TO: Rahm

FROM: Bruce

RE: Police Corps Voting Records

The House has voted twice in recent years on whether to include the Police Corps in the Crime Bill. In October 1991, a McCurdy amendment passed with broad bipartisan support, 369-51. In April 1994, a McCurdy amendment passed 250-174.

The voting records of key targets are attached. The central facts to know are:

* 49 of 58 Dems who voted No on the rule supported the Police Corps in 1994. 56 of 58 have supported it at least once.

* The CBC supported the Police Corps 27-8 in 1994, with 2 members not present. 31 of 37 have supported it at least once.

* Among Republicans, 8 of 11 who supported us on the rule have supported the Police Corps at least once in the past. 15 of 19 who supported AW but voted No on the rule have supported Police Corps at least once. Overall, 44 of the 65 Republicans who supported the Crime Bill in April have supported the Police Corps at least once in the past.

* Newt Gingrich, Bob Michel, and Henry Hyde have been consistent supporters of the Police Corps, voting for McCurdy's amendments in 1991 and 1994. Michel was an original cosponsor in 1994.

* John Lewis is a longtime supporter of the Police Corps.

POLICE CORPS VOTING RECORD
58 Democrats Who Voted No on Rule

McCURDY AMENDMENT, 4/20/94

Yes (49)	No (8)	NV (1)
Barcia	Clay**	Washington
Boucher	Hall(TX)**	
Brewster	Hilliard	
Browder	Smith (IA)**	
Chapman	Stokes**	
Cooper	Tauzin**	
Costello	Williams**	
Danner	Wilson**	
DeFazio		
Deal		
Fields (LA)		
Geren		
Hamilton		
Hayes		
Holden		
Klink		
LaRocco		
Lancaster		
Laughlin		
Lewis (GA)		
McCurdy		
Mollohan		
Ortiz		
Orton		
Parker		
Payne (VA)		
Peterson (FL)		
Peterson (MN)		
Picket		
Poshard		
Rahall		
Rangel		
Sarpalius		
Scott		
Sisisky		
Skelton		
Stenholm		
Strickland		
Stupak		
Tanner		
Taylor (MS)		
Tejeda		
Thurman		
Unsoeld		
Volkmer		
Waters		
Watt		
Wise		
de la Garza		

** Supported Police Corps amendment, 10/22/91
56 of 58 have supported Police Corps at least once

POLICE CORPS VOTING RECORD
CBC Members

McCURDY AMENDMENT, 4/20/94

Yes (27)	No (8)	NV (2)
Dixon**	Hilliard	Ford
Lewis	Dellums	Washington
Waters	C. Collins	
Tucker	Conyers	
C. Brown	B. Collins**	
Meek	Clay**	
Hastings	E. B. Johnson	
Bishop	Stokes**	
McKinney		
Rush		
Reynolds		
Thompson		
Jefferson**		
Fields		
Wynn		
Mfume**		
Wheat**		
D. Payne**		
Flake**		
Towns**		
Owens**		
Rangel**		
Clayton		
Watt		
Blackwell		
Clyburn		
Scott		

** Supported Police Corps amendment, 10/22/91

31 of 37 have supported Police Corps at least once

POLICE CORPS VOTING RECORD

Republicans Who Voted Yes on Rule

McCURDY AMENDMENT, 4/20/94

Yes (4)	No (7)
Meyers**	Shays**
Morella**	Johnson**
Roukema**	Blute
Houghton**	Ramstad**
	Boehlert**
	Grandy
	Quinn

** Supported Police Corps amendment, 10/22/91

8 of 11 have supported Police Corps at least once

POLICE CORPS VOTING RECORD

Republican Targets Who Voted Yes on Crime Bill, Yes on Assault Weapons Ban, But No on Rule

McCURDY AMENDMENT, 4/20/94

Yes (7)	No (11)	NV (1)
Huffington	B. Franks**	McDade**
Lazio	Gilchrest**	
Leach**	Greenwood	
Machtley	Horn	
Molinari**	Kasich**	
Ros-Lehtinen**	Klug**	
Smith**	Levy	
	Pryce	
	Ridge**	
	Shaw**	
	Young**	

** Supported McCurdy Police Corps amendment, 10/22/91

15 of 19 have supported Police Corps at least once

POLICE CORPS VOTING RECORD

Republicans Who Voted Yes on Crime Bill, No on Assault Weapons, No on Rule

McCURDY AMENDMENT, 4/20/94

Yes (14)	No (21)
Calvert	Cunningham**
Hunter**	McCandless**
Gallegly**	Royce
Diaz-Balart	Franks**
Hastert**	Bilirakis
Bentley**	Canady
Camp**	Mica
Upton**	Fowler
Gilman**	Ewing
Gillmor**	Rogers
Hobson**	Snowe**
Regula**	Torkildsen
Santorum**	Talent
Weldon**	McHugh
	Walsh**
	Ravenel**
	Spence**
	Quillen**
	Sundquist**
	Bonilla
	Roth

** Supported Police Corps amendment, 10/22/91

23 of 37 have supported Police Corps at least once

HOUSE VOTES 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144

137. HR 4092. Omnibus Crime Bill/Pell Grants. Wynn, D-Md., amendment to prohibit awarding Pell Grants to federal, state and local prisoners after Jan. 1, 1996, unless the secretary of Education certifies the grants reduce recidivism, are cost-effective, and the inmates make satisfactory progress toward completion of an education program. Rejected in the Committee of the Whole 162-263: R 15-154; D 146-109 (ND 105-68, SD 41-41); I 1-0, April 20, 1994. A "nay" was a vote in support of the president's position. *(Story, p. 1001)*

138. HR 4092. Omnibus Crime Bill/Police Corps and Scholarships. McCurdy, D-Okla., amendment to authorize $100 million in fiscal 1995 and $250 million in fiscal 1996 for a police corps program that would provide up to $10,000 a year to individuals in return for a four-year commitment to serve in law enforcement, and authorize $30 million in each of fiscal 1995-99 for scholarships to current law enforcement personnel to further their education. Adopted in the Committee of the Whole 250-174: R 44-127; D 205-47 (ND 135-38, SD 70-9); I 1-0, April 20, 1994. A "yea" was a vote in support of the president's position. *(Story, p. 1001)*

139. HR 4092. Omnibus Crime Bill/Private Security Officers. Martinez, D-Calif., amendment to require states to establish minimum standards for background checks and training of private security officers. Rejected in the Committee of the Whole 80-340: R 4-165; D 76-174 (ND 61-110, SD 15-64); I 0-1, April 20, 1994. *(Story, p. 1001)*

140. Procedural Motion. Approval of the House Journal of Wednesday, April 20. Approved 256-161: R 18-154; D 237-7 (ND 161-6, SD 76-1); I 1-0, April 21, 1994.

141. HR 4092. Omnibus Crime Bill/Cocaine Penalty Study. Hughes, D-N.J., amendment to require the U.S. Sentencing Commission to submit a report on sentences with recommendations for the retention or modification of the different penalties for crack vs. powder cocaine. Adopted in the Committee of the Whole 424-0: R 169-0; D 254-0 (ND 174-0, SD 80-0); I 1-0, April 21, 1994. *(Story, p. 1001)*

142. HR 4092. Omnibus Crime Bill/Early Release Education Requirement. Franks, R-N.J., amendment to require prisoners to earn a high school diploma or an equivalent degree before they can be eligible for early release. Adopted in the Committee of the Whole 347-82: R 170-2; D 177-79 (ND 108-67, SD 69-12); I 0-1, April 21, 1994. *(Story, p. 1001)*

143. HR 4092. Omnibus Crime Bill/Motion to Recommit. McCollum, R-Fla., motion to recommit the bill to the Judiciary Committee with instructions to report it back with an amendment to delete the provisions of the bill that allow the use of statistical evidence to demonstrate a significant racially discriminatory pattern to overturn death sentences. Motion rejected 192-235: R 167-5; D 25-229 (ND 9-162, SD 16-67); I 0-1, April 21, 1994. *(Story, p. 1001)*

144. HR 4092. Omnibus Crime Bill/Passage. Passage of the bill to authorize more than $27.5 billion over six years for various anti-crime initiatives, including $13.5 billion for new prisons and more than $7 billion for crime prevention programs. The bill would require life imprisonment for three-time violent offenders, expand the death penalty to apply to dozens of federal crimes and authorize grants to hire 50,000 additional police officers. Passed 285-141: R 65-107; D 219-34 (ND 149-21, SD 70-13); I 1-0, April 21, 1994. A "yea" was a vote in support of the president's position. *(Story, p. 1001)*

KEY

- Y Voted for (yea).
- # Paired for.
- + Announced for.
- N Voted against (nay).
- X Paired against.
- — Announced against.
- P Voted "present."
- C Voted "present" to avoid possible conflict of interest.
- ? Did not vote or otherwise make a position known.
- D Delegates ineligible to vote.

Democrats *Republicans*
Independent

	137	138	139	140	141	142	143	144
ALABAMA								
1 *Callahan*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
2 *Everett*	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
3 Browder	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 Bevill	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
5 Cramer	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
6 *Bachus*	N	N	?	N	Y	Y	Y	N
7 Hilliard	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
ALASKA								
AL *Young*	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
ARIZONA								
1 Coppersmith	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
2 Pastor	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
3 *Stump*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
4 *Kyl*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
5 *Kolbe*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
6 English	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
ARKANSAS								
1 Lambert	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
2 Thornton	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
3 *Hutchinson*	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
4 *Dickey*	N	N	N	N	?	Y	Y	N
CALIFORNIA								
1 Hamburg	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
2 *Herger*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
3 Fazio	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
4 *Doolittle*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
5 Matsui	Y	?	?	Y	Y	N	N	Y
6 Woolsey	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
7 Miller	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
8 Pelosi	Y	Y	N	Y	?	N	N	Y
9 Dellums	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
10 *Baker*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
11 *Pombo*	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
12 Lantos	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
13 Stark	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
14 Eshoo	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
15 Mineta	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
16 Edwards	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
17 Farr	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
18 Condit	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
19 Lehman	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
20 Dooley	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
21 *Thomas*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
22 *Huffington*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
23 *Gallegly*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
24 Beilenson	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
25 *McKeon*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
26 Berman	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
27 *Moorhead*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
28 *Dreier*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
29 Waxman	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
30 Becerra	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
31 Martinez	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
32 Dixon	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
33 Roybal-Allard	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
34 Torres	?	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
35 Waters	+	+	+	+	Y	N	N	N
36 Harman	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
37 Tucker	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
38 *Horn*	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
39 *Royce*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
40 *Lewis*	N	N	N	?	?	?	?	?
41 *Kim*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
42 Brown	?	Y	N	?	Y	N	N	Y
43 *Calvert*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
44 *McCandless*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
45 *Rohrabacher*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
46 *Dornan*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
47 *Cox*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
48 *Packard*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
49 Schenk	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
50 Filner	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
51 *Cunningham*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
52 *Hunter*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
COLORADO								
1 Schroeder	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
2 Skaggs	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
3 *McInnis*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
4 *Allard*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
5 *Hefley*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
6 *Schaefer*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
CONNECTICUT								
1 Kennelly	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
2 Gejdenson	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
3 DeLauro	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
4 *Shays*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
5 *Franks*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 *Johnson*	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
DELAWARE								
AL *Castle*	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
FLORIDA								
1 Hutto	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 Peterson	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
3 Brown	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
4 *Fowler*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 Thurman	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
6 *Stearns*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
7 *Mica*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
8 *McCollum*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
9 *Bilirakis*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
10 *Young*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
11 Gibbons	N	?	?	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
12 *Canady*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
13 *Miller*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
14 *Goss*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
15 Bacchus	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
16 *Lewis*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
17 Meek	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
18 *Ros-Lehtinen*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
19 Johnston	Y	Y	Y	Y	?	Y	N	Y
20 Deutsch	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
21 *Diaz-Balart*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
22 *Shaw*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
23 Hastings	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
GEORGIA								
1 *Kingston*	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
2 Bishop	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
3 *Collins*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
4 *Linder*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
5 Lewis	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
6 *Gingrich*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
7 Darden	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
8 Rowland	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9 Deal	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
10 Johnson	Y	Y	N	?	Y	Y	N	Y
11 McKinney	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
HAWAII								
1 Abercrombie	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
2 Mink	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
IDAHO								
1 LaRocco	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
2 *Crapo*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
ILLINOIS								
1 Rush	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
2 Reynolds	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
3 Lipinski	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 Gutierrez	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
5 Rostenkowski	N	?	?	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
6 *Hyde*	N	Y	?	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
7 Collins	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
8 *Crane*	?	?	?	N	Y	Y	Y	N
9 Yates	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
10 *Porter*	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
11 Sangmeister	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
12 Costello	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
13 *Fawell*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
14 *Hastert*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
15 *Ewing*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
16 *Manzullo*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
17 Evans	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y

ND Northern Democrats SD Southern Democrats

	137	138	139	140	141	142	143	144
18 *Michel*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
19 Poshard	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
20 Durbin	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
INDIANA								
1 Visclosky	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
2 Sharp	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	?	N	Y
3 Roemer	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
4 Long	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
5 *Buyer*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 *Burton*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
7 *Myers*	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
8 McCloskey	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
9 Hamilton	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
10 Jacobs	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
IOWA								
1 *Leach*	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 *Nussle*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
3 *Lightfoot*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
4 Smith	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
5 *Grandy*	X	X	?	?	?	?	?	?
KANSAS								
1 *Roberts*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
2 Slattery	Y	N	?	Y	Y	Y	N	+
3 *Meyers*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 Glickman	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
KENTUCKY								
1 Barlow	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
2 Vacancy								
3 Mazzoli	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
4 *Bunning*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
5 *Rogers*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 Baesler	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
LOUISIANA								
1 *Livingston*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
2 Jefferson	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
3 Touzin	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
4 Fields	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
5 *McCrery*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
6 *Baker*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
7 Hayes	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
MAINE								
1 Andrews	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N
2 *Snowe*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
MARYLAND								
1 *Gilchrest*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 *Bentley*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 Cardin	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
4 Wynn	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
5 Hoyer	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
6 *Bartlett*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
7 Mfume	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
8 *Morella*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
MASSACHUSETTS								
1 Olver	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
2 Neal	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
3 *Blute*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 Frank	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
5 Meehan	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
6 *Torkildsen*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
7 Markey	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
8 Kennedy	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
9 Moakley	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
10 Studds	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
MICHIGAN								
1 Stupak	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
2 *Hoekstra*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
3 *Ehlers*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
4 *Camp*	N	Y	N	N	+	Y	Y	Y
5 Barcia	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 *Upton*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
7 *Smith*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
8 Carr	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
9 Kildee	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
10 Bonior	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
11 *Knollenberg*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
12 Levin	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
13 Ford	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
14 Conyers	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
15 Collins	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
16 Dingell	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
MINNESOTA								
1 Penny	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N
2 Minge	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
3 *Ramstad*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 Vento	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
5 Sabo	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
6 *Grams*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
7 Peterson	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
8 Oberstar	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
MISSISSIPPI								
1 Whitten	?	?	?	?	?	?	N	Y
2 Thompson	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
3 Montgomery	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
4 Parker	N	Y	N	?	Y	Y	N	Y
5 Taylor	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
MISSOURI								
1 Clay	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N
2 *Talent*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 Gephardt	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
4 Skelton	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
5 Wheat	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
6 Danner	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
7 *Hancock*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
8 *Emerson*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
9 Volkmer	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
MONTANA								
AL Williams	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
NEBRASKA								
1 *Bereuter*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
2 Hoagland	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
3 *Barrett*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
NEVADA								
1 Bilbray	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 *Vucanovich*	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
NEW HAMPSHIRE								
1 *Zeliff*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
2 Swett	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
NEW JERSEY								
1 Andrews	N	Y	Y	?	?	?	?	?
2 Hughes	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
3 *Saxton*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
4 *Smith*	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 *Roukema*	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 Pallone	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
7 *Franks*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
8 Klein	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
9 Torricelli	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
10 Payne	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
11 *Gallo*	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
12 *Zimmer*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
13 Menendez	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
NEW MEXICO								
1 *Schiff*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
2 *Skaggs*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
3 Richardson	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
NEW YORK								
1 Hochbrueckner	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
2 *Lazio*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 *King*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
4 *Levy*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 Ackerman	N	Y	?	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
6 Flake	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
7 Manton	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
8 Nadler	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
9 Schumer	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
10 Towns	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
11 Owens	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
12 Velazquez	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
13 *Molinari*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
14 Maloney	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
15 Rangel	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
16 Serrano	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
17 Engel	Y	Y	Y	?	Y	N	N	Y
18 Lowey	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
19 *Fish*	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
20 *Gilman*	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
21 McNulty	#	#	?	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
22 *Solomon*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N
23 *Boehlert*	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
24 *McHugh*	?	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
25 *Walsh*	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
26 Hinchey	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
27 *Paxon*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
28 Slaughter	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
29 LaFalce	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
30 *Quinn*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
31 *Houghton*	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
NORTH CAROLINA								
1 Clayton	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
2 Valentine	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
3 Lancaster	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 Price	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
5 Neal	N	Y	N	?	Y	Y	N	Y
6 *Coble*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
7 Rose	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
8 Hefner	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
9 *McMillan*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
10 *Ballenger*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
11 *Taylor*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
12 Watt	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
NORTH DAKOTA								
AL Pomeroy	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
OHIO								
1 Mann	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
2 *Portman*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
3 Hall	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
4 *Oxley*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
5 *Gillmor*	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
6 Strickland	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
7 *Hobson*	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
8 *Boehner*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
9 Kaptur	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
10 *Hoke*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
11 Stokes	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
12 *Kasich*	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
13 Brown	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
14 Sawyer	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
15 *Pryce*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
16 *Regula*	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
17 Traficant	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
18 Applegate	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
19 Fingerhut	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
OKLAHOMA								
1 *Inhofe*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
2 Synar	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
3 Brewster	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
4 McCurdy	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
5 *Istook*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
6 Vacancy								
OREGON								
1 Furse	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	+
2 *Smith*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
3 Wyden	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
4 DeFazio	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
5 Kopetski	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
PENNSYLVANIA								
1 Foglietta	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
2 Blackwell	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
3 Borski	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
4 Klink	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 *Clinger*	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
6 Holden	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
7 *Weldon*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
8 *Greenwood*	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9 *Shuster*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
10 *McDade*	?	?	?	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
11 Kanjorski	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
12 Murtha	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
13 Margolies-Mezv.	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
14 Coyne	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
15 McHale	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
16 *Walker*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
17 *Gekas*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
18 *Santorum*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
19 *Goodling*	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
20 Murphy	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
21 *Ridge*	N	N	N	N	?	Y	Y	Y
RHODE ISLAND								
1 *Machtley*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 Reed	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
SOUTH CAROLINA								
1 *Ravenel*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 *Spence*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 Derrick	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
4 *Inglis*	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
5 Spratt	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
6 Clyburn	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
SOUTH DAKOTA								
AL Johnson	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
TENNESSEE								
1 *Quillen*	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 *Duncan*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
3 Lloyd	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 Cooper	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
5 Clement	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
6 Gordon	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
7 *Sundquist*	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
8 Tanner	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9 Ford	Y	?	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
TEXAS								
1 Chapman	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
2 Wilson	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
3 *Johnson, Sam*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
4 Hall	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
5 Bryant	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
6 *Barton*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
7 *Archer*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
8 *Fields*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
9 Brooks	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
10 Pickle	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
11 Edwards	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
12 Geren	N	Y	?	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
13 Sarpalius	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
14 Laughlin	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
15 de la Garza	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
16 Coleman	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
17 Stenholm	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
18 Washington	Y	?	?	?	?	?	N	N
19 *Combest*	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
20 Gonzalez	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
21 *Smith*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
22 *DeLay*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
23 *Bonilla*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
24 Frost	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
25 Andrews	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
26 *Armey*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
27 Ortiz	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
28 Tejeda	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
29 Green	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
30 Johnson, E.B.	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
UTAH								
1 *Hansen*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
2 Shepherd	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
3 Orton	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
VERMONT								
AL *Sanders*	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
VIRGINIA								
1 *Bateman*	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
2 Pickett	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 Scott	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
4 Sisisky	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 Payne	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
6 *Goodlatte*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
7 *Bliley*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
8 Moran	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
9 Boucher	N	Y	N	?	Y	Y	N	Y
10 *Wolf*	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
11 Byrne	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
WASHINGTON								
1 Cantwell	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
2 Swift	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
3 Unsoeld	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
4 Inslee	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
5 Foley								Y
6 Dicks	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
7 McDermott	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
8 *Dunn*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
9 Kreidler	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
WEST VIRGINIA								
1 Mollohan	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
2 Wise	Y	Y	N	?	Y	Y	N	Y
3 Rahall	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
WISCONSIN								
1 Barca	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
2 *Klug*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 *Gunderson*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
4 Kleczka	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
5 Barrett	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
6 *Petri*	?	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
7 Obey	N	Y	N	Y	?	Y	N	Y
8 *Roth*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
9 *Sensenbrenner*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
WYOMING								
AL *Thomas*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
DELEGATES								
de Lugo, V.I.	Y	Y	Y	D	Y	N	D	D
Faleomavaega, Am.S.	Y	Y	Y	D	Y	Y	D	D
Norton, D.C.	Y	Y	Y	D	Y	N	D	D
Romero-B., P.R.	Y	Y	N	D	Y	Y	D	D
Underwood, Guam	Y	N	Y	D	Y	N	D	D

Southern states - Ala., Ark., Flo., Ga., Ky., La., Miss., N.C., Okla., S.C., Tenn., Texas, Va.
Omitted votes ore quorum calls, which CQ does not include in its vate charts.

HOUSE VOTES 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325

318. HR 3371. Omnibus Crime Bill/Assault Weapons. Volkmer, D-Mo., amendment to strike the provisions that prohibit the ownership or sale of 13 types of semi-automatic assault weapons. The amendment would also delete provisions that make it illegal to own or sell ammunition clips of more than seven rounds. Adopted 247-177: R 133-29; D 114-147 (ND 53-124, SD 61-23); I 0-1, Oct. 17, 1991.

319. HR 3371. Omnibus Crime Bill/Federal Funds for Habeas Corpus. Hyde, R-Ill., amendment to allow states to use federal funds for prosecutors to respond to death row habeas corpus appeals and require that an amount equal to the federal funding that helps death row prisoners pursue such appeals be available for prosecutors. Adopted 281-137: R 158-2; D 123-134 (ND 62-111, SD 61-23); I 0-1, Oct. 17, 1991.

320. HR 3371. Omnibus Crime Bill/Search and Seizure. McCollum, R-Fla., amendment to codify the "good faith" exception to the exclusionary rule that allows evidence seized without a warrant but under an objectively reasonable belief that the search was in conformity with the Fourth Amendment to be used against a defendant. Adopted 247-165: R 156-3; D 91-161 (ND 38-132, SD 53-29); I 0-1, Oct. 17, 1991. A "yea" was a vote supporting the president's position.

321. HR 3371. Omnibus Crime Bill/Bureau of Justice Assistance Formula Grants. Schiff, R-N.M., amendment to change the permanent extension of the 25 percent state match for Bureau of Justice Assistance formula grants in the bill to a one-year extension and require a 50 percent state match after 1992. Rejected 129-286: R 125-33; D 4-252 (ND 2-172, SD 2-80); I 0-1, Oct. 22, 1991.

322. HR 3371. Omnibus Crime Bill/Race-Based Sentencing. McCollum, R-Fla., amendment to replace the provisions that would allow minorities to challenge a death sentence as discriminatory if statistics show a disproportionate number of their race being condemned to die, with provisions that would prohibit considering race in determining a defendant's sentence and using statistics to invalidate a sentence. Adopted 223-191: R 150-6; D 73-184 (ND 26-149, SD 47-35); I 0-1, Oct. 22, 1991. A "yea" was a vote supporting the president's position.

323. HR 3371. Omnibus Crime Bill/'Drug-Free Zones'. Clement, D-Tenn., amendment to establish "drug-free zones" around truck stops and highway rest areas. Adopted 371-48: R 158-0; D 213-47 (ND 139-38, SD 74-9); I 0-1, Oct. 22, 1991.

324. HR 3371. Omnibus Crime Bill/Race-Based Sentencing. Hyde, R-Ill., amendment to strike the provisions that allow death row prisoners to raise certain race-bias claims in habeas corpus appeals. Adopted 238-180: R 151-8; D 87-171 (ND 33-144, SD 54-27); I 0-1, Oct. 22, 1991. A "yea" was a vote supporting the president's position.

325. HR 3371. Omnibus Crime Bill/Police Corps Program. McCurdy, D-Okla., amendment to establish a Police Corps program that provides a federal college scholarship of up to $10,000 per year in return for a four-year commitment to serve in a state or local police force. Adopted 369-51: R 129-32; D 239-19 (ND 159-18, SD 80-1); I 1-0, Oct. 22, 1991.

KEY

- Y Voted for (yea).
- # Paired for.
- + Announced for.
- N Voted against (nay).
- X Paired against.
- - Announced against.
- P Voted "present."
- C Voted "present" to avoid possible conflict of interest.
- ? Did not vote or otherwise make a position known.

Democrats **Republicans** *Independent*

	318	319	320	321	322	323	324	325
ALABAMA								
1 *Callahan*	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
2 *Dickinson*	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 Browder	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 Bevill	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 Cramer	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 Erdreich	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
7 Harris	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
ALASKA								
AL *Young*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
ARIZONA								
1 *Rhodes*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 Pastor	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
3 *Stump*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
4 *Kyl*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 *Kolbe*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
ARKANSAS								
1 Alexander	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
2 Thornton	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
3 *Hammerschmidt*	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 Anthony	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
CALIFORNIA								
1 *Riggs*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 *Herger*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 Matsui	N	?	?	N	N	Y	N	Y
4 Fazio	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
5 Pelosi	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
6 Boxer	N	N	?	N	N	Y	N	Y
7 Miller	N	N	N	?	N	Y	N	N
8 Dellums	N	N	N	X	X	?	X	?
9 Stark	N	?	?	N	N	Y	N	Y
10 Edwards	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
11 Lantos	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
12 *Campbell*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
13 Mineta	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
14 *Doolittle*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
15 Condit	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
16 Panetta	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
17 Dooley	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
18 Lehman	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
19 *Lagomarsino*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
20 *Thomas*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
21 *Gallegly*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
22 *Moorhead*	Y	Y	Y	Y	?	?	?	?
23 Beilenson	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
24 Waxman	X	?	?	N	N	N	N	Y
25 Roybal	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
26 Berman	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
27 Levine	X	?	?	N	N	Y	N	Y
28 Dixon	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
29 Waters	N	N	N	?	X	?	X	?
30 Martinez	?	?	?	N	N	Y	N	Y
31 Dymally	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
32 Anderson	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
33 *Dreier*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
34 Torres	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
35 *Lewis*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
36 Brown	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
37 *McCandless*	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
38 *Dornan*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
39 *Dannemeyer*	Y	?	+	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
40 *Cox*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
41 *Lowery*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
42 *Rohrabacher*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
43 *Packard*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
44 *Cunningham*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
45 *Hunter*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
COLORADO								
1 Schroeder	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
2 Skaggs	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
3 Campbell	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
4 *Allard*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
5 *Hefley*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 *Schaefer*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
CONNECTICUT								
1 Kennelly	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
2 Gejdenson	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
3 DeLauro	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
4 *Shays*	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
5 *Franks*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 *Johnson*	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
DELAWARE								
AL Carper	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
FLORIDA								
1 Hutto	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 Peterson	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
3 Bennett	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
4 *James*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
5 *McCollum*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 *Stearns*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
7 Gibbons	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
8 *Young*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
9 *Bilirakis*	Y	Y	Y	Y	#	?	#	?
10 *Ireland*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
11 Bacchus	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
12 *Lewis*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
13 *Goss*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
14 Johnston	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
15 *Shaw*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
16 Smith	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
17 Lehman	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
18 *Ros-Lehtinen*	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
19 Fascell	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
GEORGIA								
1 Thomas	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 Hatcher	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 Ray	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 Jones	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
5 Lewis	N	N	N	N	N	N	?	?
6 *Gingrich*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
7 Darden	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
8 Rowland	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
9 Jenkins	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
10 Barnard	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
HAWAII								
1 Abercrombie	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
2 Mink	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
IDAHO								
1 LaRocco	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
2 Stallings	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
ILLINOIS								
1 Hayes	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
2 Savage	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
3 Russo	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 Sangmeister	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 Lipinski	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 *Hyde*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
7 Collins	N	N	N	?	?	?	?	?
8 Rostenkowski	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
9 Yates	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
10 *Porter*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
11 Annunzio	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
12 *Crane*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
13 *Fawell*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
14 *Hastert*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
15 *Ewing*	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
16 Cox	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
17 Evans	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
18 *Michel*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
19 Bruce	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
20 Durbin	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
21 Costello	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
22 Poshard	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
INDIANA								
1 Visclosky	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
2 Sharp	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
3 Roemer	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y

ND Northern Democrats SD Southern Democrats

	318	319	320	321	322	323	324	325
4 Long	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
5 Jontz	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
6 *Burton*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
7 *Myers*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
8 McCloskey	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
9 Hamilton	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
10 Jacobs	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
IOWA								
1 *Leach*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 *Nussle*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 Nagle	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
4 Smith	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
5 *Lightfoot*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 *Grandy*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
KANSAS								
1 *Roberts*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
2 Slattery	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
3 *Meyers*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 Glickman	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
5 *Nichols*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
KENTUCKY								
1 Hubbard	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 Natcher	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
3 Mazzoli	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
4 *Bunning*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 *Rogers*	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 *Hopkins*	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
7 Perkins	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
LOUISIANA								
1 *Livingston*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 Jefferson	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
3 Tauzin	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 *McCrery*	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 Huckaby	#	?	?	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 *Baker*	Y	Y	Y	#	#	?	#	Y
7 Hayes	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
8 *Holloway*	#	?	?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MAINE								
1 Andrews	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
2 *Snowe*	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
MARYLAND								
1 *Gilchrest*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 *Bentley*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 Cardin	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
4 McMillen	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
5 Hoyer	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
6 Byron	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
7 Mfume	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
8 *Morella*	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
MASSACHUSETTS								
1 Olver	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
2 Neal	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
3 Early	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
4 Frank	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
5 Atkins	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
6 Mavroules	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
7 Markey	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
8 Kennedy	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
9 Moakley	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
10 Studds	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
11 Donnelly	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
MICHIGAN								
1 Conyers	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
2 *Pursell*	N	Y	Y	N	?	Y	Y	Y
3 Wolpe	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
4 *Upton*	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 *Henry*	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 Carr	Y	?	?	N	N	Y	N	Y
7 Kildee	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
8 Traxler	Y	Y	?	N	N	Y	N	Y
9 *Vander Jagt*	Y	?	?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
10 *Camp*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
11 *Davis*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
12 Bonior	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
13 Collins	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
14 Hertel	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
15 Ford	Y	?	?	N	N	N	N	Y
16 Dingell	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N
17 Levin	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
18 *Broomfield*	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
MINNESOTA								
1 Penny	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
2 *Weber*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 *Ramstad*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 Vento	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y
5 Sabo	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
6 Sikorski	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
7 Peterson	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
8 Oberstar	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
MISSISSIPPI								
1 Whitten	Y	Y	?	N	Y	Y	P	Y
2 Espy	Y	N	N	?	?	?	N	Y
3 Montgomery	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 Parker	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 Taylor	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MISSOURI								
1 Clay	-	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
2 Ham	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
3 Gephardt	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
4 Skelton	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 Wheat	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
6 *Coleman*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
7 *Hancock*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
8 *Emerson*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9 Volkmer	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
MONTANA								
1 Williams	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
2 *Marlenee*	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
NEBRASKA								
1 *Bereuter*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 Hoagland	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
3 *Barrett*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
NEVADA								
1 Bilbray	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 *Vucanovich*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
NEW HAMPSHIRE								
1 *Zeliff*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
2 Swett	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
NEW JERSEY								
1 Andrews	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
2 Hughes	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
3 Pallone	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
4 *Smith*	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 *Roukema*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 Dwyer	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
7 *Rinaldo*	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
8 Roe	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
9 Torricelli	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
10 Payne	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
11 *Gallo*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
12 *Zimmer*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
13 *Saxton*	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
14 Guarini	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
NEW MEXICO								
1 *Schiff*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 *Skeen*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 Richardson	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
NEW YORK								
1 Hochbrueckner	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
2 Downey	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
3 Mrazek	N	N	?	?	?	?	?	?
4 *Lent*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 *McGrath*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 Flake	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
7 Ackerman	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
8 Scheuer	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
9 Manton	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
10 Schumer	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
11 Towns	N	N	N	?	X	N	N	Y
12 Owens	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
13 Solarz	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
14 *Molinari*	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
15 *Green*	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
16 Rangel	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
17 Weiss	N	N	N	-	-	N	N	Y
18 Serrano	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
19 Engel	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
20 Lowey	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
21 *Fish*	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
22 *Gilman*	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
23 McNulty	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
24 *Solomon*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
25 *Boehlert*	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
26 *Martin*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
27 *Walsh*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
28 McHugh	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
29 *Horton*	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
30 Slaughter	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
31 *Paxon*	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
32 LaFalce	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
33 Nowak	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
34 *Houghton*	Y	Y	Y	?	Y	Y	Y	Y
NORTH CAROLINA								
1 Jones	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 Valentine	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 Lancaster	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 Price	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 Neal	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 *Coble*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
7 Rose	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
8 Hefner	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
9 *McMillan*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
10 *Ballenger*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
11 *Taylor*	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
NORTH DAKOTA								
AL Dorgan	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
OHIO								
1 Luken	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 *Gradison*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
3 Hall	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
4 *Oxley*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
5 *Gillmor*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 *McEwen*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
7 *Hobson*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
8 *Boehner*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9 Kaptur	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
10 *Miller*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
11 Eckart	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
12 *Kasich*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
13 Pease	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
14 Sawyer	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
15 *Wylie*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
16 *Regula*	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
17 Traficant	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
18 Applegate	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
19 Feighan	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
20 Oakar	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
21 Stokes	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
OKLAHOMA								
1 *Inhofe*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 Synar	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
3 Brewster	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 McCurdy	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 *Edwards*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 English	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
OREGON								
1 AuCoin	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
2 *Smith*	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 Wyden	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
4 DeFazio	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
5 Kopetski	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
PENNSYLVANIA								
1 Foglietta	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
2 Vacancy								
3 Borski	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 Kolter	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 *Schulze*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 Yatron	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
7 *Weldon*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
8 Kostmayer	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
9 *Shuster*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
10 *McDade*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
11 Kanjorski	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
12 Murtha	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
13 *Coughlin*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
14 Coyne	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
15 *Ritter*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
16 *Walker*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
17 *Gekas*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
18 *Santorum*	Y	Y	Y	?	Y	Y	Y	Y
19 *Goodling*	Y	Y	P	Y	P	Y	P	Y
20 Gaydos	Y	?	?	N	N	Y	Y	Y
21 *Ridge*	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
22 Murphy	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
23 *Clinger*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RHODE ISLAND								
1 *Machtley*	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
2 Reed	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
SOUTH CAROLINA								
1 *Ravenel*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 *Spence*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 Derrick	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
4 Patterson	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
5 Spratt	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
6 Tallon	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
SOUTH DAKOTA								
AL Johnson	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
TENNESSEE								
1 *Quillen*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 *Duncan*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
3 Lloyd	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 Cooper	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
5 Clement	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 Gordon	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
7 *Sundquist*	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
8 Tanner	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
9 Ford	N	N	N	?	?	?	?	?
TEXAS								
1 Chapman	Y	Y	Y	N	?	Y	Y	Y
2 Wilson	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 *Johnson*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
4 Hall	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 Bryant	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
6 *Barton*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
7 *Archer*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
8 *Fields*	Y	Y	Y	?	?	?	Y	Y
9 Brooks	Y	N	N	N	N	N	?	?
10 Pickle	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
11 Edwards	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
12 Geren	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
13 Sarpalius	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
14 Loughlin	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
15 de la Garza	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
16 Coleman	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
17 Stenholm	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
18 Washington	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	?
19 *Combest*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
20 Gonzalez	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
21 *Smith*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
22 *DeLay*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
23 Bustamante	Y	N	?	N	N	Y	N	Y
24 Frost	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
25 Andrews	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
26 *Armey*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
27 Ortiz	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
UTAH								
1 *Hansen*	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 Owens	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
3 Orton	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
VERMONT								
AL *Sanders*	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
VIRGINIA								
1 *Bateman*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 Pickett	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
3 *Bliley*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 Sisisky	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
5 Payne	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 Olin	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y
7 *Slaughter*	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
8 Moran	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
9 Boucher	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
10 *Wolf*	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
WASHINGTON								
1 *Miller*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 Swift	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
3 Unsoeld	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
4 *Morrison*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 Foley								
6 Dicks	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
7 McDermott	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
8 *Chandler*	Y	Y	Y	?	#	?	Y	Y
WEST VIRGINIA								
1 Mollohan	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
2 Staggers	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
3 Wise	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
4 Rahall	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
WISCONSIN								
1 Aspin	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 *Klug*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 *Gunderson*	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 Kleczka	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
5 Moody	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
6 *Petri*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
7 Obey	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
8 *Roth*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9 *Sensenbrenner*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
WYOMING								
AL *Thomas*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Southern states - Ala., Ark., Flo., Ga., Ky., La., Miss., N.C., Okla., S.C., Tenn., Texas, Va.
Omitted votes are quorum calls, which CQ does not include in its vote charts.

PCVR

~~ASSAULT WEAPONS~~ REPUBLICANS ~~AGAINST RULE~~ WHO VOTED ~~FOR~~ YES ON CRIME BILL + A.W. BAN BUT NO ON RULE

Yes (7)	No (11)	NV (1)
Huffington	B. Franks Y	McDade Y
Lazio	Gilchrest Y	
Leach Y	Greenwood	
Machtley N	Horn	
Molinari Y	Kasich Y	
Ros-Lehtinen Y	Klug Y	
Smith Y	Levy	
	Pryce	
	Ridge Y	
	Shaw Y	
	Young Y	

12-1 in 1991

POLICE CORPS VOTING RECORD
CBC Members

Yes (28)	No (8)	NV (2)
Dixon	Hilliard	Ford
Roybal-Allard	Dellums	Washington
Waters!	C. Collins	
Tucker	Conyers	
C. Brown	B. Collins*	
Meek	Clay*	
Hastings	E. B. Johnson	
Bishop	Stokes*	
Lewis		
McKinney		
Rush		
Reynolds		
~~Gutierrez?~~		
Jefferson		
Fields		
Wynn		
Mfume		
Wheat		
D. Payne		
Flake		
Towns		
Owens		
Rangel		
Clayton		
Watt		
Blackwell		
Clyburn		
Scott		
Thompson		

*Supported in Oct. 91

McCurdy amendment, 4/20/94

Police Corps Voting Record

CBC Members

D's

Yes (28)	No (8)	NV (2)
Dixon Y	Hilliard	Ford ?
Roybal-Allard	Dellums ?	Washington ?
Waters! ?	C. Collins ?	
Tucker	Conyers X	
C. Brown	B. Collins Y	
Meek	Clay Y	
Hastings	E. B. Johnson	
Bishop	Stokes Y	
Lewis		
McKinney		
Rush		
Reynolds		
Gutierrez?		
Jefferson Y		
Fields		
Wynn		
Mfume Y		
Wheat Y		
D. Payne Y		
Flake Y		
Towns Y		
Owens Y		
Rangel Y		
Clayton		
Watt		
Blackwell		
Clyburn		
Scott		

1991 369-51 [D's 239-19
R: 129-32]

Gingrich YES in 91
YES in 94

CBC TARGETS →

Fields
Lewis
Rangel
Washington (?)
Watt

PCUR

REPUBLICANS WHO VOTED YES ON ~~AW~~ CBILL + AW
BUT NO ON RULE

REPUBLICANS - NO ON ASSAULT WEAPONS

21-1 in 1991

Yes (14)	No (21)
Calvert	Cunningham Y
Hunter Y	McCandless Y
Gallegly Y	Royce
Diaz-Balart	Franks Y
Hastert Y	Bilirakis ?
Bentley Y	Canady
Camp Y	Mica
Upton Y	Fowler
Gilman Y	Ewing N
Gillmor Y	Rogers
Hobson Y	Snowe Y
Regula Y	Torkildsen
Santorum Y	Talent
Weldon Y	McHugh
	Walsh Y
	Ravenel Y
	Spence Y
	Quillen Y
	Sundquist Y
	Bonilla
	Roth

PCVR

WHO VOTED YES ON ~~[illegible]~~ ~~YES ON~~ RULE

~~ASSAULT WEAPONS~~ REPUBLICANS YES ON RULE

Yes (4)	No (7)
Meyers Y	Shays Y
Morella Y	Johnson Y
Roukema Y	Blute
Houghton Y	Ramstad Y
	Boehlert Y
	Grandy! N
	Quinn

8-1 in 1991

Amdt. — | Nelson Rising

Recruit jrs + seniors
Pick up existing loans

Lawyers → Cops

$5-10,000 ~~surplus~~ to city per yr.

$25m - FY94
- frontload to serving
- 2,000

Severance Packages for officers

Balto
Phila
Houston
LA

#

Funnel military thru Police Cops training

Nunn

16 wks - $6,000 plus stipend
- 10,000 -
who c.t $15 train. Then pay union scale

Yes; better to go slower

Crime Bill –
Police Corps

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED

FROM: Rana Sampson
Erik Reid (DOJ)
Bill Mercer (DOJ)

DATE: April 22, 1993

As you know, there is no clear consensus for the Police Corps. While some strong supporters remain committed to the Police Corps, like Adam Walinsky and Lee Brown, there remains substantial discomfort among police unions and many police executives towards the idea. With this in mind, this memorandum offers four options for establishing a Police Corps program.

OPTION 1: Establish a Police Corps program based on H.R. 3371, the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1992.

Under this proposal, the federal government would provide up to $7,500 in scholarship assistance to prospective entry level police officers attending a four-year college or university. In addition, the federal government would provide or pay for 16 weeks of law enforcement training for all participants in the program. In return for this assistance and training, participants would agree to work as police officers for four years. Police corps graduates would receive the same pay and benefits as regular police officers.

Applicants to the Police Corps program would be selected on a competitive basis by each state under guidelines established by the federal government. Special emphasis would be given to the recruitment of minorities.

Program Advantages:

1. Increasing Opportunities for Education. The Police Corps program would provide new opportunities for individuals interested in law enforcement careers to attend college. In contrast to some educational assistance programs, the scholarship

assistance could be used for **any** costs associated with financing a college education. The scholarships could also be combined with other funds, such as Pell grants, to increase the total assistance package.

2. Improving the Quality of Police Forces. The Police Corps program would improve the quality of police forces in two ways: first, it would increase the overall educational level of police forces; and second, Police Corps officers would be able to pass along the benefits of their federal law enforcement training to their local departments.

Program Disadvantages:

1. Significant Program Costs. There are significant costs associated with the Police Corps program, all of which are borne by the federal government. The Department of Justice estimates it would cost more than $35,000 to pay for the scholarship assistance and federal training for each participant. This figure does not include any administrative costs. Based on this estimate, fewer than 700 individuals could participate in the program if it received $25 million in FY 1994. Administrative costs would further reduce this number. By comparison, OMB had estimated that 2,500 individuals could participate in the program.

2. No Assistance to Police Departments. The Police Corps program provides no financial assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies to offset the cost of hiring additional officers. As a result, and because of local budgetary constraints, police departments may not be able to hire new officers. Police departments are also concerned that Police Corps officers may leave the force after their service commitment is completed.

OPTION 2: Create a Community Policing Corps that takes an integrated approach to improving individual departments. It would include the best parts of the Police Corps like educational enhancement and improved recruitment, but eliminate the Police Corps' risk that graduates would not be hired by police agencies. In addition, it would promote community policing.

Under this option, the $25 million proposed for first year Police Corps funding could be used instead to fund the Community Policing Corps. The funds would be competed out by the Office of Justice Programs (either the National Institute of Justice or the Bureau of Justice Assistance) to support local plans that focus on community policing and encourage educational enhancement, training, and improved recruitment. Police agencies would compete for these funds. The average grant might be $100,000 and run for two years. As much as ten percent of the $25 million could be set aside for administration, monitoring, and evaluation of as many as 200 local yearly grants.

Local plans under the grant would have to include three elements for funding: educational enhancement of officers; provision of community policing training; and upgraded recruitment efforts.

The educational enhancement portion of the grant should be as high as 25 percent. If $100,000 is the total grant a department receives, then $25,000 must be spent for educational scholarships for the department's officers. In one study examining police educational levels, the data indicated that 75% of the surveyed officers had some higher education. In a second study, the average level of education in years was 13.76 years, or somewhere between freshman and sophomore status.[1] In many agencies, the $25,000 in-service scholarship funds could be parceled out to officers in small bundles, in some cases as little as $1,000. One chief said he would make the scholarships small in order to maximize officers reinvolvement in school, and that $25,000 in a 500 sworn officer department would be of significant benefit.

The scholarship money could only be given to officers engaged in community policing. The scholarships, then, reinforce community policing.

The second part of the grant can be used for community policing training. Community policing training will help these department get started and will be money well spent. It will be used to train officers in the community-based problem-solving philosophy, or in communication skills, language training, or conflict resolution. All of these fit under the community policing umbrella.

The third part of the grant is crafted to improve recruiting efforts. It is done locally so it is tailored to meet an individual department's needs. This portion of the money could be used for scholarships to attract college students to a particular local department. This would not be a substantial sum of money, but most departments, if at all, make only a few hires a year. The money could also be used for other forms of recruitment. For instance, if a department wanted to groom community residents for policing, the money could be used to pay high school students for part-time employment. This keeps kids off the streets, out of trouble, exposes them to police work, and offers them a future.

Program Advantages:

1. Union Appeal: A proposal to increase educational opportunities for today's sworn officers would have great union appeal.

2. Encouraging Improvements in Officer Education Levels: This program would help achieve the President's goal of upgrading officers' educational levels.

3. Encourages Community Policing: If community policing is a requirement of the

---

[1]Surveyed departments included only the mid to large size police and sheriff's departments.

grant, the proposal encourages and rewards this kind of work, and it might encourage more traditional officers to participate in community policing.

4. Assists with Community Policing Training: This initiative would help police agencies that are interested in the idea of community policing but are struggling to implement it because they lack training resources.

5. Supplements Local Recruitment Efforts: Police agencies would be able to use this money to attract and retain the best to the profession.

Program Disadvantages:

1. Little Measurable Increase in Sworn Officers or in Their Educational Levels: Advocates of the Walinsky model or the Conference Report version will argue that this program alone will neither increase the supply of sworn officers nor achieve the goal of substantially increasing the competency of state and local cops.

2. Local Discretion Could Lead to Abuses: Police chiefs will be given substantial discretion in awarding scholarships to members of the force and to those they are trying to recruit. Careful standards would have to be developed to assure fairness and equity in distribution of scholarship awards.

OPTION 3: Fund state or local Police Corps demonstration projects rather than a large Federal effort. Local efforts would be locally designed and locally administered. The major Federal requirement would be a linkage between the police and one or more academic institutions.

If the Community Policing Corps (described in **OPTION 2** above) is too narrow an attempt to meet the Police Corps pledge, but the national model (described in **OPTION 1** above) is too costly and too inadequate to guarantee results, an alternative to both of these models could be crafted.

The Local Police Corps would combine federal financing with local program implementation and innovation. A federal agency would provide a local institution (possibly one per state or a number based upon state population or even by competition) with a grant to finance Police Corps scholarships and administer the program. The host institution would be selected based upon a competitive selection process and, as a grantee, must offer courses prescribed for Police Corps scholars.

Elements of the Local Police Corps include:

- Local selection of Police Corps participants.

- Educational scholarships for participants.
- Local delivery of nationally prescribed training.
- Local hiring commitment to Police Corps scholars.

States or localities would be eligible to receive grants if they established a Local Police Corps program modeled on the principles listed above. One example of such a program exists in Louisiana. That program offers scholarships to a single, designated university, and guarantees employment to police corps graduates. Louisiana has never appropriated money to fulfill the spirit of the Police Corps legislation, but federal resources would give them the opportunity to implement their model.

In order to reduce the cost of program scholarships, it might be wise to only offer them to juniors and seniors. This would: (1) get Corps graduates into police departments by FY 96; (2) save a significant amount of money which would have been allocated to freshmen and sophomores; (3) target monies to those more likely to graduate; and (4) target monies to those more likely to actually pursue policing as a career.

The Local Police Corps model eliminates the need for the federal government to select police corps scholars and to administer the program. In addition, local administration of the program increases the likelihood that police corps graduates will be hired by local law enforcement agencies. Monies would only go to fund locally designed Corps' that could virtually guarantee future employment for Corps participants.

Program Advantages:

1. The program creates incentives to enter policing and, at the same time, increases the education level of officers.

2. Allows for Local Control: Although it falls short of the Walinsky model, this model allows for local involvement and innovation.

3. Creates more new officers than **OPTION 2**: In contrast to **Option 2**, which will provide only $25,000 to $35,000 per agency for scholarships to prospective cops, the Local Police Corps would provide more scholarships and generate more new police over the long-term.

4. Program is Expandable: The Local Police Corps could be implemented as a pilot in FY 94 or FY 95 in a limited number of locations before expanding or contracting the program.

5. Promotes Policing as a Career: One of the main complaints lodged by unions against the Police Corps is that Corps hires would be short timers and would feel no

sense of loyalty to the profession possibly creating some safety hazards for career officers. **Option 3** respects the need for career personnel in policing and offers a way to enhance recruitment efforts.

Program Disadvantages:

1. Uncertainty of Employment: Even with memoranda of understanding, cities may be unable to guarantee that they will hire Corps members upon graduation.

OPTION 4: The President need not establish a formal Police Corps program or a surrogate because the President's other police initiatives achieve the results that a Police Corps hoped to achieve. Money saved by not going forward with a Police Corps ($550 million) could be expended on new hires creating 15,714 new hires at $35,000 each.

A greater number of new hires can be achieved through programs other than the Police Corps and the Corps simply drains money from other more cost effective efforts. The funding of new police hires through the Cops on the Streets program will increase the number of officers substantially beyond what could have been achieved through the Police Corps.

Through National Service, the President's other initative that addresses public safety, communities, with federal assistance, can hire recent college graduates or aspiring college students as non-sworn public safety personnel. Local police agencies and local unions would have to sit down and agree on the parameters of non-sworn employment, i.e. crime prevention, drug prevention, elderly assistance, fingerprint lifting, taking reports of past crimes. In effect, National Service Community Safety Officers engaged in police-coordinated public safety activities will perform functions generally similar to those that would have been done by recruits entering the Police Corps.

Therefore, the Cops on the Streets program and the National Service Program fit well together to meet the needs of community safety. A Police Corps does not add significantly more to the mix.

Advantages:

1. National Service meets the major goal of Adam Walinsky's original police corps program, including:

   Offering new ways to fund a college education or professional training program;

   Increasing the number of individuals engaged in proactive crime prevention; and

Providing new opportunities for youth to participate in community service.

2. Police departments and unions are more supportive of a National Service program than a National Police Corps program.

3. Money not spent on a Police Corps or a surrogate for the Corps could be reprogrammed to support the hiring of additional police officers.

Disadvantages:

1. This option does not add sworn officers to the streets except by reprogramming Police Corps funds into new hires.

2. This proposal may not be a viable political option given Administration statements on the Police Corps.

Crime Bill - Police Corps

TO: Carol Rasco, Eli Segal
FR: Bruce Reed, Jose Cerda III
RE: Underfunding the Police Corps
DA: February 25, 1993

As you know, Domestic Policy's total for recommended crime expenditures is based on the crime bill conference report (H.R. 3371), which Candidate Clinton repeatedly committed to signing during the campaign. The conference report authorizes almost $3 billion in the first year (and more than $10 billion in four years) for community policing, bootcamps, safe schools, the Brady Bill, and other initiatives strongly supported by President Clinton. Despite this promise, OMB has recommended allotting less money in four years for new crime initiatives, than the crime bill would in one.

The Police Corps -- a program essential to fulfilling President Clinton's 100,000 new cops promise -- is the program hardest hit. OMB has recommended only $25 million in FY 1994 (and $400 million over four years) for the Police Corps. This amount is woefully inadequate. The Police Corps is the single most expensive line-item in the crime bill; its costs are estimated to exceed $1 billion by the third year of its inception. The cost of the Police Corps, in fact, is the primary reason why Congress has not passed it despite years of broad-based political support.

If we are to accept OMB's numbers, and if we assume no administrative costs to implement the Police Corps and to award its proposed $7,500 scholarship, $25 million will buy the Clinton Administration 833 new cops in the first year. That does not even begin to put a dent into the 100,000 promise. And if we assume a one-time administrative cost of $5,000 per student -- a conservative estimate considering that the Police Corps is supposed to train prospective officers -- $25 million will buy 713 new cops, and $400 million over four years will buy 11,428 new cops. Again, OMB's suggested funding level falls terribly short of President Clinton's goal of using the Police Corps to put 100,000 new cops on the street.

Attached for your consideration is a chart comparing the various funding levels and sources for a National Police Corps. It is worth noting that crime bill authorizations -- unlike our own estimates -- are not based on a commitment to increase police force levels by 100,000. Also, the chart includes a Law Enforcement Scholarship proposal that Congress has customarily coupled with the Police Corps to help moderate police union opposition.

POLICE CORPS FUNDING SOURCES
(new spending in millions)

PROPOSAL	1994	1995	1996	1997	TOTAL
OMB Proposed Budget					
Police Corps	25	75	150	150	400
National Service Trust	98	1,042	1,890	3,000	6,030
Domestic Policy Est.					
Police Corps	120	650	1,000	1,000	2,782
Law Enf. Scholarships	30	30	30	30	120
Original Crime Bill					
Police Corps	400	*	*	*	1,600**
Final Crime Bill***					
Police Corps	100	100	200	200	600
Law Enf. Scholarships	30	30	30	30	120

* The original Senate proposal authorizes "such sums as may be necessary" in the out years and caps the number of Police Corps graduates at 20,000 per year.

** This assumes a constant expenditure of $400 million.

*** House conferees opposed the Police Corps and moved to limit its authorization levels.

Crime Bill - Police Corps

THE POLICE CORPS, 1993

The Police Corps applies to law enforcement the principles of ROTC. The Federal government would support the college education of selected young people. In return they would serve four years in a state or local police department following graduation.

Both the Senate and the House added the Police Corps to the Omnibus Crime Bill in the Second Session of the 101st Congress. The Crime Bill died because of disagreements over unrelated issues, but will be reintroduced early in 1993. The Senate vote for the Police Corps was unanimous. The House vote in favor was 369-51.

President Clinton supports the Police Corps. He was one of the first members of the National Committee for the Police Corps, enacted the nation's first Police Corps bill in Arkansas, and spoke of it regularly during his campaign.

Rationale. 1. Over the last thirty years, violent crime is up ten times. Sample statistics (New York City, which is far from the worst), 1951 to 1990: homicides, 244 to 2,245; rapes, 904 to 3,126; robberies, 7,004 to 100,280. Less than half of violent crimes are reported. John Lewis, head of the Congressional black caucus, says that poverty is no longer causing crime: crime instead is causing poverty. Major cities have lost much of their middle classes. Crime and fear dominate the unexpressed political agenda. Most damaging, as public order has collapsed, the black lower class has disintegrated. Entire neighborhoods have been abandoned to criminal gangs, who set the dominant pattern of life. Over 40 percent of black men 18-34 in the District of Columbia are now in prison, on probation or parole, awaiting trial or being sought by the police; nationally over 25 percent.

Conditions continue to worsen, since each successive age cohort is more disorganized and violent. The problem for the rest of the decade and beyond will be set by those born in the 1980s: two-thirds without a father, more than a tenth raised without either father or mother, many drug-addicted, and all grown amid the anarchic chaos of the drug wars.

2. A major contributing factor is decline in police strength, leading to atrophy of government presence and authority. Through the early 1950s, there were 3.2 officers for each violent felony; today 3.2 violent felonies are reported for every police officer. Thus we devote to each violent crime one-tenth the police power of forty years ago. Lack of police force cripples response (one-third of 911 calls may go unanswered) and forecloses the preventive community patrol that Wilson, Moore, Kelling and leading chiefs say is the only way to preserve neighborhoods against disorder and increasing violence. Thugs, not the government, control too many streets.

3. Police costs continue to rise, particularly pensions and benefits. Nevertheless quality is often down, particularly in large cities where standards have been dropped, ostensibly to benefit minorities. According to the Director of Testing, a "functional illiterate" could pass the New York City police test.

4. Most important, citizens have become dangerously separated from the enforcement of their own laws. For all the dedication and courage of their best individuals, police forces have become highly specialized bureaucracies largely serving their own ends; many no longer even believe that crime can be defeated or controlled. Isolated from the people who are their only real strength, police are condemned and discarded whenever they make the inevitable mistake. Citizens are instructed not to resist criminals, but to comply with their every demand. Passivity in the face of aggressive evil saps and degrades the national spirit.

Program. Rebuild police strength at affordable cost, with citizen police recruited as in ROTC: the Police Corps.

Competitively selected volunteers would receive four years of aid for tuition, room, board and books, at an accredited four-year institution, up to $10,000 a year. They would pursue the study of their choice (no police classes) but train intensively two summers during college (as in Marine Corps Platoon Leaders Course). After additional local training following graduation, they would serve as sworn, fully empowered local officers with a four-year service obligation. Failure to complete education, training and service would require payback of all scholarship funds, collected through IRS.

For immediate impact on public security, recruiting would begin with current seniors and juniors: if they trained and served after graduation, they would be repaid part of their prior educational expenses.

On the ROTC pattern, many would stay in police as a career; but many would return to civilian life, after their four-year obligation, as lawyers, educators, businessmen, engineers, etc. Such term service would lower costs, especially of pensions and benefits: a Department of Justice study estimates that Police Corps officers would be 30 percent or more less expensive than career officers.

Officers returning to civilian life would become a vital bridge between police and citizens: former Police Corps officers would be lawyers, judges, journalists, congressmen. They would have confronted the worst and most dangerous aspects of society, learned the gritty reality of the streets, and learned not to be afraid. For both black and white young people, this would be the

most precious education and exercise in shared citizenship: what John Lewis has called "a resumption of the American partnership."

Also noteworthy:

. As with ROTC or the service academies, there would be no means test: service would bring recognition and reward regardless of income or social class.

. In a Justice Department survey, 40 percent of all college students, and 45 percent of minority college students, said they would be likely to join a Police Corps.

. After Los Angeles, leading chiefs said Police Corps citizen-officers would be an important safeguard against police brutality.

. The Police Corps would rapidly become the leading entry-point for a new generation of professional police leadership.

. The Police Corps is <u>not</u> an entitlement program, open to any applicant. Students could be enrolled only if their local police department committed to use their services, and if they met all local standards and tests.

<u>Public Reaction</u>. The Police Corps has strong support across a spectrum from William Raspberry to William F. Buckley, taking in the mainstream of the New York Times and Daily News, Philadelphia Inquirer, Los Angeles Times, Time, Newsweek, NBC News, etc. Eighty-eight percent of police chiefs surveyed by the Department of Justice said they would use Police Corps officers if available; not surprising, since 75 percent of small-force chiefs and 82 percent of large-force chiefs reported that they require greater manpower.

The Police Corps has been endorsed by such groups as the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association and the National Sheriffs Association. In addition to President Clinton, the National Committee to Support a Police Corps includes Commissioner Lee Brown (immediate past president of the International Association of Chiefs of Police) and other leading police commanders, law school deans, former government officials, union and business leaders, as well as sponsoring Senators and Representatives.

<u>Support and Sponsorship in Congress</u>. The Police Corps passed both Houses with strong bipartisan support. Majority and Minority Leaders of both Senate and House -- Senators Mitchell and Dole, Congressman Gephardt and Michel -- were co-sponsors. In each party, active sponsorship came from liberals (e.g., Kennedy, Bradley, Specter, Hoyer) conservatives (e.g., Nunn,

Boren, Dornan, Gramm, Lott, Gingrich) and moderates (e.g., McCurdy, Sasser, Hyde).

Opposition. One police group, the National Association of Police Organizations, has been opposed in the past; some local police unions are opposed today. Criticism has been voiced by some individual police executives, led by Daryl Gates and by the current IACP president.

Budget Impact. Federal cost will be determined by the size of the program. The bill as passed in the 101st Congress would eventually provide a constant revolving force of 80,000, which might increase actual patrol forces by fifty percent in principal areas. With total federal assumption of all scholarship and training costs, and a constant production of 20,000 graduates every year, annual cost would reach a maximum of $800 million a year. If President Clinton increases the Police Corps to 100,000, as pledged in his campaign, annual costs would increase to about $1 billion. President Clinton also pledged to assume part of localities' costs of employing Police Corps officers. Salary payments, if made, would of course increase budget impact. Given the inevitable gradual build-up of any program, maximum cost could not be reached before FY 1997. First-year costs would be under $200 million.

Adam Walinsky