucker
Goodlatte	Molinari	Upton
Goodling	Mollohan	Volkmer
Gordon	Montgomery	Vucanovich
Goss	Moorhead	Waldholtz
Graham	Murtha	Walker
Greenwood	Myers	Walsh
Gunderson	Myrick	Wamp
Gutknecht	Nethercutt	Watts (OK)
Hall (OH)	Neumann	Weldon (FL)
Hall (TX)	Ney	Weldon (PA)
Hamilton	Norwood	Weller
Hancock	Nussle	White
Hansen	Oberstar	Whitfield
Hastert	Obey	Wicker
Hastings (WA)	Ortiz	Wolf
Hayes	Orton	Young (AK)
Hayworth	Oxley	Young (FL)
Hefley	Packard	Zeliff
Heineman	Parker	

NOT VOTING—4

Becerra de la Garza
Crapo Matsui

□ 1600

Mr. WILSON and Mr. GILMAN changed their vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOKE

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the amendment been printed in the RECORD?

Mr. HOKE. No, it has not, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOKE: Beginning on page 3, strike line 8 and all that follows through page 4, line 10, and insert the following:

“(B) Enhancing security measures—

“(i) in and around a school, religious institution, medical or health facility (including a research facility), housing complex, shelter, or other facility or surroundings where a threat to law and order exists; and

“(ii) if the threat of violence or other unlawful or criminal activity, in the opinion of law enforcement officials, requires the use of funds under this title for personnel, materials, or other security measures to carry out the purposes of this title.

“(C) Establishing crime prevention programs that may, though not exclusively, involve law enforcement officials and that are intended to discourage, disrupt, or interfere with the commission of criminal activity, including neighborhood watch and citizen patrol programs, sexual assault and domestic violence programs, programs intended to prevent juvenile crime, and drug abuse resistance education.

Mr. HOKE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. VOLKMER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, do we have a copy of the amendment on this side? Do we have more than one? I would like to take a look at it. It may perhaps preclude an amendment I had planned to offer, and I would like to see it.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY].

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think it is clear to all of us that violence of any sort must be and should be condemned, and condemned in the strongest possible terms, and if we are going to deal with violence in this country, let us deal with it on a basis that is consistent with the interests of all Americans, including other problems that relate to violence.

I mentioned earlier in my opposition to the Schroeder amendment the fact that we have had a tendency in this country, in this city to attempt to micromanage on every detail on the State and local level.

Mr. Chairman, we need language that will deal with violence in any form and maximize the authority of State and local authorities to deal with it on a basis that is consistent.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that there are at least on our side of the aisle about seven Members who have amendments who wish to offer amendments this evening, and the time limitation for 45 minutes is in effect.

I do not know how many amendments our colleagues on this side of the aisle have. The gentleman from Nebraska has one.

Is there some way we can get a proportion of time divided so each individual who has an amendment at least can state what he or she wishes to offer, and then perhaps we could roll the votes on all of these at the end of the time limit?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be willing to entertain any proper agreement from both sides in that regard. There are some limits to what the Committee of the Whole can order, and certainly the Chair is not going to unilaterally impose that decision.

Mr. BONIOR. Further requesting a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman, I would just suggest to my friends on this side and this side of the aisle that in fairness to everyone who has an amendment, if we could split the time equally and then roll the votes at the end for those votes that are ordered, we might have a fair process here.

I do not know. I have not frankly even talked to my dear colleague from Detroit about this.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we have nine amendments including one—

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time. Is this on my time, or is this a parliamentary inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio does have the time. The gentleman from Michigan made a parliamentary inquiry and was recognized for that purpose.

Does the gentleman no longer yield time for that purpose?

Mr. HOKE. No. I do not. I reclaim my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reclaims his time.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I further yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY].

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Chairman, as I was saying a minute ago, violence of any sort is and should be condemned, but I think we are making a grave mistake if we take one form of violence and attempt to exalt it over other forms. We need to deal with all forms of violence.

I am certainly sympathetic to the issues concerning the health clinics and the violence and the threats of violence that have taken place. I would submit in States, and particularly my own State, the threats are being dealt with effectively and in a manner that does not polarize the issue, and it involves those who support pro-choice as well as those who are pro-life.

The language we are offering seeks to include violence that might involve schools, religious institutions, medical and health facilities, but also housing complexes, shelters, particularly shelters that might house abused women or any other facilities or surroundings where a threat to law and order exists.

And so we have designed language that is deliberately broad and encompassing to any threat to law and order or the constitutional rights of men and women in this country.

And, secondarily, that where that threat exists, that if in the opinion of State or local enforcement authority that funds within the bill may be provided for personnel, materials, or other security measures, that may be construed as fulfilling the purposes of this act.

We do not seek to limit the language to any particular item. We want to provide as much authority on a broad basis to State and local authorities to use these funds in a manner that will accomplish the purposes of the act.

□ 1610

And I want to come back to a point that I made earlier. I am going to be supporting H.R. 728, but on a reservation; that reservation being that when the Federal Government is having the financial problems that it is having, particularly the threat to Social Security funds and other major responsibilities of the Federal Government, I have a hard time seeing how we are continuing to further a Federal extension of authority into areas of State and local law enforcement.

But if we are going to do it, let us do it on a basis that is broad, but also a basis that provides as much discretion as possible to local and State authorities.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, did I understand that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY] is offering this as an amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It is an amendment by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman from Ohio offering what the gentleman from Maine was talking about as an amendment, and that is the language we have in front of us? If so, then I am really kind of amused by this because the people on the other side of the aisle first of all said my amendment was not needed because the Schiff amendment, from New Mexico, covered everything, it was terrific. Then they voted against my amendment, and now they have come with an amendment that is my amendment. I mean it basically is talking about women's health clinics. So terrific, they threw some other things in I guess kind of a deflection to try to make it look like it is even more generic.

I think the women's health clinic is absolutely essential to have in there, as they have in there, have because it is a Federal constitutional right that is eroded. But I find this really very, very interesting, and it is fascinating how they are trying to tap/dance around this.

I think it is very confusing. I think it is a shame everybody could not have just voted for the amendment we have in front of us. As I read the two amendments, there is absolutely no difference except they threw a couple of more things in. I find that quite astounding.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VOLKMER AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOKE

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOLKMER as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. HOKE: Page 6, line 10, strike "or".

Page 6, line 11, insert "or" after "yachts;" and

Page 6, after line 11, insert "(6) any police or security for abortion clinics."

Mr. VOLKMER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I probably will not object, but this is the first we have heard of a substitute.

Mr. VOLKMER. No, the gentleman has had it at the desk, right over there. If the gentleman will yield, the staff has had it for the last 15 or 20 minutes. It is not named as a substitute. It is named as my amendment. It looks like I will not be able to offer it as an amendment, so I am offering it as a substitute.

Mr. DELAY. Has this been cleared with the leadership?

Mr. VOLKMER. With whose leadership, Mr. Chairman? You mean I have to ask? Come on, now.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] has the time. Did the gentleman from Texas object?

Mr. DELAY. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue reporting the substitute amendment.

The Clerk completed the reading of the amendment offered as a substitute.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved on the amendment.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we have been beating around the bush on an issue that the majority does not want to address. And that is, should funds be used to protect, give security, police officers and everything else, to thwart pickets who are pro-life trying to in-

form people who are going to have abortions at these clinics that they should not be able to have those abortions?

We had this fight last year when we had the fight over the access to the abortion clinics bill. As one who strongly opposed that bill and feels that it should be repealed, I feel this is wrong to have in this bill an attempt by the majority to fund police officers and security so that people who picket these clinics will end up in jail. And therefore this amendment just says that none of these funds can be used to provide security police for the abortion clinics.

This is strictly, I think, a proper thing to do. I would hope that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] would accept the amendment. I believe by doing this we are going to preserve more lives of the unborn than anything else we have done so far and anything you can do in this bill. Because what I think you are going to do in this bill is you are going to help provide abortions and get rid of a bunch of unborn children.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLKMER. I would be glad to yield.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman taking out the very part that I have been trying to get in? Is that what the gentleman is doing? They finally come around to our side, and what is the gentleman doing?

Mr. VOLKMER. Basically, I am saying the opposite of what the gentleman is saying.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. That is exactly what I thought the gentleman was saying. So, in other words, the gentleman wants to get some of this money go to help protect these reproductive clinics, and what the gentleman is saying is he wants to amend it so that it covers everything but that.

Mr. VOLKMER. That is right.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. So the gentleman is trying to gut their amendment.

Mr. VOLKMER. I am not trying to gut their amendment. I am offering a substitute. I am trying to be straightforward about the whole issue, not beat around the bush.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. The gentleman is being perfectly clear.

Mr. VOLKMER. I mean, they have been all day long beating around the bush. They are acting like nobody is really going to go for these abortion clinics, we are not going to help them out at law. We are not going to do anything to help them out.

Of course, really, it does, but we really we do not want to say so in the bill. And you would be surprised how many Members I have talked to who, when I tell them there is funds in here to provide security for abortion clinics, I hear, "Oh, no, that is not in here. That is a Pat Schroeder amendment. Pat Schroeder is going to do that."

Well, folks, no. The money is already in here for it, it is there. All the gentlewoman from Colorado is trying to do is to say let us focus on it. Let us focus on it.

That is what my amendment does. Now, do you want to provide security for abortion clinics, or do you not? That is the substitute, folks. I hope the gentleman from Ohio will let us vote on it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] continue his point of order?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order that the substitute is not germane. The Hoke amendment provided for specific purposes for which the funds in the bill can be used, whereas the Volkmer amendment only provides for prohibitions for which the funds cannot be used. Therefore it is not germane, and I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri wish to be heard?

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, the substitute is in order because it does provide for an amendment to a proper section of the bill that is at the present time before the House, just as the gentleman's amendment is before the House. It does not have to be just to his amendment. It can be to other sections of the bill just as well.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GUNDERSON). Does any other Member desire to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is ready to rule.

In response to the point made by the gentleman from Missouri, the test of the germaneness is the relationship of his amendment to the amendment before the committee at the time, not to the underlying bill. With regard to the point of order raised by the gentleman from Ohio, a substitute addressing prohibited uses of funds is not germane to an amendment addressing permissible uses elsewhere in the bill, based on the precedents of the House.

Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

The amendment, therefore, is out of order.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that the minority is bound and determined that they are not going to vote on this issue because they know that with the timeframe that we have left and the number of amendments we have left—and I am not on the Committee on the Judiciary—they just do not want to vote on this issue.

It is very clear to me that they want to run and hide from the question of providing security for abortion clinics. They do not want to save these unborn children, there is no question about it. There is no question in my mind that

they are willing to let them go, let them die, and not even vote on this amendment.

□ 1620

So, Mr. Chairman, if I have time before the time runs out, I will offer the amendment that is in order by itself to the bill, and if I do not have time and they will not give me any time, that tells me that they really do not want to take up this amendment at all. They are scared to death of it.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER], I think he is making, in my judgment, a mistake. I think what he is doing is sequestering again abortion facilities and saying they are different from other places.

Under our bill, if the local authorities see that the peace is going to be disturbed, there is a threat to the peace, no matter what the place is or what it does, they have a right to send police there to protect the public safety. If it is an abortion clinic or not, if it is a church, they have a right to protect the public safety. I believe that is their constitutional duty, and the gentleman knows how I feel about abortion clinics. But people have a right to exercise their constitutional right.

Now I suggest to the gentleman that we do not need any more amendments. The Schiff amendment is in place, and it says the local authorities may send police or protective devices or whatever is required wherever they see a threat to public safety, and that ought to cover the abortion question, the bank question, the convenience store and the school.

So, I wish the gentleman would not elevate out of the mainstream abortion clinics because they do not deserve it, and I think the gentleman is doing the same thing the gentlewoman did, only in a negative way.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. To be honest with my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, I am quite disappointed from the gentleman from Illinois because I well remember last year, as we debated the access to clinics bill, and we were on the same side on that issue.

Mr. HYDE. Sure.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, we were opposed to that bill that basically is not doing anything different from what they are doing right here. There is no difference.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman let me reclaim my time?

Whenever there is a threat to public safety, if it is in the lobby of a church, if it is around an abortion clinic, if it is in my home, I want law enforcement to be there to protect innocent people.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would just ask the gentleman: I thought I heard him say because we had the Schiff amendment we did not need any further amendments on this subject.

Is the gentleman then opposing the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE]?

Mr. HYDE. Yes, I am.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. The gentleman is going to vote against the Hoke amendment?

Mr. HYDE. Yes, sir. I hope there is no doubt in the gentleman's mind. Affirmative, yes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman. I was razzle-dazzled there for a minute.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. Of course I yield to my comrade in arms, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I am a little disappointed because I see this fight as the same fight. I do not see a difference between the two, and perhaps later on we can discuss the distinction between the access bill of last year and what we are doing here.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, we cannot protect people who violate the law, no matter what their motives are. I say, "You may not do evil that good may result, and violence has to be stopped whether it's in front of abortion clinics or somewhere else."

Mr. VOLKMER. This is the question, whether they are going to use Federal tax dollars for the purpose of assisting and protecting the clinics. That is what it amounts to. Last year we passed a bit that protected—

Mr. HYDE. That is the law, though. That is the law unfortunately. The gentleman and I voted against it, but it is the law, and the gentleman and I are sworn to uphold the law.

Mr. VOLKMER. Wait a minute now. I do not want to get into this too far, but we do have the Constitution, and the Supreme Court has spoken in *Roe versus Wade*, and that is a law that I sure "ain't" going to follow, and I want the gentleman to understand that.

Mr. HYDE. Well, I am going to resist it. I am going to say it may be the law, but it is not good morality, and its lousy policy, but it is the law, and we are sworn to uphold the law. But let us fight to reverse it.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE], and in regard to my friend, the gentleman from Missouri, I would say that I have a very strong record in support of women having the right to make decisions for themselves and strongly supported the clinic access bill. But I think this bill, which is a bill that provides money to local towns and cities to fight crime at the local level, ought to be as broad as possible and yet at

the same time make absolutely clear that communities have the right to use these funds to target their resources at any institution that for whatever reason may be under particular pressure or fire.

In recent years it has been abortion clinics. In preceding years in my communities it was synagogues in certain towns. In other times there have been medical research facilities that have been the targets of bombing and terrorist activities.

So, I think it is very appropriate that we enlarge the underlying bill that mentions school to also include a number of other types of facilities that sometimes do require the mobilization of specific resources to repeal threats of violence that emanate from vicious, hateful beliefs and feelings, but represent an extraordinary threat to both the people and the facilities.

So Mr. Chairman, this amendment does say in and around a school, religious institution, medical or health facility, including a research facility, a housing complex, a shelter, because certainly shelters for abused women, if they become known, can become the target of exactly the kind of violence that we have seen develop around abortion clinics and other facilities that are surrounding where a threat to law and order exists, and then it explicitly allows, and this is the point of the preceding gentlewoman from Colorado's amendment. She fears, if we do not specifically use resources, that local elected officials will feel reluctant to use Federal tax dollars for these purposes since we do not allow, for example, the use of Federal tax dollars to provide perfectly legal medical procedures for Medicaid recipients.

So this bill does very clearly say that, if there is a threat of violence, or unlawful or criminal activity in the opinion of the law enforcement officials and local people, that the money can be used for personnel, materials, security measures to carry out the purposes of this act.

I think it is a good, solid amendment. I think it's a thoughtful response. It is an effort on the part of many who believe that abortion should not be seen and abortion violence should not be seen as singular and unique, but that kind of violence that communities have a right to respond to.

So I am proud to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE]. I think it is a strong addition to the bill. It enlarges on the Schiff amendment in a responsible way, and I urge Members' support of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 206, noes 225, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 126]

AYES—206

Abercrombie Fowler Minge
Ackerman Fox Mink
Allard Frank (MA) Molinari
Arney Franks (CT) Moran
Baesler Franks (NJ) Morella
Baldacci Frelinghuysen Nadler
Ballenger Frost Obey
Barrett (WI) Furse Olver
Beilenson Gejdenson Owens
Bentsen Geren Pallone
Bereuter Gibbons Pastor
Berman Gilchrest Payne (NJ)
Billbray Gilman Payne (VA)
Bishop Gonzalez Pelosi
Blute Green Peterson (FL)
Boehlert Greenwood Pomeroy
Bonilla Gunderson Porter
Boucher Gutierrez Pryce
Brewster Harman Ramstad
Brown (CA) Hastings (FL) Rangel
Brown (FL) Hefner Reed
Brown (OH) Heineman Reynolds
Bryant (TX) Hilliard Richardson
Camp Hinchey Riggs
Cardin Hobson Rivers
Castle Hoke Rose
Chapman Horn Roukema
Clay Houghton Roybal-Allard
Clayton Hoyer Rush
Clinger Jackson-Lee Sabo
Clyburn Jefferson Sanders
Coble Johnson (CT) Sawyer
Coleman Johnson (SD) Schroeder
Collins (IL) Johnson, E. B. Schumer
Collins (MI) Johnston Scott
Combest Kaptur Serrano
Condit Kelly Shaw
Conyers Kennedy (MA) Shays
Coyne Kennedy (RI) Skaggs
Cramer Kennelly Slaughter
Cunningham Kleczka Spratt
Danner Klug Stark
Davis Kolbe Stokes
DeFazio Lantos Studts
DeLauro Lazio Thompson
DeLay Leach Thurman
Dellums Levin Torkildsen
Deutsch Lewis (GA) Torres
Dicks Lincoln Torricelli
Dingell Lofgren Towns
Dixon Longley Traficant
Doggett Lowey Velazquez
Dooley Luther Vento
Durbin Maloney Visclosky
Edwards Markey Ward
Ehlers Martinez Waters
Engel Martini Watt (NC)
English McCarthy Waxman
Eshoo McDermott Weller
Evans McHale Weller
Farr McKinney Williams
Fattah Meehan Wilson
Fawell Meek Wise
Fazio Menendez Woolsey
Fields (LA) Meyers Wyden
Filner Mfume Wynn
Flake Miller (CA) Yates
Foglietta Miller (FL) Zimmer
Ford Mineta

NOES—225

Andrews Bunn de la Garza
Archer Bunning Deal
Bachus Burr Diaz-Balart
Baker (CA) Burton Dickey
Baker (LA) Buyer Doolittle
Barcia Callahan Dornan
Barr Calvert Doyle
Barrett (NE) Canady Dreier
Bartlett Chabot Duncan
Barton Chambliss Dunn
Bass Chenoweth Ehrlich
Bateman Christensen Emerson
Bevill Chrysler Ensign
Bilirakis Clement Everett
Bliley Coburn Ewing
Boehner Collins (GA) Fields (TX)
Bonior Cooley Flanagan
Bono Costello Foley
Borski Cox Forbes
Browder Crane Frisa
Brownback Cremeans Funderburk
Bryant (TN) Cubin Gallegly

Ganske LoBiondo Salmon
Gekas Lucas Sanford
Gephardt Manton Saxton
Gillmor Manzullo Scarborough
Goodlatte Mascara Schaefer
Goodling McCollum Schiff
Gordon McCreery Seastrand
Goss McDade Sensenbrenner
Graham McHugh Shadegg
Gutknecht McInnis Shuster
Hall (OH) McIntosh Sisisky
Hall (TX) McKeon Skeen
Hamilton McNulty Skelton
Hancock Metcalf Smith (MI)
Hansen Mica Smith (NJ)
Hastert Moakley Smith (TX)
Hastings (WA) Mollohan Smith (WA)
Hayes Montgomery Solomon
Hayworth Moorhead Souder
Hefley Murtha Spence
Herger Myers Stearns
Hilleary Myrick Stenholm
Hoekstra Neal Stockman
Holden Nethercutt Stump
Hostettler Neumann Stupak
Hunter Ney Talent
Hutchinson Norwood Tanner
Hyde Nussle Tate
Inglis Oberstar Tauzin
Istook Ortiz Taylor (MS)
Jacobs Orton Taylor (NC)
Johnson, Sam Oxley Tejada
Jones Packard Thomas
Kanjorski Parker Thornberry
Kasich Paxon Thornton
Kildee Peterson (MN) Tiahrt
Kim Petri Tucker
King Pickett Volkmer
Kingston Pombo Vucanovich
Klink Portman Waldholtz
Knollenberg Poshard Walker
LaFalce Quillen Walsh
LaHood Quinn Wamp
Largent Radanovich Watts (OK)
Latham Rahall Weldon (FL)
LaTourette Regula Weldon (PA)
Laughlin Roberts White
Lewis (CA) Roemer Whitfield
Lewis (KY) Rogers Wicker
Lightfoot Rohrabacher Wolf
Linder Ros-Lehtinen Young (AK)
Lipinski Roth Young (FL)
Livingston Royce Zeliff

NOT VOTING—3

Becerra Crapo Matsui

□ 1647

Messrs. KASICH, LAHOOD, KIM, TALENT, and THORNBERRY changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. LEWIS of Georgia, WELLER, GILCHREST, GILMAN, LAZIO of New York, and SHAW changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1650

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. MCCOLLUM

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, have the amendments been printed in the RECORD?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments, not designate them.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. MCCOLLUM: Page 18, line 4, insert "State police departments that provide law enforcement services to units of local government and" after "among".

Page 4, after line 19, insert the following: "(G) Establishing cooperative task forces between adjoining units of local government to work cooperatively to prevent and combat criminal activity, particularly criminal activity that is exacerbated by drug or gang-related involvement.

Page 4, after line 19, insert the following: "(G) Establishing a multijurisdictional task force, particularly in rural areas, composed of law enforcement officials representing units of local government, that works with Federal law enforcement officials to prevent and control crime.

Page 12, line 4, strike "and". Page 12, line 7, strike "101(a)(2)," and insert "101(a)(2); and".

Page 12, after line 7, insert the following: "(10) the unit of local government—

"(A) has an adequate process to assess the impact of any enhancement of a school security measure that is undertaken under subparagraph (b) of section 101(a)(2), or any crime prevention programs that are established under subparagraphs (C) and (E) of section 101(a)(2), on the incidence of crime in the geographic area where the enhancement is undertaken or the program is established;

"(B) Will conduct such an assessment with respect to each such enhancement of program; and

"(C) will submit an annual written assessment report to the Director.

Page 18, strike line 23 through "poses" on line 24, and insert the following:

"(c) UNAVAILABILITY AND INACCURACY OF INFORMATION.—

"(1) DATA FOR STATES.—For purposes".

Page 19, after line 4, add the following new paragraph:

"(2) POSSIBLE INACCURACY OF DATE FOR UNITS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—In addition to the provisions of paragraph (1), if the Director believes that the reported rate of part 1 violent crimes for a unit of local government is inaccurate, the Director shall—

"(A) investigate the methodology used by such unit to determine the accuracy of the submitted data; and

"(B) when necessary, use the best available comparable data regarding the number of violent crimes for such years of such unit of local government.

Page 8, line 13, after the period, insert the following language:

"Any amounts remaining in such designated fund after 5 years following the enactment hereof shall be applied to the federal deficit or, if there is no federal deficit, to reducing the federal debt."

Mr. MCCOLLUM (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would ask the gentleman from Florida what amendments these are that are being presented.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLKMER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, these are the amendments of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. REED] dealing with State police departments being provided the opportunity to get some of the money in this from the smaller community program moneys

that may go back to the States on the reverter clause; the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY] adding an additional cooperative task force; the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] establishing a multijurisdictional task force as one, again, of the illustrative areas where the money can be spent in both cases; the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] with regard to assessing the impact of the enhancement of security measures under this bill by the local unit of government. It is all in the assessment amendment, with no mandatory nature of it.

There is an amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] dealing with the accuracy of data, so we know we give discretion to the director to determine if the data is accurate that we are basing the grants on.

There is the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT] about the reversion of the monies in here to cover the deficit.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, continuing my reservation of objection, I would like to comment that it appears that these will be the last amendments that will be permitted to this bill under the rule, so that the rest of us who have amendments pending will not be able to offer those amendments and have them considered in this House. That is because of this type of rule.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, under my reservation of objection I would point out to the House that there has been little or no opportunity for Members of the House who are not members of the Committee on the Judiciary to offer amendments to this legislation if they are not members of the Committee on the Judiciary. I think that is quite inappropriate.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman under my reservation of objection, the distinguished chairman, for whom I have great respect, it is my understanding that he is not including my amendment printed in the RECORD, amendment No. 22.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the answer is that is correct, simply because, to be honest, I disagree with the amendment.

However, as the gentleman knows, the time constraints out here were eaten up by the determination of a lot of Members to talk on two or three of these abortion-related amendments, and it was not, of course, our intent that that occur.

Mr. BEREUTER. Continuing my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the gentleman that under my reservation, I can object to the unanimous-consent

request that all of these amendments the gentleman has listed are not read here on the House floor, and exhaust the amount of time.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield under his reservation of objection?

Mr. BEREUTER. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, would my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] entertain a motion allowing the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] 1 minute to offer his amendment, and letting the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE] receive 1 minute to offer her amendment?

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield under his reservation, I would prefer not to allow any more time for any other amendments. There are a lot of Members who wish to offer them. The clock is running. With all due respect to everybody concerned, there are other amendments that we would like to have had.

Mr. BEREUTER. Continuing my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman, I think given the time considerations, I would say to the chairman, this Member does not think he was well treated by the process that was established here.

However, I want this process to move forward.

Mr. Chairman, I want the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] to have an opportunity to offer his amendment, so I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reserving my right to object, I am not going to object, except I hope that after this display with the very able gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] being shut out, and others, no one will ever again describe this cockamamie 10-hour thing as an open rule.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I just simply want to point out to the gentleman that even members of the committee have also been denied the right to offer amendments, and that during the course of debate on the rule itself we pointed out the insanity of including in the debate time the time for votes, which has consumed about 2 to 3 hours of the debate time that the other side has told the American people we have, and that the same kind of process is being built into the next rule for the bill that is coming forward tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman, it makes no sense on this bill, it makes no sense on any other bill, and I am hopeful that the majority will come to its senses and quit describing these rules as open rules, when in fact there are at least 20

or 25 Members around who still desire to offer worthy amendments and engage in debate.

Mr. SOLOMON. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Regular order is demanded.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am reserving the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may not reserve the right to object after a demand for the regular order.

Without objection, the request of the gentleman from Florida to dispense with the reading is agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Reed-Wynn-Baldacci-Sanders amendment. Crime is not just an urban issue, it is a rural issue as well. And in the State of Vermont when people in small towns and villages need help they rely on the Vermont State Police to come to their assistance. There are no local police.

Under the bill as it is written, moneys are allocated to municipalities under a formula. If a town's grant is less than \$10,000 then that money goes instead to the Governor. He or she is then supposed to distribute that money to local communities but cannot use it for State police protection of those towns.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would correct this problem. Under the amendment the Governor would be able to use the multiple small grants that come to him or her to fund the law enforcement activities of the State police.

I would like to have seen local police and State police be equally eligible for funding under this bill but I believe that this amendment provides some equity to small communities. This amendment also recognizes the dedication and bravery of State police officers in Vermont and across the nation.

I also want to express my appreciation to Representative REED. It is always a pleasure to work with him.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Chairman, many communities are faced with growing gang and drug-related violence. In these communities our constituents live in fear under the shadow of gang-related violence, not just in our cities. Often local law enforcement officials do not have the necessary resources to address the drug and gang problems that plague their communities. What often happens if a community is fortunate and the problem is bad enough, a Federal task force will begin. However, this is expensive, time consuming, and can be a drain on resources. My amendment will offer local law enforcement another option to combat gang and drug-related violence under the law enforcement block grant. My amendment would allow local communities to form a partnership by pooling their resources together to form a task force designed to combat drug and gang related crimes.

In my hometown of Hartford, the gang problem has continued to escalate. Last year a record number of murders were committed in the city, capped off by a killing spree over New Year's weekend during which five people were murdered and several others wounded by gunfire. It is times like these that the additional resources which a regional task force

could provide would be beneficial for local communities to fight crime.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the majority has reviewed this amendment and is willing to accept this language.

I thank the gentleman from Florida and I thank the gentleman from Michigan for their cooperation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM].

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule and the time limit set by that rule, no further amendments are in order.

The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 237, noes 193, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 127]

AYES—237

Allard	Dickey	Inglis
Archer	Doolittle	Istook
Army	Dornan	Johnson (CT)
Bachus	Dreier	Johnson, Sam
Baker (CA)	Duncan	Jones
Baker (LA)	Dunn	Kasich
Ballenger	Ehlers	Kelly
Barr	Ehrlich	Kim
Barrett (NE)	Emerson	King
Barlett	English	Kingston
Barton	Everett	Klug
Bass	Ewing	Knollenberg
Bateman	Fawell	Kolbe
Bereuter	Fields (TX)	LaHood
Bilbray	Flanagan	Largent
Bilirakis	Foley	Latham
Bliley	Forbes	LaTourette
Boehlert	Fowler	Laughlin
Boehner	Fox	Lazio
Bonilla	Franks (CT)	Leach
Bono	Franks (NJ)	Lewis (CA)
Brewster	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (KY)
Brownback	Frisa	Lightfoot
Bryant (TN)	Funderburk	Linder
Bunn	Gallegly	Livingston
Bunning	Ganske	LoBiondo
Burr	Gekas	Longley
Burton	Geren	Lucas
Buyer	Gilchrest	Manzullo
Callahan	Gillmor	Martini
Calvert	Gilman	McCollum
Camp	Goodlatte	McCreery
Canady	Goodling	McDade
Castle	Goss	McHugh
Chabot	Graham	McInnis
Chambliss	Greenwood	McIntosh
Chenoweth	Gunderson	McKeon
Christensen	Gutknecht	McNulty
Chrysler	Hall (TX)	Metcalf
Clinger	Hancock	Meyers
Coble	Hansen	Mica
Coburn	Hastert	Miller (FL)
Collins (GA)	Hastings (WA)	Molinari
Combest	Hayworth	Montgomery
Condit	Heineman	Moorhead
Cooley	Herger	Myers
Cox	Hilleary	Myrick
Crane	Hobson	Nethercutt
Cremeans	Hoekstra	Neumann
Cubin	Hoke	Ney
Cunningham	Horn	Norwood
Danner	Hostettler	Nussle
Davis	Houghton	Oxley
Deal	Hunter	Packard
DeLay	Hutchinson	Parker
Diaz-Balart	Hyde	Paxon

Petri	Schiff	Taylor (NC)
Pombo	Seastrand	Thomas
Porter	Sensenbrenner	Thornberry
Portman	Shadegg	Tiahrt
Pryce	Shaw	Traficant
Quillen	Shuster	Upton
Quinn	Skeen	Vucanovich
Radanovich	Skelton	Waldholtz
Ramstad	Smith (MI)	Walker
Regula	Smith (NJ)	Walsh
Riggs	Smith (TX)	Wamp
Roberts	Smith (WA)	Watts (OK)
Rogers	Solomon	Weldon (FL)
Rohrabacher	Souder	Weldon (PA)
Ros-Lehtinen	Spence	Weller
Roth	Stearns	White
Roukema	Stenholm	Whitfield
Royce	Stockman	Wicker
Salmon	Stump	Wolf
Sanford	Talent	Young (AK)
Saxton	Tate	Young (FL)
Scarborough	Tauzin	Zeliff
Schaefer	Taylor (MS)	Zimmer

NOES—193

Abercrombie	Gordon	Orton
Ackerman	Green	Owens
Andrews	Gutierrez	Pallone
Baesler	Hall (OH)	Pastor
Baldacci	Hamilton	Payne (NJ)
Barcia	Harman	Payne (VA)
Barrett (WI)	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Beilenson	Hayes	Peterson (FL)
Bentsen	Hefley	Peterson (MN)
Berman	Hefner	Pickett
Bevill	Hilliard	Pomeroy
Bishop	Hinchey	Poshard
Blute	Holden	Rahall
Bonior	Hoyer	Rangel
Borski	Jackson-Lee	Reed
Boucher	Jacobs	Reynolds
Browder	Jefferson	Richardson
Brown (CA)	Johnson (SD)	Rivers
Brown (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Roemer
Brown (OH)	Johnston	Rose
Bryant (TX)	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Cardin	Kaptur	Rush
Chapman	Kennedy (MA)	Sabo
Clay	Kennedy (RI)	Sanders
Clayton	Kennelly	Sawyer
Clement	Kildee	Schroeder
Clyburn	Klecza	Schumer
Coleman	Klink	Scott
Collins (IL)	LaFalce	Serrano
Collins (MI)	Lantos	Shays
Conyers	Levin	Sisisky
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Skaggs
Coyne	Lincoln	Slaughter
Cramer	Lipinski	Spratt
de la Garza	Lofgren	Stark
DeFazio	Lowey	Stokes
DeLauro	Luther	Studds
Dellums	Maloney	Stupak
Deutsch	Manton	Tanner
Dicks	Markey	Tejeda
Dingell	Martinez	Thompson
Dixon	Mascara	Thornton
Doggett	McCarthy	Thurman
Dooley	McDermott	Torkildsen
Doyle	McHale	Torres
Durbin	McKinney	Torrice
Edwards	Meehan	Towns
Engel	Meek	Tucker
Eshoo	Menendez	Velazquez
Evans	Mfume	Vento
Farr	Miller (CA)	Visclosky
Fattah	Mineta	Volkmer
Fazio	Minge	Ward
Fields (LA)	Mink	Waters
Filner	Moakley	Watt (NC)
Flake	Mollohan	Waxman
Foglietta	Moran	Williams
Ford	Morella	Wilson
Frank (MA)	Murtha	Wise
Frost	Nadler	Woolsey
Furse	Neal	Wyden
Gejdenson	Oberstar	Wynn
Gephardt	Obey	Yates
Gibbons	Olver	
Gonzalez	Ortiz	

NOT VOTING—4

Becerra	Ensign
Crapo	Matsui

□ 1713

Mr. DOOLEY changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. MICA changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentlelady from Colorado which would specifically single out the protection of women's health clinics as a use of these block grant funds. This bill would give communities the needed flexibility to deal with crime without Washington telling them how to do it. This amendment does not improve the bill. It is unnecessary and redundant.

This debate is not about whether this bill would allow funds to be used to protect women's health facilities. It already does and that is not in dispute. I strongly support protecting areas such as women's health clinics where people are threatened by senseless acts of violence. Those on the other side of the aisle know full well that the amendment offered yesterday by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF], which passed with overwhelming support, adequately addresses in general terms the issue of violence at women's health clinics, as well as at women's shelters, religious organizations, political organizations, and any other facility or location considered to be especially at risk to crime. I understand that there will also be an amendment later today offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE], which I plan to support, that further highlights these general areas without focusing on only one. It is unnecessary and redundant to single out one single area. This is not good legislation.

We are about the Nation's business here. We here are engaged in a debate about the role of the Federal Government in fighting crime. This amendment is redundant and gets us off of focusing on the real issue for this legislation, the crime that plagues our Nation. Although I support a woman's right to choose, I do not support singling out this issue in a bill designed to allow localities who best understand crime determine how to address it.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in reluctant opposition to H.R. 728. There is no question that the epidemic of violent crime in America is one of the most serious concerns of all of our constituents—in inner cities, in suburbs, and in rural regions. Certainly, we must continue to strengthen our criminal justice system and require personal accountability on the part of the criminal. Strong measures must be taken to deter would-be criminals and to punish repeat offenders severely and swiftly. As an example, last week, I supported two bills passed by the House that strengthen the death penalty by limiting habeas corpus appeals and that ensure that evidence obtained in good faith is admissible in court. Congress plays an important and appropriate role in clarifying the application of these rights under the U.S. Constitution. I believe Congress must continue to act aggressively to combat crime wherever appropriate.

I feel, however, that H.R. 728, the Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grant Act of 1995, is bad policy in light of the Federal Government's limited role in fighting crime and in light of the very serious debt crisis in our country. I simply cannot justify spending \$10 billion that the Federal Government does

not have for a function that truly is the responsibility of State and local governments. It seems clear to me that a more appropriate approach would be to free up more State and local dollars to allow them to fight crime.

That is why I have taken the lead on relieving States and localities of the burden of unfunded Federal mandates, that currently cost State and local governments tens of billions of dollars a year. That money could otherwise be used for essential services, including more community policing.

Asking taxpayers to send their dollars to Washington to be redistributed to local law enforcement agencies, through a political process and after administrative costs are incurred, makes little sense. Local communities should raise local dollars to meet what has always been viewed as a local responsibility.

Furthermore, the pressures on the Federal budget today are greater than ever before. With the commitment shown by passing a balanced budget amendment, Congress should be scrutinizing existing Federal programs to cut spending, not increase it as H.R. 728 does. If H.R. 728 passes, I assure my colleagues that I and others concerned about our crippling national debt will scrutinize the appropriations bills for this and all other legislation in order to make the cuts necessary to limit annual budget deficits so we can start to reduce the national debt.

For these reasons and because of my opposition to imposing Federal mandates on State and local governments, I also opposed H.R. 667, the Violent Criminal Incarceration Act.

Each local community has unique crime problems. Last week, Congress exercised its appropriate role by passing legislation clearly within its purview. I fear that efforts by the Federal Government, like H.R. 728, to assert control in areas that, under our Constitution, are clearly left to State and local law enforcement officials, will result in politicizing the crime issue, too much Federal control and an unjustified increase in our budget deficit. If this occurs, our constituents, our communities, our families, will be the ones who pay the price.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the bill, H.R. 728. This bill undermines the focus of our crime fighting efforts in last year's crime bill—putting more police on America's streets.

Mr. Chairman, under the crime bill passed last year grants for nearly 17,000 new officers have been awarded in 4 months. The speed of this process is remarkable. Simplicity is the key to the success of the current program, and I believe the downfall of the bill under consideration. Under last year's bill police chiefs and sheriffs in North Dakota had to fill out a one-page application to get funding for an additional officer and supply the DOJ with salary and benefit information.

This is in stark contrast to the bill under consideration where local communities must put together an advisory board made up of representatives from the police department, local prosecutor's office, local court system, local public school system and a local non-profit, educational, religious or community group active in crime prevention or drug use prevention or treatment. The board must review the application, hold a public hearing on proposed use of funds, establish a trust fund to deposit Federal payments, utilize federally proscribed accounting, audit, and fiscal procedures regarding the funds, provide records to

the DOJ for compliance review purposes, and finally make reports as required by DOJ in addition to the annual reports required under the act.

So what's been done here is a dramatic change in the process. Under the guise of local flexibility, the authors of this bill have taken a one page application for small jurisdictions, thrown it out the window and created a bureaucratic nightmare. Under a similar block grant program known as law enforcement assistance administration, a review found that one-third of all Federal funds were used to hire consultants. This newly created bureaucratic maze leads me to conclude a similar situation will emerge under this bill.

What further concerns me is that the formula in H.R. 728 disadvantages rural areas like North Dakota. Last year's crime bill recognized the fact that crime is growing at a faster rate in rural America than in the rest of the country. It contained specific language requiring that at least half of the money be reserved for jurisdiction under 150,000 in population. This bill contains no such provision, and in fact, is likely to considerably reduce North Dakota's share of crime fighting funds.

What's more, H.R. 728 provides no waiver provisions for the local match. While I believe a local match is good policy, there are some communities that will find even in the 10 percent match now included in H.R. 728 to be prohibitive. Under the current program, the Attorney General is provided with the authority to waive wholly or in part the local match requirement. The omission of this authority in H.R. 728 strikes another direct hit to rural America.

In my estimation, North Dakota is a net loser under H.R. 728, as are the great majority of congressional districts across this country.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 728. It represents a departure from what has been argued from the other side of the aisle—give the people what they want. Last year's anticrime bill has provided nearly 8,000 communities, rural to urban and large to small, funds to hire 14,622 new police officers through the COPS program. These communities have submitted COPS requests because community-oriented policing has been shown to work to make neighborhoods safer. The American people do not want Congress to dismantle this much needed 4-month-old program by absorbing it into a giant block grant, without targeted allocations.

The National Association of Police Organizations has stated its strong belief that unless funds are given directly to law enforcement agencies for police hiring, the funds will be diverted elsewhere. The National Sheriffs' Association and Law Enforcement Steering Committee, which represents 450,000 law enforcement officers nationally, echoes NAPO's sentiments. The Police Executive Research Forum opposes H.R. 728 because it fails to require that funds be spent on community policing and will force police organizations to compete with every other community group or service agency that has some relation to public safety. H.R. 728 clearly symbolizes a "pass the buck" approach which will not ensure that Federal funds will go toward crime control and turns a deaf ear to local law enforcement experts.

H.R. 728 is also sending an appalling negative message to our young people by depleting funding for crime prevention programs. The get-tough crime provisions that have

passed, in addition to this atrocious piece of legislation, are telling the youth of America that we will lock them up and punish them after they commit a crime, but we will deny that they need help before the crime occurs. Scientific research has demonstrated time and time again that violence is a learned behavior that can be stopped or reversed if caught early enough (Journal of the American Medical Association). Many of our children are taught to hurt others early in their lives because they are bombarded with messages in the media or through school that desensitize them to violence. Crime prevention programs in last year's anticrime bill have given our young people much-needed alternatives to violence.

Proponents of H.R. 728 allege that funds could be used for youth crime prevention programs, but the bill includes no such guarantees. Without these measures of accountability, crime prevention programs will disappear. Looking at actual trends, funds for prevention have taken a back seat to other local budgetary demands. More than half of all States did not plan to spend any money granted through the Byrne Law Enforcement Program on crime prevention (Bureau of Justice Assistance). We must work hard to change these archaic attitudes with which we treat crime; we address the outcomes—murders, assaults, rapes, robberies—and not the causes of crime.

H.R. 728 also lacks cost effectiveness. It costs \$29,600 a year to keep one teenager in detention, according to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention of the Justice Department. Much-debated midnight basketball programs, which were praised as one of President Bush's Thousand Points of Light, cost roughly \$3,000 to \$4,000 per year and have led to reductions in crime rates. Such thriving antigang, drug treatment, after school, community service, and urban recreation programs entail a much smaller cost and substantially help our youth to rebuild their lives—in stark contrast to nonintervention, after-the-fact, punitive actions that come too late. It is unforgivable to ignore the need for community investments that help our troubled youth in their struggle toward a decent life.

We cannot abandon another generation to the menacing hazards they inevitably encounter through life on the streets. One of every six suspects arrested in this country for murder, rape, robbery or assault is under the age of 18, and a large portion of their victims are other juveniles (FBI). Juvenile arrests for violent crime increased 50 percent from 1987 to 1991, twice the increase for persons 18 years-of-age and older (National Center for Policy Analysis). These are the Nation's children crying out for help!

It is a shame that we live in the greatest country on Earth, and yet we ignore the fact that violence is an American problem that starts with disgraceful conditions in which we allow our young people to live. The National League of Cities conference last year stated that the homicide rates for young men in the United States are between 4 to 73 times homicide rates for young men in any other developed nation. We acknowledged this problem and proved that we wanted to solve it through prevention programs in last year's anticrime bill. H.R. 728 would force us to backpedal on the valuable progress we have made thus far.

The Community Schools Youth Services and Supervision Program is working to make

schools centers of community life. This program encourages schools to become safe places where children and their families can participate after school, in the evening and on weekends, in such programs as academic enhancement, recreational activities and mentoring. H.R. 728 would exterminate this program.

The Family and Community Endeavors Program awards competitive matching grants to local education agencies or community-based organizations toward academic and social improvement of children at-risk for committing violence. H.R. 728 would decimate funds for this program.

The Gang Resistance Education and Training Program [GREAT] is a cooperative program through which the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms has trained more than a thousand officers in 44 States as gang resistance instructors. This program has been in place since 1992. H.R. 728 would drastically reduce its funding.

These are only a sample of programs H.R. 728 would put on the chopping block. The bill does not make sense. It is wrong to fold COPS and crime prevention funding into a single block grant with no accountability measures. H.R. 728 must be defeated because it fails to help our law enforcement officers, our youth and our children.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, had I been permitted to offer this amendment under this restrictive rule, I would have proposed this amendment to H.R. 728, which would acknowledge the special relationship that the Federal Government has with the more than 550 Indian Tribes in this country. The bill as written would inappropriately turn over control and funding of vital law enforcement programs to States, or in other circumstances, force tribes to directly compete with local governments for funding. My amendment would prevent this from happening.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 728 OFFERED BY MR. RICHARDSON

1. Section 101(f)(3) of the Bill is amended by inserting the words "and tribal" following the word "local", by striking the period at the end of the sentence, and adding the following: ", and the director shall take into account the extraordinary need for law enforcement assistance in Indian country."

2. Section 104(b)(7) of the Bill is amended by inserting after the word "local" the words "and tribal" in the title.

3. Section 104(b)(7) of the Bill is further amended by adding after the period the following: "If an allocation to an Indian tribal governments under paragraphs (3) or (4) is less than 10,000 dollars for the payment period, the amounts allotted shall be returned to the Director who shall distribute such funds among Indian tribes whose allotment is less than such amount in a manner which reduces crime and improves public safety."

1. Section 102 of the Bill is amended by adding the following subsection:

"(d) INDIAN TRIBE ALLOCATION.—In view of the extraordinary need for law enforcement assistance in Indian country, an appropriate amount of funds available under this Act shall be made available by the Attorney General for direct grants to Indian tribal governments to carry out the purposes of this Act."

4. Section 108(1)(B) of the Bill is amended by striking all that follows, except the period, after the phrase "District of Columbia"

5. Section 108 of the Bill is further amended by adding the following new paragraphs at the end of subsection (a):

"(7) The term "Indian tribal government" means the recognized governing body of an Indian tribe that carries out substantial governmental duties and powers.

"(8) The term "Indian tribe" means a tribe, band, pueblo, nation, or other organized group or community of Indians, including an Alaskan Native village (as defined in, or established under, the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601, et seq.)), that is recognized as eligible for the special programs and services provided by the United States to Indians because of their status as Indians and because of the United States trust responsibility to Indian tribes."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE) having assumed the chair, Mr. GUNDERSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 728), to control crime by providing law enforcement block grants, pursuant to House Resolution 79, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CONYERS. I certainly am, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CONYERS moves to recommit H.R. 728 back to the Committee on the Judiciary and report back forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 4, after line 5, insert the following:

"(D) Establishing the programs described in the following subtitles of title III of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (as such title and the amendments made by such title were in effect on the day preceding the date of the enactment of this Act):

"(i) Assistance for Delinquent and At-Risk Youth under subtitle G.

"(ii) Urban Recreation and At-Risk Youth subtitle O which made amendments to the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978.

"(iii) Gang Resistance and Education Training under subtitle X."

Page 6, after line 24, insert the following (and redesignate any subsequent subsections accordingly):

"(C) PREVENTION SET-ASIDE FOR YOUTH.—Of the amounts to be appropriated under

subsection (a), the Attorney General shall allocate \$100,000,000 of such funds for each of fiscal years 1996 through 2000 to carry out the purposes of subparagraph (D) of section 101(a)(2).

Page 9, after line 2, insert the following (and redesignate any subsequent subsections accordingly):

"(b) RESERVATION FOR BYRNE PROGRAMS.—The Attorney General shall reserve such sums as may be necessary of the amounts authorized under this section in each fiscal year to ensure that not less than \$450,000,000 is available to carry out the programs under subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1986.

Mr. CONYERS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, this has been a long and difficult bill, due to very restrictive rules. I offer this motion to recommit that combines the provisions of the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], which targets youth programs, assistance for delinquents at risk and urban recreation programs, as well as the provision of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] for \$400 million a year under the Byrne grant for funds for crime reduction purposes.

I yield briefly to them to make their comments, but on a really personal note I want to thank my colleagues on this side who have cooperated under great duress to the Chair. I personally apologize to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO], my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. WATT], and members of the committee who I know had amendments pending: the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS], the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE], the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE], who all had amendments that we were eager to have debated and under the restrictions we were not able to permit them, as well as the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS].

□ 1720

Ladies and gentlemen, this motion to recommit provides us with a great opportunity to bring the kinds of improvements to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 1/2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], a member of the committee.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] very much for your leadership.

When the people were hungry in France, Marie Antoinette said, "Let them eat cake." When the children of our country are fighting against the siege of gang violence and gang solicitation, we are telling them that that is OK.

I simply ask that the amendment be considered by this body that speaks to the issue of the high numbers of gang violence incidences and the many cities, some 79 in the United States, who show an increase in gang activity.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know about the rest of my colleagues. But my heart goes out when babies are thrown outside of buildings because of gang initiation rites, when driveby shootings take our young children away from us. Yet we can stand here and resist promoting \$500 million simply for gang-resistance programs, for children at risk and keeping our parks open. It is documented that in 110 jurisdictions reporting gangs, the survey found over a 12-month period there were 249,329 gang members. There were 4,881 gangs, 46,359 gang-related crimes, and a staggering 1,072 gang-related homicides.

What more do we need to say to give a mere \$500 million to emphasize, unlike Marie Antoinette, to give them cake, we are going to give them food and substance to provide for them a life, an opportunity, a future. Where are we today when we tell our children it is all right to be subject to the gangs and driveby shootings?

Mr. Speaker, I ask for support, that we truly give support to our children.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK].

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, in this motion to recommit, we are asking that \$450 million each year for the life of this crime bill be made available for the Byrne grants. The Byrne grants, for those of you who were not here last year, is very popular. It is 22 programs that States use to do crime prevention, crime enforcement, projects throughout their States.

In the bill we currently have, the current crime bill, there is \$580 million; fiscal year next year, fiscal year 1996, that goes to \$130 million, a 300 percent decrease in 1 year.

Every major law enforcement group tells you you cannot fight crime in 1 year. It takes more than 1 year. We will unstabilize funding over 5 years.

You wanted flexibility so the locals can do what they want. It is right here, \$450 million grant in the Byrne grants that gives you the flexibility you sought for the last few days.

Last year when there was some question whether or not Byrne grants would continue, we put together a letter in a bipartisan spirit, 153 Members signed that letter, 47 on that side of the aisle, including the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], who said, "Keep the Byrne grants, keep them authorized at \$450 million."

That is what we are asking to do in this motion to recommit.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I first learned of the critical role that Byrne funding plays in rural law enforcement when sheriffs and police chiefs from my district came to Washington last year to participate in the development of the crime bill. In a meeting which I set up between them and Attorney General

Reno, they expressed their concern over the fact that funding for the Byrne program had been gutted.

The Attorney General listened and, due to her efforts and those of myself and many of my colleagues, Byrne funding was not just restored; it was significantly increased.

Byrne funding is important to local law enforcement around the country. But rural America is particularly dependent on it for participation in Federal law enforcement assistance programs. Without it, Glenn, Colusa, and Yolo Counties in my district would have to do away with their narcotics task forces, leaving these communities wide open to drugs and the violence that accompanies this persistent problem. This amendment will help ensure that rural communities continue to get the attention and resources that they need—that they are not left behind.

Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Jackson-Lee amendment and the motion to recommit.

It amazes me that the same Members of this body who are so intent on spending billions of the taxpayer's dollars to construct new prisons, want to eliminate the modest amount of funding we made available for youth crime prevention programs.

Mr. Chairman, the truth is that crime prevention programs make a serious impact on crime in our streets.

Whenever I talk to the mayors, police chiefs, community activists, and kids from the cities and towns in my district, crime is always an issue. And time and time again, they tell me of another prevention program that is working, another program that stops crime before it starts.

I can speak from experience about one program in particular in 1993, the Boston Police Department was the first major east coast police department to become involved in GREAT, the Gang Prevention Program.

In the 1993–94 school year, Boston police youth service officers taught the GREAT curriculum to over 10,000 seventh graders in 117 schools across the city.

That is over 10,000 young people who received a clear message about how to stay away from gangs and gang related violence. This year, with the help of funds from the crime bill, Boston will be able to expand this successful program.

My constituents are not interested in tough talk or sound bite public policy. They want anti-crime programs that are going to get rid of gangs, stop violence, and give their children the opportunities they need to succeed.

Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what the GREAT Program does.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, first of all, everybody in this body really likes the Byrne grants, wants to protect the Byrne grants. I want to assure the Members they are protected under existing law. The legislation we passed today or are passing today in no way erodes the authorization or the opportunity to appropriate money for the Byrne grants that is currently in law.

We are very happy and pleased to be able to report that fact.

However, what the gentleman wants to do in part, and it is only part of this motion to recommit, is to reserve more money even still for the Byrne grants in the out years than is so under present law, which will eat into the total amount of money available for the local communities under this bill by considerable amounts.

The appropriate way to deal with the Byrne grants in the out years, if the gentleman is correct, and he probably is, that we ought to deal with them in the future with adding more authorizations, is for the Committee on the Judiciary to produce that future authorization as separate authorization and not affect the grant moneys going to local communities.

So I would oppose this amendment for that reason had it been brought up in the regular course of affairs anyway.

The thing that really is bad or worse by far is the provision the gentleman from Texas has offered that is part of this motion to recommit. I want everybody to understand that she would set aside over the next 5 years \$500 million of the money which is involved in this bill today that is currently going out to the local cities and counties to spend as they want; she would set aside \$500 million for three at-risk youth programs that are already in law. There are 266 at-risk youth grant programs today already in the Federal Government under somebody's jurisdiction; 266 already exist either in the Departments of Justice or the Department of Education or somewhere else in our Government, and including these three programs, she singled out. Why should we set aside a specific amount of money for these programs today when we have not set aside money for anything else?

The very essence of this bill that we are debating today is the essence of saying to the cities and counties essentially we think you know best how to fight crime. If you want to devote some of your resources to some of these at-risk youth programs, that is fine, go ahead and do that, but that should be your decision, because what is good, again, in Seattle, WA, may not be good in Key West, FL, or upstate New York or wherever.

This is important and a very important thing that we do not want to do in this bill. So I must urge a no vote on this motion to recommit, because it undermines the very basic principle of this crime bill, which is a local grant provision to let the local communities decide for themselves how to spend the money under this bill, whether it is for more cops or whether it is for prevention programs and which prevention programs. That should be left to be a local decision not decided here today, and the amendment which is part of this motion to recommit and the very essence of it is a bad amendment.

I urge a "no" vote on the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 247, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 128]

AYES—184

Abercrombie	Gephardt	Obey
Ackerman	Geren	Olver
Andrews	Gibbons	Orton
Baesler	Gonzalez	Owens
Baldacci	Gordon	Pallone
Barcia	Green	Pastor
Barrett (WI)	Gutierrez	Payne (NJ)
Beilenson	Hall (OH)	Pelosi
Bentsen	Harman	Peterson (FL)
Berman	Hastings (FL)	Pomeroy
Bevill	Hayes	Poshard
Bishop	Hefner	Rahall
Bonior	Hilliard	Rangel
Borski	Hinchev	Reed
Brewster	Holden	Reynolds
Browder	Hoyer	Richardson
Brown (CA)	Jackson-Lee	Rivers
Brown (FL)	Jacobs	Roemer
Brown (OH)	Jefferson	Rose
Bryant (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Cardin	Johnston	Rush
Chapman	Kanjorski	Sabo
Clay	Kaptur	Sanders
Clayton	Kennedy (MA)	Sawyer
Clement	Kennedy (RI)	Schroeder
Clyburn	Kennelly	Schumer
Coleman	Kildee	Scott
Collins (IL)	Kleczka	Serrano
Collins (MI)	Klink	Skaggs
Condit	LaFalce	Skelton
Conyers	Lantos	Slaughter
Costello	Levin	Spratt
Coyne	Lewis (GA)	Stark
Cramer	Lincoln	Stenholm
de la Garza	Lofgren	Stokes
DeFazio	Lowey	Studds
DeLauro	Luther	Stupak
Dellums	Maloney	Tanner
Deutsch	Manton	Tejeda
Dicks	Markey	Thompson
Dingell	Martinez	Thornton
Dixon	Mascara	Thurman
Doggett	McCarthy	Torres
Dooley	McDermott	Torricelli
Doyle	McHale	Towns
Durbin	McKinney	Tucker
Edwards	McNulty	Velazquez
Engel	Meehan	Vento
Eshoo	Meek	Visclosky
Evans	Menendez	Volkmer
Farr	Mfume	Ward
Fattah	Miller (CA)	Waters
Fazio	Mineta	Watt (NC)
Fields (LA)	Minge	Waxman
Filner	Mink	Wilson
Flake	Moakley	Wise
Foglietta	Mollohan	Woolsey
Ford	Moran	Wyden
Frank (MA)	Murtha	Wynn
Frost	Nadler	Yates
Furse	Neal	
Gejdenson	Oberstar	

NOES—247

Allard	Barrett (NE)	Bliley
Archer	Bartlett	Blute
Army	Barton	Boehler
Bachus	Bass	Boehner
Baker (CA)	Bateman	Bonilla
Baker (LA)	Bereuter	Bono
Ballenger	Bilbray	Boucher
Barr	Bilirakis	Brownback

Bryant (TN)	Hastings (WA)	Peterson (MN)
Bunn	Hayworth	Petri
Bunning	Hefley	Pickett
Burr	Heineman	Pombo
Burton	Herger	Porter
Buyer	Hillery	Portman
Callahan	Hobson	Pryce
Calvert	Hoekstra	Quillen
Camp	Hoke	Quinn
Canady	Horn	Radanovich
Castle	Hostettler	Ramstad
Chabot	Houghton	Regula
Chambliss	Hunter	Riggs
Chenoweth	Hutchinson	Roberts
Christensen	Hyde	Rogers
Chryslers	Inglis	Rohrabacher
Clinger	Istook	Ros-Lehtinen
Coble	Johnson (CT)	Roth
Coburn	Johnson (SD)	Roukema
Collins (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Combest	Jones	Salmon
Cooley	Kasich	Sanford
Cox	Kelly	Saxton
Crane	Kim	Scarborough
Creameans	King	Schaefer
Cubin	Kingston	Schiff
Cunningham	Klug	Seastrand
Danner	Knollenberg	Sensenbrenner
Davis	Kolbe	Shadegg
Deal	LaHood	Shaw
DeLay	Largent	Shays
Diaz-Balart	Latham	Shuster
Dickey	LaTourrette	Sisisky
Doolittle	Laughlin	Skeen
Dornan	Lazio	Smith (MI)
Dreier	Leach	Smith (NJ)
Duncan	Lewis (CA)	Smith (TX)
Dunn	Lewis (KY)	Smith (WA)
Ehlers	Lightfoot	Solomon
Ehrlich	Linder	Souder
Emerson	Lipinski	Spence
English	Livingston	Stearns
Ensign	LoBiondo	Stockman
Everett	Longley	Stump
Ewing	Lucas	Talent
Fawell	Manzullo	Tate
Fields (TX)	Martini	Tauzin
Flanagan	McCollum	Taylor (MS)
Foley	McCrery	Taylor (NC)
Forbes	McDade	Thomas
Fowler	McHugh	Thornberry
Fox	McInnis	Tiahrt
Franks (CT)	McIntosh	Torkildsen
Franks (NJ)	McKeon	Trafficant
Frelinghuysen	Metcalf	Upton
Frisa	Meyers	Vucanovich
Funderburk	Mica	Waldholtz
Gallegly	Miller (FL)	Walker
Ganske	Molinari	Walsh
Gekas	Montgomery	Wamp
Gilchrest	Moorhead	Watts (OK)
Gillmor	Morella	Weldon (FL)
Gilman	Myers	Weldon (PA)
Goodlatte	Myrick	Weller
Goodling	Nethercutt	White
Goss	Neumann	Whitfield
Graham	Ney	Wicker
Greenwood	Norwood	Williams
Gunderson	Nussle	Wolf
Gutknecht	Ortiz	Young (AK)
Hall (TX)	Oxley	Young (FL)
Hamilton	Packard	Zeliff
Hancock	Parker	Zimmer
Hansen	Paxon	
Hastert	Payne (VA)	

NOT VOTING—3

Becerra	Crapo	Matsui
---------	-------	--------

□ 1744

Mr. LINDER and Mr. PAYNE of Virginia changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 192, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No 129]

AYES—238

Allard	Funderburk	Myrick
Archer	Gallegly	Nethercutt
Army	Ganske	Neumann
Bachus	Gekas	Ney
Baker (CA)	Geren	Norwood
Baker (LA)	Gilchrest	Nussle
Ballenger	Gillmor	Oxley
Barr	Gilman	Packard
Barrett (NE)	Gingrich	Parker
Bartlett	Goodlatte	Paxon
Barton	Goodling	Petri
Bass	Goss	Pombo
Bateman	Graham	Porter
Bereuter	Greenwood	Pryce
Bilbray	Gunderson	Quillen
Bilirakis	Gutknecht	Radanovich
Bliley	Hall (TX)	Ramstad
Boehler	Hancock	Regula
Boehner	Hansen	Riggs
Bonilla	Hastert	Roberts
Bono	Hastings (WA)	Rogers
Brewster	Hayworth	Rohrabacher
Brownback	Heineman	Ros-Lehtinen
Bryant (TN)	Herger	Roth
Bunn	Hilleary	Roukema
Bunning	Hobson	Royce
Burr	Hoekstra	Salmon
Burton	Hoke	Sanford
Buyer	Horn	Saxton
Callahan	Hostettler	Schaefer
Calvert	Houghton	Schiff
Camp	Hunter	Seastrand
Canady	Hutchinson	Sensenbrenner
Castle	Hyde	Shadegg
Chabot	Inglis	Shaw
Chambliss	Istook	Shuster
Chenoweth	Johnson, Sam	Skeen
Christensen	Jones	Skelton
Chryslers	Kasich	Smith (MI)
Clinger	Kelly	Smith (NJ)
Coble	Kim	Smith (TX)
Coburn	King	Smith (WA)
Collins (GA)	Kingston	Solomon
Combest	Klug	Souder
Condit	Knollenberg	Spence
Cooley	Kolbe	Stearns
Cox	LaHood	Stenholm
Crane	Largent	Stockman
Creameans	Latham	Stump
Cubin	LaTourrette	Talent
Cunningham	Laughlin	Tanner
Danner	Lazio	Tate
Davis	Leach	Tauzin
Deal	Lewis (CA)	Taylor (MS)
DeLay	Lewis (KY)	Taylor (NC)
Diaz-Balart	Lightfoot	Thomas
Dickey	Lincoln	Thornberry
Doolittle	Linder	Tiahrt
Dornan	Livingston	Trafficant
Dreier	LoBiondo	Upton
Duncan	Longley	Vucanovich
Dunn	Lucas	Waldholtz
Ehlers	Manzullo	Walker
Ehrlich	Martini	Walsh
Emerson	McCollum	Wamp
English	McCrery	Watts (OK)
Ensign	McDade	Weldon (FL)
Everett	McHugh	Weldon (PA)
Ewing	McInnis	Weller
Fawell	McIntosh	White
Fields (TX)	McKeon	Whitfield
Flanagan	McNulty	Wicker
Foley	Metcalf	Wolf
Forbes	Meyers	Yates
Fowler	Mica	Young (AK)
Fox	Miller (FL)	Young (FL)
Franks (CT)	Molinari	Zeliff
Franks (NJ)	Montgomery	Zimmer
Frelinghuysen	Moorhead	
Frisa	Myers	

NOES—192

Abercrombie	Barcia	Bevill
Ackerman	Barrett (WI)	Bishop
Andrews	Beilenson	Blute
Baesler	Bentsen	Bonior
Baldacci	Berman	Borski

Boucher	Hefner	Pastor
Browder	Hilliard	Payne (NJ)
Brown (CA)	Hinchev	Payne (VA)
Brown (FL)	Holden	Pelosi
Brown (OH)	Hoyer	Peterson (FL)
Bryant (TX)	Jackson-Lee	Peterson (MN)
Cardin	Jacobs	Pickett
Chapman	Jefferson	Pomeroy
Clay	Johnson (CT)	Portman
Clayton	Johnson (SD)	Poshard
Clement	Johnson, E. B.	Quinn
Clyburn	Johnston	Rahall
Coleman	Kanjorski	Rangel
Collins (IL)	Kaptur	Reed
Collins (MI)	Kennedy (MA)	Richardson
Conyers	Kennedy (RI)	Rivers
Costello	Kennelly	Roemer
Coyne	Kildee	Rose
Cramer	Klecicka	Roybal-Allard
de la Garza	Klink	Rush
DeFazio	LaFalce	Sabo
DeLauro	Lantos	Sanders
Dellums	Levin	Sawyer
Deutsch	Lewis (GA)	Scarborough
Dicks	Lipinski	Schroeder
Dingell	Lofgren	Schumer
Dixon	Lowey	Scott
Doggett	Luther	Serrano
Dooley	Maloney	Shays
Doyle	Manton	Sisisky
Durbin	Markey	Skaggs
Edwards	Martinez	Slaughter
Engel	Mascara	Spratt
Eshoo	McCarthy	Stark
Evans	McDermott	Stokes
Farr	McHale	Studds
Fattah	McKinney	Stupak
Fazio	Meehan	Tejeda
Fields (LA)	Meek	Thompson
Filner	Menendez	Thornton
Flake	Mfume	Thurman
Foglietta	Miller (CA)	Torkildsen
Ford	Mineta	Torres
Frank (MA)	Minge	Towns
Frost	Mink	Tucker
Furse	Moakley	Velazquez
Gejdenson	Mollohan	Vento
Gephardt	Moran	Visclosky
Gibbons	Morella	Volkmer
Gonzalez	Murtha	Ward
Gordon	Nadler	Waters
Green	Neal	Watt (NC)
Gutierrez	Oberstar	Waxman
Hall (OH)	Obey	Williams
Hamilton	Olver	Wilson
Harman	Ortiz	Wise
Hastings (FL)	Orton	Woolsey
Hayes	Owens	Wyden
Hefley	Pallone	Wynn

NOT VOTING—5

Becerra	Matsui	Torricelli
Crapo	Reynolds	

□ 1801

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 728, LOCAL GOVERNMENT LAW ENFORCEMENT BLOCK GRANTS ACT OF 1995

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 728, as amended, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, cross-references, and punctuation, and to make such stylistic, clerical, technical conforming, and other changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislation days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 728, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Texas, is this the last vote for the evening? How late will we go tomorrow, and what might be the schedule for Thursday.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, it seems that we will have no more votes today. We will not take up the rule for the National Security Act tonight. We will start tomorrow after a reasonable number of 1 minutes that we will work out with the minority leader and start with the rule on the National Security Act.

Members need to understand that it is the intention of the majority to make sure that we go late enough tomorrow night so that we will be assured of being out at 3 o'clock Thursday for the President's Day recess.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, could the gentleman also give any indication about the schedule for Tuesday and Wednesday so that Members who might want to suggest amendments to bills could get ready to do that?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, right now we are not prepared to say what will happen Tuesday. We do think we will stick, possibly, to the normal come in at 2, no votes until 5. But that would be announced at a later date.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding to me.

I just want to rise and commend the majority and particularly the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY]. He and I have risen to engage in a colloquy the last couple weeks to talk about a family-friendly schedule and, in particular, to talk about getting out tonight by 7 o'clock.

I can see that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] is not only good on his word at 7 o'clock, he is an hour early.

A number of families, Congressmen, Congresswomen have come up to me and asked me to end my poetic career

by doing one more poem for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY]. So I will do this and end in salute to him.

Roses are red,
Violets are blue.
Thanks to DICK ARMEY,
We are out of the stew.

We are into the roses and maybe a sip of wine,

A family-friendly schedule, it's about time.

Mr. Speaker, we are delighted to have this opportunity to spend 1 night with our families, and we look forward to working with the majority in the future, especially after the first 100 days, to see that we can make this body more productive, more efficient and not necessarily working against scheduling time with our families.

I thank the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks in complimenting our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY]. Even though he does not look like cupid, there is a lot of love in his heart. In fact, he understands how important it is to get out and be with our families, particularly on Valentine's Day.

I just might urge those Members that have been signed up for special orders, that if they would, on both sides of the aisle, would take care in the amount of time that they spend so that our staff can also have a little Valentine's Day break and get out of here early.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

APPROVAL OF BLOCK GRANT APPROACH NOTED IN WASHINGTON POST EDITORIAL

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, it is not often I find myself in agreement with the editorial page of the Washington Post, but today's Post shows rare insight and good sense when it says the President should not veto the crime bill that is on the floor because of the block grant program.

The Post recognizes that the President's 100,000 cop program was a fraud, saying that "almost immediately * * * it was challenged by law enforcement experts and some local officials. In fact, the law created a five-year matching program during which the Federal Government's share diminished and eventually disappeared, leaving localities with the full cost of maintaining the new officers."

In other words, it would never have fulfilled its promise of 100,000 new police officers.

The editorial then goes on to make the case for allowing local communities more flexibility in using Federal