

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), as well as the gentleman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) and especially the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), for being such a strong advocate of this legislation but also for being such a strong advocate for law enforcement in general.

This legislation rights a minor wrong, and that is it acknowledges those families that were left out of the original legislation. Despite the good intentions, that first draft clearly left some families out across the country.

I am very proud to represent the folks in Staten Island and Brooklyn and probably represent the most police officers, active and retired, I would bet, in any congressional district in the country. They are my friends. They are my neighbors. But more importantly, they protect us every single day.

It feels like every year I am going to another funeral for a police officer who was killed in the line of duty. And, yeah, it affects the New York City Police Department. It goes to the heart of society. It goes to the heart of these men and women who are willing to risk their lives to protect us. But it also destroys, in part, their families.

I have seen the young boys who lost their fathers to gunshot wounds to the head trying to protect a local community. I have seen mothers who were pregnant expecting their baby when they are burying their father. I have seen families who have four or five or six police officers between two families devastated when a young husband, a young father is killed from some career criminal.

So those are all the things that sometimes we forget that police officers are willing to do for us.

But one thing we do not forget today, with the help of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) and everyone else here today, is to tell those families that may have been left out, the Congress of the United States appreciates what they went through; and if they need help to help their child, we are there for them.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just conclude by saying that when police officers give their lives to protect the rest of us, there is really no limit to what we ought to be willing to give back to that family.

This is a really symbolic gesture. The education of the children means that the next generation has a future. We know what education will do. And this is just one symbolic gesture of our respect and admiration for the courage of police officers and for those that have given the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of the rest of us.

I certainly know of no opposition to the bill and hope it can be passed unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1638.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT LAW ENFORCEMENT BLOCK GRANTS ACT OF 2000

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4999) to control crime by providing law enforcement block grants, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4999

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants Act of 2000".

SEC. 2. BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) PAYMENT AND USE.—

(1) PAYMENT.—The Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance shall pay to each unit of local government which qualifies for a payment under this Act an amount equal to the sum of any amounts allocated to such unit under this Act for each payment period. The Director shall pay such amount from amounts appropriated to carry out this Act.

(2) USE.—Amounts paid to a unit of local government under this section shall be used by the unit for reducing crime and improving public safety, including but not limited to, 1 or more of the following purposes:

(A)(i) Hiring, training, and employing on a continuing basis new, additional law enforcement officers and necessary support personnel.

(ii) Paying overtime to presently employed law enforcement officers and necessary support personnel for the purpose of increasing the number of hours worked by such personnel.

(iii) Procuring equipment, technology, and other material directly related to basic law enforcement functions.

(B) Enhancing security measures—

(i) in and around schools; and

(ii) 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.

(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, and programs intended to prevent juvenile crime.

(D) Establishing or supporting drug courts.

(E) Establishing early intervention and prevention programs for juveniles to reduce or eliminate crime.

(F) Enhancing the adjudication process of cases involving violent offenders, including the adjudication process of cases involving violent juvenile offenders.

(G) Enhancing programs under subpart 1 of part E of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

(H) 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.

(I) 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.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) the term "violent offender" means a person charged with committing a part I violent crime; and

(B) the term "drug courts" means a program that involves—

(i) continuing judicial supervision over offenders with substance abuse problems who are not violent offenders; and

(ii) the integrated administration of other sanctions and services, which shall include—

(I) mandatory periodic testing for the use of controlled substances or other addictive substances during any period of supervised release or probation for each participant;

(II) substance abuse treatment for each participant;

(III) probation, or other supervised release involving the possibility of prosecution, confinement, or incarceration based on non-compliance with program requirements or failure to show satisfactory progress; and

(IV) programmatic, offender management, and aftercare services such as relapse prevention, vocational job training, job placement, and housing placement.

(b) PROHIBITED USES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a unit of local government may not expend any of the funds provided under this Act to purchase, lease, rent, or otherwise acquire—

(1) tanks or armored personnel carriers;

(2) fixed wing aircraft;

(3) limousines;

(4) real estate;

(5) yachts;

(6) consultants; or

(7) vehicles not primarily used for law enforcement;

unless the Attorney General certifies that extraordinary and exigent circumstances exist that make the use of funds for such purposes essential to the maintenance of public safety and good order in such unit of local government.

(c) TIMING OF PAYMENTS.—The Director shall pay each unit of local government that has submitted an application under this Act not later than—

(1) 90 days after the date that the amount is available, or

(2) the first day of the payment period if the unit of local government has provided the Director with the assurances required by section 4(c), whichever is later.

(d) ADJUSTMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Director shall adjust a payment under this Act to a unit of local government to the extent that a prior payment to the unit of local government was more or less than the amount required to be paid.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—The Director may increase or decrease under this subsection a payment to a unit of local government only if the Director determines the need for the increase or decrease, or if the unit requests the increase or decrease, not later than 1 year after the end of the payment period for which a payment was made.

(e) **RESERVATION FOR ADJUSTMENT.**—The Director may reserve a percentage of not more than 2 percent of the amount under this section for a payment period for all units of local government in a State if the Director considers the reserve is necessary to ensure the availability of sufficient amounts to pay adjustments after the final allocation of amounts among the units of local government in the State.

(f) **REPAYMENT OF UNEXPENDED AMOUNTS.**—

(1) **REPAYMENT REQUIRED.**—A unit of local government shall repay to the Director, by not later than 27 months after receipt of funds from the Director, any amount that is—

(A) paid to the unit from amounts appropriated under the authority of this section; and

(B) not expended by the unit within 2 years after receipt of such funds from the Director.

(2) **PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO REPAY.**—If the amount required to be repaid is not repaid, the Director shall reduce payment in future payment periods accordingly.

(3) **DEPOSIT OF AMOUNTS REPAID.**—Amounts received by the Director as repayments under this subsection shall be deposited in a designated fund for future payments to units of local government. Any amounts remaining in such designated fund after 5 years following the enactment of the Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants Act of 2000 shall be applied to the Federal deficit or, if there is no Federal deficit, to reducing the Federal debt.

(g) **NONSUPPLANTING REQUIREMENT.**—Funds made available under this Act to units of local government shall not be used to supplant State or local funds, but shall be used to increase the amount of funds that would, in the absence of funds made available under this Act, be made available from State or local sources.

(h) **MATCHING FUNDS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Federal share of a grant received under this Act may not exceed 90 percent of the costs of a program or proposal funded under this Act.

(2) **EXCEPTION FOR FINANCIAL HARDSHIP.**—The Director may increase the Federal share under paragraph (1) up to 100 percent for a unit of local government upon a showing of financial hardship by such unit.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act—

- (1) \$2,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2001;
- (2) \$2,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2002;
- (3) \$2,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2003;
- (4) \$2,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2004; and
- (5) \$2,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2005.

(b) **OVERSIGHT ACCOUNTABILITY AND ADMINISTRATION.**—Not more than 3 percent of the amount authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a) for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005 shall be available to the Attorney General for studying the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the provisions of this Act, and assuring compliance with the provisions of this Act and for administrative costs to carry out the purposes of this Act. The Attorney General shall establish and execute an oversight plan for monitoring the activities of grant recipients. Such sums are to remain available until expended.

(c) **TECHNOLOGY ASSISTANCE.**—The Attorney General shall reserve 1 percent in each of fiscal years 2001 through 2003 of the amount authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a) for use by the National Institute of Justice in assisting local units to identify, select, develop, modernize, and purchase new technologies for use by law enforcement.

(d) **AVAILABILITY.**—The amounts authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a) shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 4. QUALIFICATION FOR PAYMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director shall issue regulations establishing procedures under which a unit of local government is required to provide notice to the Director regarding the proposed use of funds made available under this Act.

(b) **PROGRAM REVIEW.**—The Director shall establish a process for the ongoing evaluation of projects developed with funds made available under this Act.

(c) **GENERAL REQUIREMENTS FOR QUALIFICATION.**—A unit of local government qualifies for a payment under this Act for a payment period only if the unit of local government submits an application to the Director and establishes, to the satisfaction of the Director, that—

(1) the unit of local government has established a local advisory board that—

(A) includes, but is not limited to, a representative from—

- (i) the local police department or local sheriff's department;
- (ii) the local prosecutor's office;
- (iii) the local court system;
- (iv) the local public school system; and
- (v) a local nonprofit, educational, religious, or community group active in crime prevention or drug use prevention or treatment;

(B) has reviewed the application; and

(C) is designated to make nonbinding recommendations to the unit of local government for the use of funds received under this Act;

(2) the chief executive officer of the State has had not less than 20 days to review and comment on the application prior to submission to the Director;

(3)(A) the unit of local government will establish a trust fund in which the government will deposit all payments received under this Act; and

(B) the unit of local government will use amounts in the trust fund (including interest) during a period not to exceed 2 years from the date the first grant payment is made to the unit of local government;

(4) the unit of local government will expend the payments received in accordance with the laws and procedures that are applicable to the expenditure of revenues of the unit of local government;

(5) the unit of local government will use accounting, audit, and fiscal procedures that conform to guidelines which shall be prescribed by the Director after consultation with the Comptroller General and as applicable, amounts received under this Act shall be audited in compliance with the Single Audit Act of 1984;

(6) after reasonable notice from the Director or the Comptroller General to the unit of local government, the unit of local government will make available to the Director and the Comptroller General, with the right to inspect, records that the Director reasonably requires to review compliance with this Act or that the Comptroller General reasonably requires to review compliance and operation;

(7) a designated official of the unit of local government shall make reports the Director reasonably requires, in addition to the annual reports required under this Act;

(8) the unit of local government will spend the funds made available under this Act only for the purposes set forth in section 2(a)(2);

(9) the unit of local government will achieve a net gain in the number of law enforcement officers who perform nonadministrative public safety service if such unit uses funds received under this Act to increase the number of law enforcement officers as described under subparagraph (A) of section 2(a)(2);

(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 2(a)(2), or any crime prevention programs that are established under subparagraphs (C) and (E) of section 2(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 or program; and

(C) will submit an annual written assessment report to the Director; and

(11) the unit of local government has established procedures to give members of the Armed Forces who, on or after October 1, 1990, were or are selected for involuntary separation (as described in section 1141 of title 10, United States Code), approved for separation under section 1174a or 1175 of such title, or retired pursuant to the authority provided under section 4403 of the Defense Conversion, Reinvestment, and Transition Assistance Act of 1992 (division D of Public Law 102-484; 10 U.S.C. 1293 note), a suitable preference in the employment of persons as additional law enforcement officers or support personnel using funds made available under this Act. The nature and extent of such employment preference shall be jointly established by the Attorney General and the Secretary of Defense. To the extent practicable, the Director shall endeavor to inform members who were separated between October 1, 1990, and the date of the enactment of this section of their eligibility for the employment preference;

(d) **SANCTIONS FOR NONCOMPLIANCE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Director determines that a unit of local government has not complied substantially with the requirements or regulations prescribed under subsections (a) and (c), the Director shall notify the unit of local government that if the unit of local government does not take corrective action within 60 days of such notice, the Director will withhold additional payments to the unit of local government for the current and future payment periods until the Director is satisfied that the unit of local government—

(A) has taken the appropriate corrective action; and

(B) will comply with the requirements and regulations prescribed under subsections (a) and (c).

(2) **NOTICE.**—Before giving notice under paragraph (1), the Director shall give the chief executive officer of the unit of local government reasonable notice and an opportunity for comment.

(e) **MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT REQUIREMENT.**—A unit of local government qualifies for a payment under this Act for a payment period only if the unit's expenditures on law enforcement services (as reported by the Bureau of the Census) for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year in which the payment period occurs were not less than 90 percent of the unit's expenditures on such services for the second fiscal year preceding the fiscal year in which the payment period occurs.

SEC. 5. ALLOCATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.

(a) **STATE SET-ASIDE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Of the total amounts appropriated for this Act for each payment period, the Director shall allocate for units of local government in each State an amount that bears the same ratio to such total as the average annual number of part 1 violent crimes reported by such State to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the 3 most recent calendar years for which such data is available, bears to the number of part 1 violent crimes reported by all States to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for such years.

(2) **MINIMUM REQUIREMENT.**—Each State shall receive not less than .25 percent of the total amounts appropriated under section 3 under this subsection for each payment period.

(3) **PROPORTIONAL REDUCTION.**—If amounts available to carry out paragraph (2) for any payment period are insufficient to pay in full the total payment that any State is otherwise eligible to receive under paragraph (1) for such period, then the Director shall reduce payments under paragraph (1) for such payment period to the extent of such insufficiency. Reductions under the preceding sentence shall be allocated among the States (other than States whose payment is determined under paragraph (2)) in the same proportions as amounts would be allocated under paragraph (1) without regard to paragraph (2).

(b) **LOCAL DISTRIBUTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—From the amount reserved for each State under subsection (a), the Director shall allocate—

(A) among reporting units of local government the reporting units' share of such reserved amount, and

(B) among nonreporting units of local government the nonreporting units' share of the reserved amount.

(2) **AMOUNTS.**—

(A) The reporting units' share of the reserved amount is the amount equal to the product of such reserved amount multiplied by the percentage which the population living in reporting units of local government in the State bears to the population of all units of local government in the State.

(B) The nonreporting units' share of the reserved amount is the reserved amount reduced by the reporting units' share of the reserved amount.

(3) **ALLOCATION TO EACH REPORTING UNIT.**—From the reporting units' share of the reserved amount for each State under subsection (a), the Director shall allocate to each reporting unit of local government an amount which bears the same ratio to such share as the average annual number of part 1 violent crimes reported by such unit to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the 3 most recent calendar years for which such data is available bears to the number of part 1 violent crimes reported by all units of local government in the State in which the unit is located to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for such years.

(4) **ALLOCATION TO EACH NONREPORTING UNIT.**—From the nonreporting units' share of the reserved amount for each State under subsection (a), the Director shall allocate to each nonreporting unit of local government an amount which bears the same ratio to such share as the average number of part 1 violent crimes of like governmental units in the same population class as such unit bears to the average annual imputed number of part 1 violent crimes of all nonreporting units in the State for the 3 most recent calendar years.

(5) **LIMITATION ON ALLOCATIONS.**—A unit of local government shall not receive an allocation which exceeds 100 percent of such unit's expenditures on law enforcement services as reported by the Bureau of the Census for the most recent fiscal year. Any amount in excess of 100 percent of such unit's expenditures on law enforcement services shall be distributed proportionally among units of local government whose allocation does not exceed 100 percent of expenditures on law enforcement services.

(6) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) The term 'reporting unit of local government' means any unit of local government that reported part 1 violent crimes to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the 3

most recent calendar years for which such data is available.

(B) The term 'nonreporting unit of local government' means any unit of local government which is not a reporting unit of local government.

(C)(i) The term 'like governmental units' means any like unit of local government as defined by the Secretary of Commerce for general statistical purposes, and means—

(I) all counties are treated as like governmental units;

(II) all cities are treated as like governmental units;

(III) all townships are treated as like governmental units.

(ii) Similar rules shall apply to other types of governmental units.

(D) The term 'same population class' means a like unit within the same population category as another like unit with the categories determined as follows:

(i) 0 through 9,999.

(ii) 10,000 through 49,999.

(iii) 50,000 through 149,999.

(iv) 150,000 through 299,999.

(v) 300,000 or more.

(7) **LOCAL GOVERNMENTS WITH ALLOCATIONS OF LESS THAN \$10,000.**—If under paragraph (3) or (4) a unit of local government is allotted less than \$10,000 for the payment period, the amount allotted shall be transferred to the chief executive officer of the State who shall distribute such funds among State police departments that provide law enforcement services to units of local government and units of local government whose allotment is less than such amount in a manner which reduces crime and improves public safety.

(8) **SPECIAL RULES.**—

(A) If a unit of local government in a State that has been incorporated since the date of the collection of the data used by the Director in making allocations pursuant to this section, such unit shall be treated as a nonreporting unit of local government for purposes of this subsection.

(B) If a unit of local government in the State has been annexed since the date of the collection of the data used by the Director in making allocations pursuant to this section, the Director shall pay the amount that would have been allocated to such unit of local government to the unit of local government that annexed it.

(9) **RESOLUTION OF DISPARATE ALLOCATIONS.**—(A) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, if—

(i) the attorney general of a State certifies that a unit of local government under the jurisdiction of the State bears more than 50 percent of the costs of prosecution or incarceration that arise with respect to part 1 violent crimes reported by a specified geographically constituent unit of local government, and

(ii) but for this paragraph, the amount of funds allocated under this section to—

(I) any one such specified geographically constituent unit of local government exceeds 200 percent of the amount allocated to the unit of local government certified pursuant to clause (i), or

(II) more than one such specified geographically constituent unit of local government (excluding units of local government referred to subclause I and in paragraph (7)), exceeds 400 percent of the amount allocated to the unit of local government certified pursuant to clause (i) and the attorney general of the State determines that such allocation is likely to threaten the efficient administration of justice,

then in order to qualify for payment under this Act, the unit of local government certified pursuant to clause (i), together with any such specified geographically con-

stituent units of local government described in clause (ii), shall submit to the Director a joint application for the aggregate of funds allocated to such units of local government. Such application shall specify the amount of such funds that are to be distributed to each of the units of local government and the purposes for which such funds are to be used. The units of local government involved may establish a joint local advisory board for the purposes of carrying out this paragraph.

(B) In this paragraph, the term "geographically constituent unit of local government" means a unit of local government that has jurisdiction over areas located within the boundaries of an area over which a unit of local government certified pursuant to clause (i) has jurisdiction.

(c) **UNAVAILABILITY AND INACCURACY OF INFORMATION.**—

(1) **DATA FOR STATES.**—For purposes of this section, if data regarding part 1 violent crimes in any State for the 3 most recent calendar years is unavailable or substantially inaccurate, the Director shall utilize the best available comparable data regarding the number of violent crimes for such years for such State for the purposes of allocation of any funds under this Act.

(2) **POSSIBLE INACCURACY OF DATA 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 for such unit of local government.

SEC. 6. UTILIZATION OF PRIVATE SECTOR.

Funds or a portion of funds allocated under this Act may be utilized to contract with private, nonprofit entities or community-based organizations to carry out the purposes specified under section 2(a)(2).

SEC. 7. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—A unit of local government expending payments under this Act shall hold not less than 1 public hearing on the proposed use of the payment from the Director in relation to its entire budget.

(b) **VIEWS.**—At the hearing, persons shall be given an opportunity to provide written and oral views to the unit of local government authority responsible for enacting the budget and to ask questions about the entire budget and the relation of the payment from the Director to the entire budget.

(c) **TIME AND PLACE.**—The unit of local government shall hold the hearing at a time and place that allows and encourages public attendance and participation.

SEC. 8. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

The administrative provisions of part H of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, shall apply to this Act and for purposes of this section any reference in such provisions to title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 shall be deemed to be a reference to this Act.

SEC. 9. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act:

(1) The term "unit of local government" means—

(A) a county, township, city, or political subdivision of a county, township, or city, that is a unit of local government as determined by the Secretary of Commerce for general statistical purposes; and

(B) the District of Columbia and the recognized governing body of an Indian tribe or Alaskan Native village that carries out substantial governmental duties and powers.

(2) The term "payment period" means each 1-year period beginning on October 1 of any

year in which a grant under this Act is awarded.

(3) The term "State" means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands.

(4) The term "juvenile" means an individual who is 17 years of age or younger.

(5) The term "part 1 violent crimes" means murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault as reported to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for purposes of the Uniform Crime Reports.

(6) The term "Director" means the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4999.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Local Government Law Enforcement Act of 2000 represents an important step by this Congress to assist local governments throughout the country as they confront crime. In stark contrast to the 1994 Crime Act, it does so without prescribing the specific programs localities must implement in order to receive funding.

This bill provides resources to localities to respond to their unique crime problems with their own unique solutions.

The text of H.R. 4999 is nearly identical to the reauthorization passed by the House of Representatives in February of 1995. There are two differences between this bill and the previous reauthorization.

First of all, the previous reauthorization as passed sought to repeal the COPS program. This bill does not do that.

□ 1645

It authorizes the block grants without in any way affecting the COPS. That is one difference. The second difference is that under the previous reauthorization and this bill, both include a 10 percent local match requirement, whereby the Federal share may not exceed 90 percent of the cost of a program proposed funding under the act. However, only H.R. 4999 includes a waiver exception in cases of financial hardship. Therefore, a unit can have its matching requirement waived upon a showing of financial hardship.

We should make no mistake that this bill will provide money for our law enforcement fighting efforts with greater

flexibility to the vast majority of localities throughout America. Those who argue that this money will be wasted are completely wrong. This is not a grant program for police chiefs like the old Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. This is a grant program that assists communities in addressing their crime problems. It does so through a highly visible process involving all the major law enforcement, judicial and private sector voices in the community. There is a role for the Federal Government to assist the States in the fight against crime, but such assistance must appreciate that the problems vary from State to State and community to community. We must avoid a one-size-fits-all approach, even as we reject micromanagement support from Washington that comes at the expense of flexibility.

The act leaves to local governments the decisions regarding what their funding priorities should be. It neither requires that funds be spent on police officers nor on prevention programs. It leaves that decision to local governments who understand their crime problems far better than we do. Under this bill, localities can fund police on the beat or prevention activities or anything in between. The act simply requires that those funds be used to reduce crime and improve public safety.

I will not go through all the different sections of the bill, Mr. Speaker; but I believe that the Local Government Law Enforcement Act is an important way for the Federal Government to assist localities in dealing with crime without getting in their way. It is a rejection of the "Washington knows best" mind-set and it provides more resources for the counties, cities, and towns of America to develop home-grown solutions to their unique crime problems.

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise not only to express my support for H.R. 4999 but also to express my disappointment that the bill under consideration on the floor today is being considered without committee consideration. Among the constructive purposes authorized in the bill are the hiring, training, and equipping of police and other law enforcement personnel and the establishment of crime prevention, early intervention, and drug court programs. The bill specifically contains prohibitions on buying things like tanks, airplanes, yachts, and limousines which could have been purchased under some of the former programs that the gentleman from Arkansas referenced.

While I support the reauthorization contained in the bill, I had hoped that we would be looking at a program at the committee level along with other important law enforcement programs such as the Community Oriented Policing Services program, better known as the COPS program. The COPS program

has been very successful and considered to be a vital contributor to the success of local communities in bringing down the crime rate all across the country.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER), a member of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime introduced an authorization bill for the COPS program which had the support of the administration and a significant number of other Members of the House. I know that the law enforcement community which strongly supports the Weiner bill would have preferred to see both of these matters taken up in committee with both coming to the floor for an authorization based on a full assessment of their value to the local communities. Unfortunately, that did not happen and here we are with just this part of the bill.

But before closing, Mr. Speaker, I would want to thank the gentleman from Arkansas for accommodating the concerns of the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) involving the formula for the appropriation. Inadvertently, the bill that we were to bring to the floor had an outdated allocation for Guam, but the bill before us now includes the updated allocation. Thanks to the alertness and effectiveness of the gentleman from Guam, we were able to correct this oversight.

Mr. Speaker, although the bill does not contain the COPS program, I support the bill because it includes authorization for valuable, effective crime prevention initiatives which will be developed on the local level. I urge my colleagues to vote aye on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just wanted to thank the gentleman from Virginia for his comments in support of this legislation. I also just wanted to remark that the gentleman from Virginia has certainly been an ardent worker in the issues of crime, both in his work on the subcommittee but also I have attended numerous hearings across the country with him and he has certainly devoted himself to this issue. The gentleman raised the issue of the COPS program, Community Oriented Policing Services program. We have held hearings in committee. It is true that we have not moved forward the bill to reauthorize his program, but as the gentleman knows, there has been some concern expressed about the effectiveness of the program. It was originally planned as a program with a fixed end to it. And so I think it is appropriate, just expressing my view, that at this juncture we wait until the next administration, wherever that might take us, to see exactly where we are going to go on that particular issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER), who has done an extraordinary job in pushing this legislation. Without his leadership

on this issue, I do not think we would be here today talking about this.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) for yielding me this time, and I certainly thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for his support of this. I also want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) for all the work that he has done on this and the Subcommittee on Crime and the staff there that has done a lot of work on this.

As it stands right now, we have had a program similar to this instituted; it has been through the appropriations. We have never had it fully authorized. We passed a bill similar to this or it was passed in Congress before I was here, at least on the House but never on the Senate side. So we are hoping very much that we can get this bill fully authorized, fully passed to authorize this program with the appropriate changes that have been made here.

First of all, it allocates \$2 billion a year for the fiscal years 2001 through 2005. We also understand as far as the improvements, they have already been mentioned, these as far as providing block grants back to local law enforcement agencies, it ensures that those communities, those poor communities that are not able to meet that match requirement previously will not be precluded from getting these block grants because of a waiver that we have instituted. I know this is going to be particularly helpful for our State of Kentucky. We have several communities that may need certain items for safety or police officers or other crime prevention programs, and yet they may not be able to meet that 10 percent match sometimes. So in those hardship cases, they are able to receive this grant which previously was unavailable to them. We are glad that that change was able to be instituted.

Why have we had so much emphasis on crime? I am glad to say that over the last 8 years we have seen a decrease in crime in this country, but if we look back as early as 1960, from 1960 or 1964 up to 1991, 1992, we had a 600 percent increase in crime in this country, a tremendous increase in crime. Seventy to 80 percent of all families were affected by crime, many types of crimes. Certainly it has affected our region.

I reference an article we had recently in Lexington, Kentucky, where we have particular needs. I think it points out the diversity of communities and the diverse needs communities have where it says the crime in Lexington increased in 1999 and that probably happened in other communities around the country. We can see from the diversity of problems that we have across the Nation that a plan that implements just a one-size-fits-all is not best for particular communities.

I think, clearly, the Federal Government certainly has a role; but the best crime prevention needs to come locally where they understand the particular

problems that they have. That is what makes this program so effective and really so popular among law enforcement agencies and other institutions that work to prevent and reduce crime.

In Kentucky, we have already received \$4.2 million in grants from this program. Almost \$1 million has gone to our State police in Kentucky. Over half a million has gone to my district alone. In these we have used funds to hire police and to pay overtime. We have used the funds to purchase other law enforcement equipment and increased the technology that allows them to more effectively prevent and detect crimes. And we have used it to establish crime prevention programs that otherwise would not be able to be afforded or be available for the communities. So it is very important.

I am certainly pleased that we have a tremendous amount of bipartisan support on this bill, the approach to reduce crime by ensuring that we provide flexibility to local law enforcement agencies and organizations and that we understand that we can bring certainly the priority of crime prevention from the Federal level but many of the decisions need to be made at the local level to ensure that we do effectively fight crime, reduce crime in this country, and make this a safer Nation for all people. I encourage everyone to vote for this bill.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4999, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERIODIC REPORT ON TELECOMMUNICATIONS PAYMENTS MADE TO CUBA PURSUANT TO TREASURY DEPARTMENT SPECIFIC LICENSES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 1705(e)(6) of the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992, 22 U.S.C. 6004(e)(6), as amended by section 102(g) of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996, Public Law 104-114, 110 Stat. 785, I transmit herewith a semiannual report detailing payments made to Cuba as a result of the provision of telecommuni-

cations services pursuant to Department of the Treasury specific licenses.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 19, 2000.

□ 1700

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4577, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees on the bill (H.R. 4577) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COBURN moves that the managers on the part of the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 4577, be instructed to recede to Section 517 of the Senate Amendment to the House bill, prohibiting the use of funds to distribute postcoital emergency contraception (the morning-after pill) to minors on the premises or in the facilities of any elementary or secondary school.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair, who has the right to close on this debate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma has the right to close.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this motion to instruct is to bring the House in line with the Senate's vote on this very issue, and we are going to hear a broad debate this evening about the pros and cons of postcontraception, but that is not what I think this debate is. I think the debate is whether or not parents ought to be made or allowed to be involved in significant decisions of their children, and what we are doing now in 180 schools in this country is excepting out parents from a decision that they need to know about, excepting out parents and the child's physician from a medical decision that is being made for that individual.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I ask, as we await some other Members who are a little better informed on this than I, I did have some questions for the gentleman from