

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 30, 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: BRUCE REED
JOSE CERDA III

SUBJECT: FINAL DECISIONS ON THE CRIME BILL

As outlined in a previous memorandum to you, we believe that the crime bill should include a down-sized Police Corps, not the Justice Department's new Community Police Corps. But whether you accept our suggestion or Justice's -- the most important thing is not to let this or any other issue slow down or jeopardize quick introduction of a crime bill.

Last week, Senator Biden and the National District Attorneys Association finally reached an agreement on the crime bill's habeas provisions. The State Attorneys General are also on board. We are prepared to proceed with the announcement of a joint Biden-Brooks crime bill the first week of the August recess. The bill will include: (1) a community policing title that will put 50,000 new police on the street over the next five years; (2) boot camps; (3) federal death penalty; (4) habeas corpus reform; (5) the Brady Bill; and (6) the Police Corps.

We have reached agreement with the Justice Department, OMB and House and Senate Judiciary Committee staff on a bold community policing initiative that will be the centerpiece of the crime bill. It provides grants to cities and states to put 50,000 new police officers on the street over the next five years. The other 50,000 of your 100,000 pledge will come from (1) the FY 1993 supplemental appropriations bill you signed last month, which included \$150 million for community policing; (2) National Service, which will make up to one-fourth of its slots available for law enforcement and crime prevention efforts; (3) HUD's COMPAC program for public safety in public housing; (4) the Education Department's Safe Schools Initiative; (5) a joint Labor-Defense Troops-to-Cops initiative; and (6) community investment funds targeted to Empowerment Zones.

The one remaining policing issue is the nature of the Police Corps. All parties (except Adam Walinsky and the staunchest Police Corps proponents) agree that the Police Corps is not the most cost-effective way to put new police on the street, and that its funding should be scaled back. We recommend that funding for the Police Corps be scaled back to \$25 million per year, as you proposed in your FY 1994 budget. The Justice Department wants to cut funding still further, to \$5 million a year, and fundamentally change the nature of the program.

In the attached memorandum, the Attorney General has outlined three options on the Police Corps. Here is our assessment.

1. Justice's Community Police Corps

The Justice Department substitute would create a Community Police Corps that would provide grants to a handful of local police departments to allow them to offer scholarships to prospective police recruits as well as to current officers. Chiefs of Police, police unions and cities would prefer such a locally-based proposal. But Justice has yet to persuade Senator Kennedy and the Police Corps' many other friends in Congress to support the DOJ substitute, and Walinsky is already campaigning vehemently against it. Senators Sasser and Specter re-introduced the Walinsky version as a stand-alone bill this week.

2. Walinsky's Police Corps

We think the Attorney General's concerns about the nature of the Police Corps could still be addressed in conference -- the only time Police Corps proponents are likely to agree to changes. We will face an uphill battle if we try to scale back funding for the Police Corps and replace it with our own version at the outset. The Walinsky version passed the House and Senate with bipartisan support last year, and you endorsed it in the campaign. We also fear that unless Kennedy and Biden can be persuaded to support the Justice substitute, we will squander the only good thing to come of having to wait so long for a crime bill, which is that we have an unprecedented opportunity to introduce the same bill in both houses. It could also increase pressure on the two chairmen to differ on more volatile issues, like habeas.

3. National Service Trust Fund

Over the long term, you could resolve this issue by developing a small, but high-profile, Police Corps through the National Service program. One-third of National Service funds are dedicated for certain priority projects to be administered by the National Service Corporation, including professional corps like teachers, nurses and police. The essential elements of the Justice Department's Community Police Corps could be implemented more quickly and in far more communities through National Service -- without further congressional action or funding.

Eli Segal has always been supportive of a public safety component in National Service. Moreover, a national Police Corps would give the National Service program the visible symbol it needs to capture the American people's attention.

We recommend announcing the crime bill the first week of the August recess with the Walinsky language, and addressing the Attorney General's concerns either in conference -- or better yet, by developing a Police Corps proposal through the National Service program that will not require further congressional action.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

October 25, 1993

Copy to: ① BR
② POTUS memos
③ Crime Bill -
BRR
~~to POTUS~~
Memos to Pres.
~~Crime~~

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: BRUCE REED
JOSE CERDA III

SUBJECT: CRIME BILL FUNDING

I. ACTION-FORCING EVENT

The crime bill will be taken up on the Senate floor and in the House Judiciary Committee next week. As the crime issue takes on increasing urgency in Congress and the countryside, we face the prospect of a bidding war in both houses, in which Republicans and even liberal Democrats compete to prove that they care more about crime than the Administration. Senator Biden and others are urging us to pre-empt this debate by pledging more resources for cops, drug treatment, and prisons.

II. BACKGROUND

A. House Update

The outlook for passing some kind of crime bill by Thanksgiving may have improved significantly. In the House, Chairman Brooks has given up trying to find habeas reform and death penalty provisions that can attract a majority of House Democrats, and has decided to postpone consideration of those issues until next year. The Black Caucus opposed his habeas proposal, even though it was more liberal than ours and much more liberal than current law, and he does not believe he could get a majority to vote the crime bill out of committee without substantial prodding from the Administration or unacceptable revisions in habeas.

Brooks plans instead to break out the key components -- cops, boot camps, drug courts, Safe Schools, and the Brady Bill -- and pass them all separately. If the Republicans go along, the crime measures can then be passed quickly under suspension in the House, and easily reconciled with Senate versions. This strategy reduces the chance of a gridlocked conference, and should assure that the Brady Bill and most key elements of the crime bill will be on your desk by Thanksgiving.

Biden is considering a similar strategy in the Senate, but he has less control over the outcome. Hatch may agree to drop habeas, but Gramm and other Republicans will force

death penalty votes at every turn -- and most will probably pass. The leadership in both houses may have to commit to considering a death penalty/habeas reform bill at some point.

B. What to Do About the Bidding War

Momentum is building within the Congress and around the country to do more on crime -- and the chance that the death penalty may not be part of this year's final package will only increase pressure on Democrats to come out for more cops and more money for state and local prisons.

Before introducing the House and Senate crime bills in September, Brooks and Biden scaled back the authorization levels from \$8.9 billion in last year's conference report to around \$5.9 billion this year. At the time, they were concerned about deflecting criticism over how to pay for these programs. With crime emerging as the number one issue in the country, that concern is out the window.

Now Biden, John Kerry, and other Senate Democrats are concerned that the Republicans (and some of their own Democratic colleagues) will try to do to us on crime what they did to us last week on drugs: beat up on this Administration for being unwilling to spend more than the last one. Biden recognizes that these criticisms are unfair, but he expects his colleagues to make them anyway. He fears that our \$6 billion crime bill will quickly become somebody else's \$12 billion crime war.

There is no way to stop this train in the Senate, where every imaginable get-tough amendment is likely to pass with large bipartisan majorities. (Biden told us that Senators Feinstein and Moseley-Braun plan to offer an amendment to let states try 12-year-olds as adults, even in capital cases, and other Democrats will offer truth-in-sentencing amendments to make states that want prison funds guarantee that their inmates will serve at least 85% of their sentence.) The Republicans will add \$2-3 billion for prisons, the Democrats will add more money for drugs, and both sides will get behind more money for cops. Even deficit hawks from low-crime states, like Conrad and Dorgan, are leading the charge to throw more money at the crime problem.

Biden strongly believes that the Administration needs to seize control of the issue by upping the ante. On Friday, Mack McLarty convened a meeting with the Attorney General and White House senior staff to address this matter. There was no disagreement on the merits or the politics of putting more money into the Administration's key anti-crime programs; the only issue was money.

That meeting produced one recommendation for how you can take the initiative in a responsible but aggressive manner, by claiming a little more credit for a decision you've

already made but few know about: to earmark part of the October spending cuts package for the crime bill.

Two weeks ago, you and the Vice President agreed to commit \$3+ billion of the \$10+ billion in spending cuts and procurement savings to fully fund the crime bill. The \$3+ billion figure represents the difference between the \$3.4 billion already in the Justice Department's FY94-99 planning baseline for community policing, and OMB's estimate of what all the programs in the Biden-Brooks bills would actually cost. (It adds up to more than \$5.9 billion because some of the authorization levels in the crime bill are set at "such sums.")

Last week, Leon Panetta sent you a memorandum advising you not to promise to "fully fund" the entire crime bill (except for community policing), because we will also have to find room in next year's budget for other Justice priorities, such as immigration and health care fraud, as well as contemplate some difficult cuts in federal law enforcement. Moreover, at least \$1 billion of the \$6 billion in the current bill goes for programs and authorization levels that Biden and Brooks inserted at the request of other members, which Justice has no intention of funding and which duplicate other initiatives under way at other agencies.

Rather than committing \$3+ billion from the spending cuts package to "fully fund" a hodgepodge of crime programs, we recommend earmarking \$5 billion in savings from the October package and procurement reform to the Administration's three crime priorities: more cops, drug courts, and boot camps/prisons.

We still wouldn't be fully funding the crime bill, but the combination of \$3.4 billion from the Justice planning baseline and \$5 billion from the October package and procurement reform would enable us to increase the community policing authorization from \$3.4 billion to \$4.9 billion (which will fund between 60,000 and 70,000 cops); increase the drug court authorization from \$1.2 billion to \$1.5 billion (which will fund drug treatment and certainty of punishment for an estimated 250,000 minor drug offenders); and increase the boot camp/regional prison authorization from \$200 million to \$2 billion (which will fund an estimated 75,000 boot camp slots, 15,000 three-year prisoner slots, and drug treatment for 200,000 criminal addicts). The rationale would be that the Administration wants to stress a few big-ticket law enforcement priorities in the bill, but cannot assure funding for the rest.

There are several advantages to this strategy:

1. We could get 60-70,000 cops (instead of 50,000), and address several members' concern that some cities may need a slightly higher federal match than currently contemplated;

2. We could blunt our drug critics by committing some real money to drug courts, an approach which has the strong support of the Attorney General and the Drug Director;

3. We could head off the pounding we'll take from Republicans over money for prisons, which will pass whether we like it or not. Our bill will enable states to use that prison money for boot camps;

4. We could give the spending cuts package and procurement reform a boost by tying them to a popular and immediate issue.

Moreover, there is a natural link between reinventing government and fighting crime: the whole point of the Vice President's effort has been to steer government away from things it doesn't know how to do, into things government can do best. You made this connection many times in the campaign, when you said you wanted to reduce the bureaucracy by 100,000 and use the money to help put 100,000 new police on the street.

This strategy is not without some cost. First, if we commit \$5 billion of savings from the October package to crime, we will fall short of some members' \$10 billion target for deficit reduction. Second, if the October package doesn't pass, we may be criticized for passing a crime bill that has not yet been paid for. But that's true whether we commit \$3 billion or \$5 billion -- and if Congress votes down our spending cuts, it won't be our fault if we can't fund everything in the crime bill. Moreover, we can come back next year with any spending cuts that fail this time around and use them to offset crime-related Justice spending in FY95.

You should also be aware that like every other department, Justice faces a serious funding crunch in FY95, even though its planning baseline shows the largest percentage increase from 1994 to 1995. Justice has been handed several new initiatives, including immigration and health care fraud. These initiatives, together with other new programs at other departments, will present a series of tough choices in nailing down the FY95 budget. For example, while funding for state and local law enforcement assistance goes up dramatically, funding for federal law enforcement may decline.

The Attorney General summed up her concerns in one word: "money". She is willing to commit to more drug courts, cops, and boot camps -- so long as the White House is willing to commit the money. She does not want to be forced down the road to cut FBI and DEA agents to make room in the budget for expansions in other law enforcement assistance.

Panetta's memorandum spells out OMB's concerns. In summary, OMB wants you to understand that every program is in competition with something else. We will not be able to fully fund all the authorizations in the crime bill and all the potential new initiatives everywhere else.

We agree that those concerns will have to be addressed early next year in the broader context of the FY95 budget. Unless and until Congress keeps its end of the bargain by agreeing to your spending cuts, you cannot be expected to spend money you don't have.

If you are willing to commit a substantial portion (\$5 billion) of the spending cut package to crime, we recommend that you consider the following course of action:

___ Use Tuesday's procurement/October package event to announce that as a sign of the Administration's seriousness about the epidemic of violence, you want about half the spending cuts and procurement savings to go to fighting crime, with the balance to go for deficit reduction.

___ Ask Biden and Brooks to raise the authorization levels for more cops, more drug courts, and more boot camps/prisons, as suggested above.

___ If your schedule permits, join Drug Director Brown and Attorney General Reno at Wednesday's opening of the D.C. drug court, which is being funded through an HHS grant from the Clinton Administration.

___ Use every appropriate opportunity during the House/Senate debates on the crime bill and the spending cut package to stress the importance of bold, immediate action.

DRAFT

October 27, 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: BRUCE REED
JOSE CERDA III

SUBJECT: POSSIBLE BIDEN-DOLE DEAL ON CRIME

Biden has held extensive discussions with Dole about a possible bipartisan deal on key provisions in the crime bill. He believes he can close a deal with the Republicans if he has sufficient assurances from the White House that we will find the money for it.

We are raising this matter one more time, because we believe this is not just another accounting decision. You have a chance to seize one of the two most powerful realignment issues (along with health care) that will come your way, at a time when public concern about crime is the highest it has been since Richard Nixon stole the issue from the Democrats in 1968. In Robert Kennedy's day, crime was a linchpin that helped hold a Democratic majority together across racial and class lines.

In 1992, you were the first Democratic candidate since RFK to speak credibly about crime. As President, you have an opportunity to unite the country on an issue that has divided our party and our nation for three decades. Even more important, as you have said many times in recent months, we have an obligation to do everything we can to restore personal security for all the decent, ordinary Americans who are cowering in their homes and seeing their children get shot in the streets.

Elements of the Deal

The deal would raise the five-year cost of the Senate crime bill from \$5.9 billion to between \$9.9 and \$11.3 billion. The key elements of the deal are:

1) Increasing the policing authorization from \$3.4 billion to \$5.2 billion, which would pay for 60,000 five-year grants at a declining federal match of 75-50-40-25-10% (the current bill provides 50,000 three-year grants with a match of 75-50-25%); and

2) Raising the boot camp/prison authorization to Republican levels (\$2.5-3 billion), but maintaining our program. If the crime bill goes to the floor without a deal, the Republicans will offer amendments -- which will pass, and probably survive conference -- that will not only increase prison spending, but force us to take on an expensive new program of federally run regional prisons that Justice opposes and we cannot afford. Biden believes that if we accept something close to Republican funding levels, he can get them to accept Democratic provisions -- which would earmark at least \$1 billion for boot camps, and let states choose whether to spend the rest on boot camps or regional prisons.

OMB has \$3.5 billion in the Justice planning baseline -- enough to fund the cops title. Yesterday, you pledged to use \$5 billion in savings from procurement reform for crime if Congress will pass it, or come back with other cuts if necessary. CBO is expected to score those savings at \$3-5 billion, but we can use savings beyond what is scored, so long as the procurement reforms work.

Together, this total of \$8.5 billion over five years (\$3.5 billion in the baseline and \$5 billion in procurement savings) would come close to covering the key components of the crime bill -- cops, drug courts, and boot camps/prisons -- at the low end of the possible Biden-Dole deal. It would not cover about \$1 billion in authorizations for non-essential programs that Biden added to his bill without our support.

	<u>Current Authoriz.</u>	<u>Biden- Dole</u>	<u>Increase</u>
Cops	3.4	5.2	+1.8
Boot camps/prisons	.3	2.5-3.0	+2.2-2.8
Drug courts	1.2	1.2	no change
Essential programs	.1	.1	no change
Non-essential programs	.9	.9	no change
<hr/>			
Total, all programs	5.9	9.9-11.3	+4.0-4.5
Total, essential programs	5.0	9.0-10.4	+4.0-4.5
Baseline plus procurement savings		8.5	

In the House, Brooks plans to pass total authorizations of less than \$5 billion -- assuming he can hold the line in committee. Biden's staff believes the result in conference will be a House-Senate bill at around \$8 billion.

Here are the implications of pursuing a deal:

Advantages

One way or another, these authorization levels will go up, and the public will hold us to them whether we asked for them or not. Either we look for a deal that enables us to protect our programs and interests, or we cede control of the process and take our lumps.

Biden believes that if he can strike a deal with the Republicans, he will be able to avert a bidding war in the Senate. His plan would be to reach advance agreement with Dole and Hatch to support a manager's substitute that would include the crime programs at agreed-upon spending levels and with agreed-upon legislative provisions. Biden, Dole and Hatch would agree to oppose amendments to these programs from either side of the aisle.

A deal in advance -- announced with Biden, Dole, and others at the White House, with a statement that it's time to put politics behind us -- would stop Republicans from

pursuing their current strategy, which will be to bloody the Administration on two fronts: first, that we don't have the money to pay for our bill; and second, that we're not willing to cut government to pay for putting criminals behind bars.

Finally, this deal would beef up boot camps and certainty of punishment for what the Attorney General calls "the mean bads," and ward off a Republican prison program that she hates but may not be able to stop.

Dole and Hatch would also be willing to agree to drop habeas for this year, but they cannot guarantee that their colleagues will give them unanimous consent to do so. More likely, the Senate would debate and pass their habeas or ours as part of the crime bill, and Biden would drop it in conference since it will not be in the House bill.

The Administration would need to demand other conditions in any deal, such as: 1) bipartisan assurances to put a crime bill on your desk by Thanksgiving, and not go home until they finish; 2) bipartisan agreement to pass your procurement reforms and other spending cuts in the October package; 3) Republican assurances to still support the bill if it comes back from conference without habeas and possibly without death; and 4) perhaps most important, agreement from Dole and Hatch that when Brady comes to the floor, they will join Biden and Mitchell in fighting to table any non-gun amendments. We would also want to make clear that our commitment extends only to specific funding levels for the three programs we care most about -- cops, drug courts, and boot camps/prisons -- not every crime authorization they send our way.

To underscore your commitment to finding the money, you could earmark the procurement savings (or other cuts if procurement fails) toward an \$8-10 billion Crime Trust Fund that would pay for your anti-crime priorities. To relieve Justice's immediate funding crunch, you could pursue an FY94 supplemental next spring targeted to border control and more police, and pay for it with FY94 rescissions from the October package.

Disadvantages

Any additional commitments to anti-crime initiatives will make accounting decisions about the FY95 budget even harder -- assuming that Congress sends you Senate-size authorization levels for cops, drug courts, and prisons and does not reduce them in conference. As we discussed at the meeting in the Roosevelt Room on Monday, Justice and OMB have reservations about any new commitments. These decisions may become tougher still if Congress rejects your procurement reforms and other budget cuts -- but as you said yesterday, you have reserved the right to come back with more cuts.

There is also an inherent risk, more difficult to calculate, in entering into negotiations with the Republicans, who may walk away from a deal or find excuses to abandon it later. Finally, if the Republicans cannot control their own on death and habeas, they will continue to use it against us -- just as we'll hold their feet to the fire on guns.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

May 20, 1993

Copy to BR,
Copy to Poms memo,
Copy to 100,000
POLICE
Copy to Crime Bill -
Memo to President

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: BRUCE REED, DEPUTY ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT
JOSE CERDA III, SENIOR POLICY ANALYST

SUBJECT: UPDATE ON 100,000 NEW POLICE

Carol Rasco passed along your request for an update on the status of the Administration's plans to put 100,000 cops on the street. We have been working with the Justice Department and OMB on a credible proposal to meet your campaign promise.

Although funds are tight, we believe the Administration can claim credit for up to 100,000 new law enforcement personnel from the following sources:

Crime Bill	- 50,000	-- \$3-5 billion over 5 years
Jobs Package	- 10,000	-- \$200 million over 2 years
Enterprise Zones	- 15,000	-- \$500 million over 2 years
HUD's Compac	- 5,000	-- \$750 million over 5 years
ED's Safe Schools	- 100	-- \$235 million over 5 years
National Service	- 20,000	-- no set amount
Troops to Cops	-	- to be determined

Total Cops 100,100

I. Revised Crime Bill -- Community Policing/Cop on the Beat

The Domestic Policy Council and the Justice Department recommend that our main vehicle for putting more cops on the street should be a modified version of last year's crime bill, with a new Administration-backed title on community policing. There is widespread support on the Hill for more cops. Senator Biden is working with the state attorneys general on habeas corpus reform, the main sticking point from last year. The rest of last year's conference report would remain largely unchanged. The Brady Bill would still be included.

Senator Biden is concerned that we work this out quickly because he believes that Gramm and the GOP could introduce their own crime bill any day. He would like the Senate to take up this issue in June, before the July 4th recess. We will be ready to proceed as soon as the economic plan clears the House.

The linchpin of the 100,000 new police proposal should be a single grant program administered by the Justice Department that helps states and localities put police on the street by providing a source of direct funding.

TOTAL NEW POLICE -- 50,000

II. Jobs Package -- Re-Hire/New Hire Proposal

Per your request, the new jobs bill now contains \$200 million to re-hire or hire additional police officers, perhaps as many as 10,000. These funds could also be used to redeploy police officers onto the streets in community policing roles.

If passed, DOJ would have to spend \$44 million of this money in FY 1993 through its current discretionary authority. The Attorney General has considerable flexibility in awarding these funds. Hopefully, if we move quickly on a crime bill, the remainder of the funds could be spent under the authorizing language to be included in the Biden/Brooks crime bill.

TOTAL NEW POLICE -- 10,000

III. Empowerment Zones -- Community Investment Program

The Empowerment Zone legislation authorizes \$250 million in FY 1994 (already appropriated) and \$250 million in FY 1995 for community policing grants to these 110 areas selected by the Enterprise Board. The Attorney General has broad discretion to make these grants: they can be made under the general language in the legislation; they can be made under current Justice programs; or they can be made under authorizing language passed in a new crime bill.

TOTAL NEW POLICE -- 15,000

IV. Department of Housing and Urban Development -- COMPAC

To help housing authorities fight against crime, HUD has proposed restructuring its current Drug Elimination Grant Program into a considerably more flexible Community Partnership Against Crime (COMPAC). The program is budgeted for \$265 million next year,

and \$1.5 billion over the next five years. HUD expects that about \$150 million of these funds per year will be spent on law enforcement or security personnel, including community-based policing efforts that would increase police presence on public housing complexes.

TOTAL NEW POLICE -- 5,000

V. Department of Education -- Safe Schools

We have amended the Department of Education's draft of Safe Schools legislation to allow the program's monies to be used for "sworn" police officers, not only professional security personnel. While hiring "sworn" police personnel may prove too expensive to use them in the same round-the-clock manner as security guards, they can be used more cost-effectively in community policing roles, including schools as part of their "beat".

TOTAL NEW POLICE -- 100

VI. National Service -- National Service Officers

The National Service Trust Fund estimates that some 20,000 of its participants will serve in law enforcement/public safety roles. These "national service officers" could be used to assist police departments in the broad areas of community policing and crime prevention. They could take reports, staff telephone crime reporting units and administer citizen crime prevention surveys. Relieving officers from these time-consuming duties would potentially free more police officers to become cops "on the beat", and the support work will make officers more effective in their crime-fighting. With direct funding available for most of the new police, we believe it is credible to use National Service members serving in public safety/law enforcement roles in our 100,000 count.

TOTAL NEW NSOs -- 20,000

VII. Military/Labor -- Troops to Cops Demonstration Programs

We are working with the Labor and Defense Departments to define these proposals. However, substantial funds are not available from these sources.

As we understand it, monies available under Senator Nunn's "Troop to Teachers" initiative are not available for a "Troops to Cops" initiative without new authorizing language. Currently, this DoD account has about \$65 million in it, \$20 million of which could probably be used for a cops initiative.

Perhaps as much as \$75 million may be available through the Department of Labor if we develop appropriate demonstration projects under amendments to the Job Training Partnership Act. Authority to undertake such projects was enacted in the 1991 Defense Department Authorization.

TOTAL NEW POLICE -- TO BE DETERMINED

Bruce Reed

Have you talked w/ Ron Brownstein
on this? If not, you should →

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN

8.16.94

What Are the Facts Behind the Crime Bill? (Washn)

By Ronald Brownstein

(c) 1994, Los Angeles Times

WASHINGTON Pat Buchanan says it. On the floor of the House of Representatives, Republican congressmen say it. The conservative think-tank Empower America says it. But is it true?

Those critics of the \$33 billion crime bill try to paint it as soft on criminals by making a mantra of the claim that the legislation would fund two social workers for every cop.

An examination of the facts, however, shows their calculation rests on a pyramid of questionable or flatly improbable assumptions. To reach that conclusion, critics appear to underestimate the number of police the bill could produce and wildly overestimate the number of social workers it funds.

On the other hand, even some allies admit President Clinton's signature claim that the bill would fund 100,000 police officers probably overstates its impact on local law enforcement. At best, that is a cumulative total: the bill aims to increase the nation's police force by 100,000 not immediately, but over six years. And meeting even that goal would require local governments to accept substantial financial commitments to supplement the federal assistance from the bill.

As Congress moves toward reconsideration of the crime legislation as soon as later this week, "facts" are flying like arrows between both sides in the bitter debate. But, as in the case of the disputed cops, the facts are often more complex than the sharp sound bites that slice the airwaves. The pitched struggle over the crime bill shows again that in Washington, as in war, truth is often the first casualty of conflict.

The argument that the bill would generate more social workers than police officers appears to have its roots in an Aug. 2 "Issue Bulletin" put out by the Heritage Foundation, a conservative think-tank.

In the paper, Scott A. Hodge, a fellow in federal budgetary affairs at the foundation, argues that the bill would only fund 20,000 cops annually and 40,000 social workers.

To reach the figure of 40,000 social workers, Hodge simply divides all the so-called crime prevention money in the bill some \$1.23 billion per year or \$7.4 billion over the six years covered by the legislation by the average annual salary and benefits of social workers, which he estimates at \$36,000. "If all this social welfare money goes toward hiring new social workers," he writes, "the bill will add ... at least two social workers ... for every cop the bill puts on the street."

But the legislation makes clear that not all of that money could possibly go to hiring social workers. For instance, \$1 billion of the prevention money is designated for strengthening law enforcement, including hiring police and prosecutors, in cases involving violence against women.

Another \$900 million goes to establish after-school programs in troubled neighborhoods. Much of that money would go for the cost of keeping schools open and paying teachers, notes one House Judiciary Committee aide. Another \$40 million would go to operate midnight sports leagues.

Some programs in the bill, such as drug treatment for prisoners and grants to discourage young people from participating in gangs, clearly would produce employment for social workers. It is impossible to estimate in advance how many, said the Judiciary Committee aide, but the assumption that all the bill's prevention funds would go toward hiring social workers "just doesn't make any sense."

Hodge did not return a phone call seeking comment.

Hodge's conclusion that the bill only funds 20,000 cops annually, which Republicans have widely echoed, also rests on a series of questionable assumptions. He estimates the cost of putting "one new cop on the street for one year in a high-crime area at between \$70,000 to \$80,000 per year." Based on that he says the cost of adding 100,000 cops would be "at least" \$7 billion per year, or \$42 billion over the bill's six-year life.

Since the bill only provides \$8.845 billion in federal funds for police programs, he concludes, it will only fully fund "at most just 20,000 permanent cops on the street over the next six years."

But Justice Department officials say the estimated annual cost for adding a police officer is wildly inflated. An International City/County Management Association survey last year found the median salary for entry-level police officers was \$23,546. Fringe benefits might add another third to that cost, bringing the total closer to around \$31,000, a department official said.

Those figures vary substantially from region to region, but even for high police-cost cities like Beverly Hills, Calif., Detroit, San Diego and Washington the total of first-year benefits and salary for a new police officer is more in the range of \$50,000, according to Justice Department surveys.

Using Hodge's methodology, that would reduce the annual cost of 100,000 cops to about \$3.1 billion, which means the federal government could fully fund well over 40,000 new cops annually by his calculations.

But, in fact, those calculations are somewhat beside the point because the legislation generally requires cities to pay for at least one-fourth the cost of the new hires. That local contribution multiplies the federal dollars to produce more officers on the streets, proponents note.

Even so, to reach the 100,000 officers depends on another series of debatable assumptions.

The administration reaches that total this way: of the \$8.8 billion in the bill allocated to police programs, \$7.34 billion is designated specifically for hiring new officers. The rest goes to training and other purposes.

The legislation authorizes the government to provide cities up to \$75,000 toward the salary and benefits of each new officer hired. Divided into \$7.34 billion, that provides enough money to help hire 97,920 officers, the department estimates.

Municipalities have already hired another 2,080 cops with funds from a pilot program approved as part of the budget deal last summer. Taken together, that raises the total to Clinton's 100,000 figure.

But that neat calculation also leaves out some important qualifications. For one, if localities could not afford to put up their matching share, that would reduce the number of police hired.

And, though Clinton hardly stresses the point, the bill would not mean that cities could put 100,000 more cops on the streets for each of the next six years. Instead the process is cumulative: the federal government in effect will provide the cities seed money to cover most of the initial costs of adding about 20,000 new officers per year through the year 2000. Once the program has been in place for three years, the Justice Department calculates, the federal government will be subsidizing about 60,000 police officers per year.

This is where the math gets tricky. The federal grants will generally last for three years. To reach the figure of 100,000 cops, the administration assumes that after the three-year subsidies expire local governments will keep on their payrolls all the cops they hired with Washington's help.

So, for instance, in the program's fourth year, when the government is subsidizing about 60,000 officers, another

91