

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. memo	Rahm Emanuel, Pat Griffin, Reed et al. to McLarty re: Crime Bill-- Legislative Strategy Issues (partial) (1 page)	06/14/94	P5
002. memo	Emanuel, Griffin and Ron Klain to POTUS re: General Update on Crime Bill Conference, Rule, and Final Passage (partial) (2 pages)	07/08/94	P5

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential records
 Domestic Policy Council
 Bruce Reed (Crime)
 OA/Box Number: 8413

FOLDER TITLE:

Strategy

rs17

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advise between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Crime Strategy

*Statement of Senator Joseph R. Biden, Jr.,
on the Republican 1995 Crime Proposals
February 9, 1995*

LAST YEAR, THE CONGRESS COMPLETED A SIX-YEAR EFFORT AND ENACTED A MAJOR ANTI-CRIME LAW, IN WHICH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT LAUNCHED A BOLD, MULTI-FACETED ATTACK ON VIOLENT CRIME AND ITS ROOTS IN THE COMMUNITY. FOR THE FIRST TIME, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MADE A MAJOR COMMITMENT TO HELP STATES AND LOCALITIES -- WHERE 95 PERCENT OF CRIME OCCURS AND IS PROSECUTED -- REDRESS THE GREATEST SHORTCOMINGS OF OUR SYSTEM:

- * THE SHORTAGE OF POLICE OUT ON THE STREETS OF OUR COMMUNITIES;**
- * THE SHORTAGE OF PRISON SPACES AND THE NEED FOR SENTENCING REFORM;**
- * THE SHORTAGE OF EFFECTIVE RESPONSES TO DRUG OFFENDERS;**
- * THE LACK OF A SERIOUS RESPONSE TO RAPE AND FAMILY VIOLENCE;**
- AND**
- * THE LACK OF SAFE PLACES AND POSITIVE ACTIVITIES FOR THOSE CHILDREN GROWING UP SURROUNDED BY ILLEGAL DRUGS, CRIME, AND VIOLENCE.**

IN ITS BREADTH, THE LAW REFLECTS THE LESSONS LEARNED OVER THE LAST DECADE AS WE STUDIED CRIME AND LAW ENFORCEMENT AND WORKED ON PASSING THIS LAW -- NAMELY, THAT ALL OF THESE SHORTCOMINGS MUST BE ADDRESSED TOGETHER, THAT CORRECTING ONE WITHOUT THE OTHERS IS FUTILE -- BECAUSE CRIME KNOWS NO EASY, SINGLE ANSWER. THE ANTI-CRIME LAW ADDRESSES EACH OF THESE SHORTCOMINGS, AS I WILL DETAIL IN A MOMENT. AND IN ITS APPROACH,

AS WELL AS IN MANY SPECIFICS, THE LAW WAS THE RESULT OF BI-PARTISAN EFFORTS.

THE LAW IS ALREADY AT WORK. \$1 BILLION HAS BEEN AWARDED TO STATES AND LOCALITIES TO PUT OVER 14,000 NEW POLICE OFFICERS ON THE STREETS IN COMMUNITY POLICING PROGRAMS. DOLLARS UNDER THE DRUG COURT PROGRAM AND THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT WILL BE AWARDED IN THE NEXT FEW MONTHS.

I HAD HOPED THAT I COULD SPEND THE NEXT SEVERAL MONTHS WATCHING OVER THE SMOOTH AND SPEEDY IMPLEMENTATION OF THE LAW, AS WELL AS TURNING MY FOCUS TO THOSE SUBSTANTIAL ISSUES STILL BEFORE US: JUST TO NAME TWO PRIORITIES -- WE MUST TURN ALL THE TALK ABOUT OUR WAR ON DRUGS INTO A REAL BATTLE; AND WE MUST REFORM OUR JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM AS IT STRUGGLES TO DEAL WITH VIOLENT YOUNG CRIMINALS UNLIKE ANY THE CURRENT SYSTEMS WERE DESIGNED TO HANDLE.

BUT INSTEAD OF MOVING FORWARD TO TAKE ON NEW, PRESSING CHALLENGES, THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES WILL BE IN FULL RETREAT. VERY SOON, THE SENATE WILL EMBARK ON A DEBATE NOT OF NEW CHALLENGES, BUT OF THE ANTI-CRIME LAW WE JUST ENACTED LAST FALL. THE HOUSE IS ALREADY TAKING APART THE LAW PIECEMEAL. WHAT IS MOTIVATING A RETREAT ON A BILL THAT CONTAINS SO MANY PROVISIONS DRAFTED AND ONCE SUPPORTED BY REPUBLICANS AS WELL AS DEMOCRATS?

I WILL LET YOU DRAW YOUR OWN CONCLUSIONS, BUT I ASK THAT YOU WALK WITH ME THROUGH THE CHANGES THE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP SEEKS TO MAKE IN THE ANTI-CRIME LAW -- AND I SUSPECT THE MERITS

WILL SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES. AT THE SAME TIME, I WANT TO MAKE CLEAR WHAT I WILL FIGHT FOR AND WHAT I WILL FIGHT AGAINST, AS WE REVISIT THE ISSUES WE DEBATED SO THOROUGHLY LAST YEAR.

THE 100,000 POLICE PROGRAM

LET ME TURN FIRST TO A CENTRAL PROVISION OF THE NEW LAW, A PROGRAM DESIGNED TO ADDRESS THE FIRST MAJOR LAW ENFORCEMENT SHORTCOMING I MENTIONED -- A PROGRAM THAT DESERVES TO BE PRESERVED AND ONE I WILL FIGHT TO SAVE FROM THE REPUBLICAN CHOPPING BLOCK. I AM SPEAKING, OF COURSE, ABOUT THE 100,000 POLICE PROGRAM.

I DON'T KNOW A RESPONSIBLE POLICE LEADER, ACADEMIC EXPERT, OR PUBLIC OFFICIAL WHO DOES NOT AGREE THAT PUTTING MORE POLICE OFFICERS ON OUR STREETS AND IN OUR NEIGHBORHOODS IS A GOOD IDEA -- A GOOD IDEA THAT GOES BY THE NAME OF "COMMUNITY POLICING."

THE TRUE INNOVATION OF COMMUNITY POLICING IS THAT IT ENABLES POLICE TO PURSUE DUAL GOALS -- THEY ARE BETTER POSITIONED TO RESPOND AND APPREHEND SUSPECTS WHEN CRIME OCCURS, BUT THEY ARE ALSO BETTER POSITIONED TO KEEP CRIME FROM OCCURRING IN THE FIRST PLACE. TODAY, TOO MANY POLICE OFFICERS ARE STRANGERS IN THEIR OWN COMMUNITIES; FROM HEADQUARTERS OR CRUISERS THEY RESPOND TO RADIO CALLS ONLY AFTER A CRIME HAS OCCURRED, FOREVER BEHIND THE CURVE. COMMUNITY POLICE ARE A PART OF THEIR COMMUNITY, THEY KNOW THEIR COMMUNITY -- THE HOT SPOTS, THE TROUBLE MAKERS, THE GANG MEMBERS -- AND THEY CAN WORK TO PREVENT A CRIME FROM EVER GETTING STARTED.

IN MY OWN HOME STATE, COMMUNITY POLICING TOOK THE FORM OF FOOT PATROLS WITH A PARTICULAR FOCUS ON BREAKING-UP STREET LEVEL DRUG DEALING THAT HAD TURNED ONE WILMINGTON NEIGHBORHOOD INTO A CRIME ZONE. THESE EFFORTS SUCCESSFULLY SUPPRESSED DRUG ACTIVITY, WITHOUT DISPLACING IT TO OTHER PARTS OF THE CITY. THE WILMINGTON EXAMPLE FITS THE SHORTHAND DESCRIPTION OFTEN USED FOR COMMUNITY POLICING -- PUTTING COPS ON THE STREETS TO "WALK THE BEAT."

BUT IN PRACTICE, COMMUNITY POLICING TAKES MANY FORMS, DEPENDING ON THE NEEDS OF EACH PARTICULAR COMMUNITY. WHILE THE FORM COMMUNITY POLICING TAKES MAY VARY DEPENDING ON THE NEED OF A PARTICULAR COMMUNITY, THE RESULTS COMING IN FROM THE FIELD ARE THE SAME -- COMMUNITY POLICING WORKS:

* IN NEW YORK CITY -- A PLACE WHERE CRIME CAN SEEM INSURMOUNTABLE -- THE POLICE COMMISSIONER BEGAN AN AGGRESSIVE COMMUNITY POLICING PROGRAM THAT CONTRIBUTED TO SIGNIFICANT DECREASES IN SERIOUS OFFENSES LAST YEAR.

** MURDERS DROPPED 19 PERCENT.

** ROBBERIES FELL BY 16 PERCENT.

** BURGLARIES WENT DOWN 11 PERCENT.

** AND AUTO THEFTS WERE REDUCED BY 15 PERCENT.

* IN TAMPA, FLORIDA, POLICE COMMITTED THEMSELVES TO MOVING CRACK DEALERS OFF OF STREET CORNERS AND FORGED AN UNPRECEDENTED ALLIANCE WITH CITIZENS IN THE COMMUNITY TO ACHIEVE IT. THROUGH A COMBINATION OF STANDARD "BUY-BUST" OPERATIONS, NEW OUTREACH TO THE COMMUNITY, AND INVOLVEMENT OF OTHER CITY AGENCIES AND THE LOCAL MEDIA, THE

DEALERS HAD BEEN DRIVEN OFF WITHIN A YEAR AND THE STREETS IN THE TARGETED AREA RETURNED TO NORMAL.

- * IN NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT, POLICE CHIEF NICK PASTORE'S AGGRESSIVE COMMUNITY POLICING EFFORT LEAD TO A 10% DROP IN SERIOUS CRIME IN 1992.**
- * COMMUNITY POLICING TECHNIQUES WERE INTRODUCED IN THE NEW YORK CITY SUBWAY SYSTEM FOUR YEARS AGO AND THE RESULTS HAVE BEEN PHENOMENAL: ROBBERIES HAVE FALLEN BY 52%.**
- * IN THE ENGLEWOOD SECTION OF CHICAGO, COMMUNITY POLICING WAS CREDITED WITH A 6% DECREASE IN VIOLENT CRIME LAST YEAR.**

THE ANTI-CRIME LAW ENACTED LAST YEAR TARGETS \$8.8 BILLION IN FEDERAL FUNDS TO STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TO BE USED SPECIFICALLY TO TRAIN AND HIRE 100,000 NEW COMMUNITY POLICE OFFICERS ACROSS THE NATION. LIKE COMMUNITY POLICING ITSELF, THIS PROGRAM WORKS. ALREADY, THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT HAS AWARDED \$680 MILLION TO STATES AND LOCALITIES FOR 9,500 NEW OFFICERS. APPLICATIONS FOR ANOTHER \$450 MILLION IN FEDERAL FUNDS -- FOR MORE THAN 6,000 ADDITIONAL NEW OFFICERS -- ARE ALREADY PENDING AT THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT; THESE FUNDS WILL BE AWARDED THIS MONTH.

IN SHORT, IN ONLY THE FIRST SIX MONTHS FOLLOWING PASSAGE OF THE CRIME LAW, 15,000 NEW LOCAL POLICE OFFICERS WILL BE ON THE STREETS OF AMERICA. SO MUCH FOR THE CRITICS WHO CLAIMED THE NEW CRIME LAW WOULD FUND ONLY 22,000 POLICE OFFICERS IN SIX YEARS. IN FACT, THE LAW WILL FUND 15,000 IN THE FIRST SIX MONTHS ALONE. THESE

RESULTS SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES, AND THEY ARE THE BEST EVIDENCE THAT THE PROMISE OF 100,000 COPS IS REAL.

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE COPS PROGRAM DERIVES FROM ITS DESIGN -- THE COPS PROGRAM IS THE RESULT OF SETTING A PRECISE GOAL AND ENACTING A RESPONSIBLE PROGRAM TO ACHIEVE THAT PRECISE GOAL: WHEN HE TOOK OFFICE, PRESIDENT CLINTON CALLED ON US TO PUT 100,000 MORE POLICE ON THE STREETS OVER THE NEXT FIVE YEARS; WE THEN DESIGNED A PROGRAM THAT FUNDS THAT EFFORT AND THAT EFFORT ALONE -- THE FEDERAL DOLLARS WERE AWARDED FOR THE SOLE PURPOSE OF HIRING NEW POLICE OFFICERS, SO THAT IN FIVE YEARS TIME, AMERICA WILL HAVE 100,000 MORE POLICE ON THE STREET.

THE PRECISION OF THIS PROGRAM STANDS IN STARK CONTRAST TO THE REPUBLICANS' NEW "LAW ENFORCEMENT BLOCK GRANT" -- WHICH WOULD SPEND ROUGHLY THE SAME AMOUNT OF FEDERAL FUNDS -- TO BE SPECIFIC, \$8.5 BILLION -- WITHOUT GUARANTEEING A SINGLE NEW POLICE OFFICER ON ANY STREET IN AMERICA. READ THEIR PROPOSAL -- MONEY IS SENT NOT TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, BUT TO GOVERNORS; AND THE MONEY MAY BE USED TO HIRE OR PAY OVERTIME TO UNDEFINED "LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS," OR TO "PROCURE EQUIPMENT, TECHNOLOGY AND OTHER MATERIAL" THAT IS "DIRECTLY RELATED TO BASIC LAW ENFORCEMENT FUNCTIONS, SUCH AS THE DETECTION OR INVESTIGATION OF CRIME, OR THE PROSECUTION OF CRIMINALS."

NOW, THAT MAY SOUND FINE ON THE SURFACE, BUT A CLOSER LOOK REVEALS CRITICAL WEAKNESSES. LET'S CALL THE FIRST WEAKNESS THE "OFFICER LOOPHOLE" -- BECAUSE THE REPUBLICANS DO NOT DEFINE "LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS" AS CAREER OFFICERS DEDICATED TO ENFORCING THE CRIMINAL LAWS -- AS THEY ARE DEFINED IN THE NEW

CRIME LAW; INDEED, THE REPUBLICANS DO NOT DEFINE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS AT ALL. LET'S CALL THE SECOND WEAKNESS THE "EQUIPMENT LOOPHOLE." THE REPUBLICAN PROPOSAL WOULD FUND ANY EQUIPMENT OR TECHNOLOGY RELATED TO "LAW ENFORCEMENT FUNCTIONS," AND THOSE FUNCTIONS ARE SPECIFICALLY DEFINED TO INCLUDE PROSECUTION.

THESE TWO LOOPHOLES MEAN STATES COULD SPEND ALL THE MONEY TO HIRE PROSECUTORS, TO IMPROVE COURT SYSTEMS, OR ANYTHING ELSE RELATED TO "LAW ENFORCEMENT." ARGUABLY, THE MONEY COULD EVEN BE USED TO HIRE ANY OFFICERS WHO ENFORCE THE LAWS, CIVIL AS WELL AS CRIMINAL -- FOR EXAMPLE, PUBLIC HEALTH OFFICERS WHO INSPECT RESTAURANTS. EQUIPMENT, AS DEFINED BY THE REPUBLICANS, COULD INCLUDE NOT MERELY POLICE EQUIPMENT -- WHICH THE NEW ANTI-CRIME LAW PERMITS A PORTION OF THE GRANT FUNDS TO PURCHASE -- BUT COMPUTERS FOR PROSECUTORS OR COURTS, OR TELEPHONE BOOTHS OR LIGHTING OR WHATEVER A GOVERNOR DECIDED WOULD "RELATE TO LAW ENFORCEMENT FUNCTIONS." AND ONE HUNDRED PERCENT OF THE FEDERAL FUNDS COULD BE USED FOR THIS EQUIPMENT, OR TO FUND PROSECUTORS. NOT ONE DOLLAR NEED BE USED TO HIRE A SINGLE NEW POLICE OFFICER.

NOW, I SUPPORT MANY OF THESE OTHER FUNCTIONS. IMPROVED PUBLIC LIGHTING AND EMERGENCY TELEPHONES ARE USEFUL. PROSECUTION OF CRIMINALS IS A CRITICAL FUNCTION -- IN FACT, THE ANTI-CRIME LAW PROVIDES \$150 MILLION FOR STATE AND LOCAL COURTS, PROSECUTORS, AND OTHER CRIMINAL JUSTICE PARTICIPANTS. BUT I CONTINUE TO BELIEVE THAT THE SINGLE MOST CRITICAL NEED OUR COMMUNITIES FACE WHEN IT COMES TO FIGHTING CRIME IS THE LACK OF POLICE. I REMAIN COMMITTED TO USING THE SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT OF FEDERAL FUNDING WE

HAVE SET ASIDE -- OVER \$8 BILLION -- TO SERVE OUR HIGHEST PRIORITY -- GETTING MORE COPS OUT ON THE STREETS. I AM OPPOSED TO REPLACING A PROGRAM THAT GUARANTEES 100,000 NEW COPS ON OUR STREETS WITH A PROPOSAL THAT COULD SPEND OVER \$8 BILLION IN FEDERAL FUNDS WITHOUT PUTTING ANY COPS ANYWHERE.

THE REPUBLICAN PROPOSAL SUFFERS FROM AN ADDITIONAL FATAL FLAW -- IT REQUIRES NO FISCAL ACCOUNTABILITY OR RESPONSIBILITY; IT IS SIMPLY A FEDERAL GIVE-AWAY. THE BILL USES A FORMULA TO SIMPLY HAND OUT FEDERAL FUNDS TO MAYORS AND STATE OFFICIALS WITH NO STRINGS ATTACHED -- NO STRINGS AND NO ACCOUNTABILITY. THE ANTI-CRIME LAW REQUIRES THAT STATES AND LOCALITIES "MATCH" THE FEDERAL GRANTS WITH FUNDS OF THEIR OWN. THE MATCH REQUIREMENT IS NOT BORNE OF A LACK OF GENEROSITY -- THE OFFER OF \$8.8 BILLION IN FEDERAL FUNDS TO ASSIST WITH A PURELY STATE AND LOCAL FUNCTION CAN HARDLY BE CHARACTERIZED AS STRINGY.

NO, THE MATCH REQUIREMENT IS BORNE OF EXPERIENCE -- EXPERIENCE I GAINED FIRST IN MY OWN DAYS AS A CITY COUNCILMAN -- THAT LOCAL OFFICIALS CARE A WHOLE LOT MORE ABOUT MAKING SURE THAT FEDERAL TAX DOLLARS ARE USED WISELY WHEN SOME LOCAL TAX DOLLARS ARE ALSO ON THE LINE. I LEARNED MORE ABOUT THIS PHENOMENON WHEN THIS CONGRESS TRIED -- AND THEN ABANDONED -- LEAA (LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION), OVER A DECADE AGO.

REMEMBER THE ALLEGATIONS OF LAVISH AND WASTEFUL SPENDING THAT OCCURRED UNDER THE PROGRAM? -- EVERYTHING FROM "DICK TRACY" WRIST RADIOS TO PURCHASING RIOT CONTROL GEAR FOR SMALL TOWNS THAT HAD NEVER HAD (AND PROBABLY NEVER HAVE SINCE) A MAJOR RIOT?

IN DISBANDING LEAA, WE CONCLUDED THAT THE PROGRAM'S DESIGN ACTUALLY ENCOURAGED THESE ABUSES. JUST LIKE THE REPUBLICAN BILL, THE LEAA PROGRAM PERMITTED SPENDING FEDERAL DOLLARS ON A ILL-FOCUSED RANGE OF GOODIES, INCLUDING EQUIPMENT, WITH NO MATCHING REQUIREMENT. THE RESULT WAS TESTAMENT TO THE LAW OF UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES -- LEAA ENDED UP FUNDING TOO MUCH EXTRANEOUS EQUIPMENT BY ENCOURAGING UNDISCIPLINED SPENDING.

I WAS ONE OF THE LEADING CRITICS OF THE LEAA PROGRAM IN THE LATE 1970'S, WHEN THE PROGRAM WAS RUN BY A DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATION. IN PARTICULAR, I CRITICIZED THE INABILITY OF THE PROGRAM TO IDENTIFY GOALS AND PRIORITIES AND TO ENCOURAGE CAREFUL PLANNING, AS LEADING TO A SCATTERSHOT APPROACH TO FREE SPENDING. IN 1980, 1984 AND AGAIN IN 1988, WITH THE SUPPORT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS AND BI-PARTISAN COOPERATION (SENATOR SPECTER AND I INTRODUCED ONE KEY BILL IN 1982, FOR EXAMPLE), THE CONGRESS EVENTUALLY STRENGTHENED THE STATE AND LOCAL CRIME-FIGHTING EFFORTS.

WE BUILT IN THREE KEY CONCEPTS -- WE TARGETED LAW ENFORCEMENT AID TO SPECIFIC PROGRAMS, WE REQUIRED A MATCH OF ONE STATE OR LOCAL DOLLAR FOR EVERY THREE FEDERAL DOLLARS, AND WE REQUIRED EXTENSIVE STATE PLANS TO EXPLAIN WHAT THE DOLLARS WOULD FUND. THE RESULTING LAW WAS WHAT WE CALL THE BYRNE GRANT PROGRAM -- A FISCALLY RESPONSIBLE, WELL RUN PROGRAM THAT CONTINUES TODAY. THESE SAME CONCEPTS MARK THE ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF THE ANTI-CRIME LAW'S 100,000 POLICE PROGRAM. IN FACT, WE EVEN IMPROVED ON BYRNE IN ONE RESPECT -- WE PERMIT LOCALITIES -- NOT JUST GOVERNORS -- TO APPLY DIRECTLY FOR FUNDS, TO ENSURE THAT MONEY GETS TO WHERE IT IS MOST NEEDED.

THE REPUBLICANS IGNORE THE LESSONS OF THE LEAA -- THEIR PROPOSAL IS AN \$8.5 BILLION GIVE-AWAY OF FEDERAL DOLLARS WITH NO SPECIFIC GOALS, NO SET LIMITS, AND NO EVALUATION OR MATCHING REQUIREMENTS. THE LOOPHOLES AND LOOSE LANGUAGE WOULD PERMIT EVERY CENT TO BE SPENT WITHOUT ANY INCREASE OF POLICE ON THE STREETS TO SHOW FOR OUR INVESTMENT AT THE END OF FIVE YEARS.

IN CONTRAST, THE CRIME LAW BUILDS ON THE LEAA LESSONS. IT SETS SPECIFIC GOALS, PROVIDES A SIMPLIFIED APPLICATION PROCESS, AND REQUIRES ACCOUNTABILITY THROUGH EVALUATIONS AND MATCHING REQUIREMENTS. IN ADDITION, THE MATCHING REQUIREMENT IS SET UP SO THAT THE LOCAL SHARE INCREASES FROM YEAR TO YEAR. THIS IS THE WAY TO ENSURE THAT LOCAL DOLLARS WILL BE USED RESPONSIBLY. IT IS ALSO THE KEY TO ENSURING A LASTING COMMITMENT ON THE PART OF LOCAL OFFICIALS.

POLICING IS A STATE AND LOCAL -- NOT A FEDERAL -- RESPONSIBILITY. THE ANTI-CRIME LAW OFFERS HELP TO THOSE WHO WANT TO STRENGTHEN THEIR POLICING EFFORTS AND WHO ARE WILLING TO STEP UP AND ACKNOWLEDGE THEIR OWN RESPONSIBILITY. THE ANTI-CRIME LAW ENCOURAGES STATES AND LOCALITIES TO INVEST IN THEIR OWN FUTURE. THE REPUBLICANS BLOCK GRANT DOES NOT. MOST IMPORTANTLY, THE ANTI-CRIME LAW TARGETS FUNDS TO HELP STATES AND LOCALITIES MAKE THE SHIFT TO COMMUNITY POLICING.

THE CHOICE WILL SOON BE BEFORE THIS BODY: WILL WE MAINTAIN THE ANTI-CRIME LAW'S GUARANTEE OF 100,000 COPS WORKING IN EFFECTIVE AND RESPONSIBLE COMMUNITY POLICING EFFORTS SUCH AS THOSE DESCRIBED ABOVE? OR WILL WE REPLACE A WORKING PROGRAM WITH AN IRRESPONSIBLE FEDERAL GIVE-AWAY?

I WILL SAY IT AGAIN BECAUSE IT IS WORTH REPEATING, THE REPUBLICAN BILL DOES NOT GUARANTEE A SINGLE NEW POLICE OFFICER ON ANY STREET IN AMERICA. IT DOES NOT EVEN GUARANTEE THAT A SINGLE DOLLAR WILL REACH ANY POLICE DEPARTMENT. LET US NOT WASTE ANOTHER \$8.5 BILLION TO LEARN THE SAME LESSONS WE LEARNED UNDER LEAA. LET US CHOOSE TO KEEP THE 100,000 COPS PROGRAM IS PLACE.

PRISON GRANTS

LET ME TURN NEXT TO THE SECOND MAJOR SHORTCOMING I MENTIONED. THE SECOND PRIMARY FOCUS OF THE ANTI-CRIME LAW WAS TO HELP STATES MEET THE SERIOUS PRISON CRISIS CONFRONTING MANY STATE PRISON SYSTEMS. AND AGAIN, THE PROGRAM WAS DESIGNED TO MEET TWO GOALS: FIRST, TO HELP STATES INCREASE -- AND THEN USE TO MAXIMUM ADVANTAGE -- THEIR SUPPLY OF PRISON SPACE, SECOND, TO ENCOURAGE STATES TO ADOPT THE KIND OF "TRUTH-IN-SENTENCING" SYSTEM THAT HAS WORKED SO WELL AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL.

TODAY, PRISON SYSTEMS IN 34 STATES ARE UNDER COURT ORDER DUE TO OVERCROWDING. BECAUSE THERE ARE NOT ENOUGH PRISON CELLS, STATES CAN KEEP THOSE VIOLENT CRIMINALS WHO ARE BEHIND BARS FOR ONLY ABOUT HALF THEIR SENTENCE; WORSE YET, 30,000 OFFENDERS EACH YEAR ARE CONVICTED OF A VIOLENT CRIME ARE NOT EVEN SENTENCED TO PRISON. THE BOTTOM LINE -- CONVICTED VIOLENT CRIMINALS WHO SHOULD BE BEHIND BARS ARE NOT, BECAUSE THERE ARE TOO FEW PRISON CELLS.

THE ANTI-CRIME LAW HELPS STATES RESPOND TO THIS PROBLEM WITH \$7.9 BILLION GRANT PROGRAM, UNDER WHICH STATES CAN BUILD AND OPERATE EITHER ADDITIONAL SECURE PRISON CELLS FOR VIOLENT

CRIMINALS OR BOOT CAMP PRISONS FOR NONVIOLENT OFFENDERS, THEREBY FREEING UP SECURE PRISON SPACES FOR VIOLENT CRIMINALS. IN THIS WAY, THE LAW ENCOURAGES STATES TO MAKE THE MOST EFFICIENT USE OF EXISTING PRISON CELLS BY PUTTING VIOLENT OFFENDERS IN THE MOST EXPENSIVE SPACE AND HOUSING NON-VIOLENT, MINOR OFFENDERS AT ONE-THIRD THE COST OF TRADITIONAL PRISON SPACE.

BOOT CAMP PRISONS WERE INCLUDED AMONG THE OPTIONS A STATE COULD CHOOSE UNDER THE PROGRAM FOR ONE REASON AND ONE REASON ONLY -- THEY ARE A CHEAPER MEANS OF INCARCERATING NONVIOLENT OFFENDERS. A BOOT CAMP SPACE COSTS ABOUT ONE-THIRD WHAT A PRISON SPACE COSTS PER INMATE. TODAY 160,000 YOUNG, NON-VIOLENT, MINOR OFFENDERS ARE BEHIND BARS IN COSTLY PRISON CELLS THAT WOULD BE BETTER USED TO HOUSE TRULY VIOLENT, DANGEROUS CRIMINALS. SO MOVING NONVIOLENT OFFENDERS INTO BOOT CAMPS, THEREBY FREEING UP SPACE IN TRADITIONAL PRISONS FOR VIOLENT OFFENDERS, IS A COST-EFFECTIVE RESPONSE TO THE PRISON SPACE SHORTAGE.

IN A PROVISION OF THE PROGRAM THAT REFLECTS A COMPROMISE I STRUCK WITH CONGRESSMAN MCCULLOM, THE LAW RESERVES HALF THE \$7.9 BILLION IN PRISON GRANT MONEY FOR STATES THAT MOVE TOWARDS A "TRUTH IN SENTENCING" MODEL FOR SENTENCING CONVICTED FELONS. NATIONWIDE TODAY, PRISONERS SERVE ON AVERAGE ONLY 40 PERCENT OF THEIR SENTENCES. ENCOURAGING STATES TO REFORM THEIR SYSTEMS IS A WORTHY GOAL. BUT IN ISSUING A CHALLENGE TO THE STATES, IT IS IMPORTANT THAT THE STANDARD SET BE ONE STATES CAN REALISTICALLY WORK TO MEET.

THE CRIME LAW'S PRISON PROGRAM DOES THAT: THE GRANTS ARE CONDITIONED ON A STATE KEEPING REPEAT VIOLENT OFFENDERS BEHIND BARS FOR AT LEAST 85 PERCENT OF THEIR SENTENCE. SO, LIKE THE 100,000 COPS PROGRAM, THE PRISON PROVISION WAS CAREFULLY DRAFTED TO INCLUDE REASONABLE, BUT SPECIFIC, REQUIREMENTS THAT SERVED SPECIFIC GOALS.

WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE REPUBLICAN'S NEW PRISON PROPOSAL, YOU SEE A MUCH DIFFERENT PICTURE. THIS TIME, THEY HAVE IDENTIFIED A SPECIFIC GOAL; THE PROBLEM IS THEIR PROGRAM ISN'T DESIGNED TO ATTAIN THAT GOAL. THE REPUBLICAN PROPOSAL GIVES STATES MONEY FOR ONE PURPOSE AND ONE PURPOSE ONLY -- TO BUILD AND OPERATE TRADITIONAL PRISONS.

BUT INSTEAD OF ENCOURAGING STATES TO MAXIMIZE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE FUNDS, THEY HAVE SEVERELY LIMITED THE WAYS IN WHICH STATES CAN USE THE MONEY. FOR EXAMPLE, CONSIDER A STATE THAT HAS A LARGE STORE OF TRADITIONAL PRISON SPACE, BUT IS CURRENTLY USING 30 PERCENT OF THAT SPACE TO HOUSE NONVIOLENT OFFENDERS. THE MOST EFFECTIVE STRATEGY FOR THAT STATE WOULD BE TO BUILD A BOOT CAMP PRISON TO HOUSE THE NONVIOLENT OFFENDERS NOW IN CONVENTIONAL PRISONS, BECAUSE BOOT CAMP BEDS COST ABOUT ONE-FIFTH THE PRICE TO BUILD, AND ONLY ONE-THIRD THE PRICE TO OPERATE AS CONVENTIONAL PRISON BEDS. THE END RESULT WOULD BE THAT THE STATE COULD KEEP VIOLENT OFFENDERS BEHIND BARS 30 PERCENT LONGER, OR PUT 30 PERCENT MORE VIOLENT OFFENDERS BEHIND BARS, AND COULD DO SO AT ONE-THIRD THE COST OF BUILDING MORE CONVENTIONAL PRISON SPACE.

BUT UNDER THE REPUBLICAN PROPOSAL, THE STATE WOULD BE FORCED TO BUILD MORE EXPENSIVE, CONVENTIONAL PRISON CELLS IF IT WANTED TO RECEIVE THE FEDERAL FUNDS -- EVEN THOUGH IT COULD GET THE SAME RESULTS FOR ONE-THIRD THE PRICE IF IT COULD BUILD A BOOT CAMP PRISON. GOVERNOR ENGLER OF MICHIGAN, GOVERNOR THOMPSON OF WISCONSIN, GOVERNOR WILSON OF CALIFORNIA, GOVERNOR WELD OF MASSACHUSETTS, GOVERNOR EDGAR OF ILLINOIS -- ALL REPUBLICANS -- HAVE JOINED A NUMBER OF DEMOCRATIC GOVERNORS WHO ARE OPERATING BOOT CAMPS FOR NONVIOLENT OFFENDERS, SO THAT EXPENSIVE, TRADITIONAL PRISONS CAN BE RESERVED FOR VIOLENT OFFENDERS.

RIGHT NOW, THERE ARE APPROXIMATELY 160,000 FIRST-TIME, NON-VIOLENT PRISONERS ACROSS THE COUNTRY WHO ARE ELIGIBLE FOR BOOT CAMP PRISONS, BUT ONLY ABOUT 10,000 ARE ENROLLED. MOVING MORE OF THESE INMATES INTO BOOT CAMPS WOULD FREE UP TRADITIONAL PRISON CELLS FOR VIOLENT INMATES AND WOULD MAKE THE MOST OF BOTH THE STATE AND THE FEDERAL RESOURCES AVAILABLE FOR PRISONS. AND THAT IS WHAT GOVERNORS FROM BOTH PARTIES ARE TRYING TO DO IN MANY STATES.

I OUTLINED BEFORE THE MISTAKE MADE WITH THE LAW ENFORCEMENT BLOCK GRANTS -- WHERE THE REPUBLICANS FAILED TO DEFINE GOALS AND THEN DEvised AN AMORPHOUS PROGRAM WITH NO REQUIREMENTS AND NO GUIDELINES. WITH PRISONS, THE REPUBLICANS HAVE MADE THE OPPOSITE MISTAKE -- THEY FAIL TO GIVE THE STATES THE NECESSARY FLEXIBILITY TO MEET THE GOAL THEY IDENTIFY AND INSTEAD HAVE PUT THE STATES IN A STRAJTJACKET. THIS MISTAKE IS PARTICULARLY IRONIC GIVEN THAT FLEXIBILITY AND "DEVOLUTION TO THE STATES" IS THE REPUBLICAN WATCHWORD OF THE MONTH.

IN THE HOUSE, THE REPUBLICANS HAVE GONE EVEN FURTHER. TO GET ANY OF THE PRISON MONEY UNDER THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN'S PROVISION, EVEN FIRST-TIME VIOLENT OFFENDER MUST SERVE 85 PERCENT OF HIS SENTENCE. NOW, THIS IS THE ULTIMATE GOAL MANY OF US HAVE IN SIGHT. I WANT TO SEE ALL VIOLENT CRIMINALS SERVING AT LEAST 85 PERCENT OF THEIR SENTENCES. IF YOU DO THE CRIME, YOU SHOULD DO THE TIME. BUT IF WE WANT TO HELP STATES MEET THAT GOAL, WE HAVE TO BE REALISTIC. TO MEET THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN'S STANDARD, MOST STATES WOULD HAVE TO DOUBLE THE TIME THEY KEEP VIOLENT OFFENDERS BEHIND BARS FROM APPROXIMATELY 42 PERCENT TO THE REQUIRED 85 PERCENT.

IT WOULD COST THE STATES AT LEAST \$60 BILLION TO DO THIS -- \$60 BILLION DOLLARS, WHEN THE ENTIRE AMOUNT OF FEDERAL FUNDS AVAILABLE IS \$? BILLION. NOW, I COME FROM A STATE THAT ACTUALLY MEETS THIS REQUIREMENT -- DELAWARE HAS TRUTH-IN-SENTENCING LAWS -- BUT IT IS ONE OF ONLY THREE OR FOUR STATES THAT DOES. I RESPECTFULLY SUGGEST THAT NONE OF THE REMAINING 47 STATES WOULD BE WILLING TO SPEND TRIPLE THE AMOUNT OF ANY FEDERAL FUNDING THEY COULD RECEIVE, EVEN IF THEY DESPERATELY NEEDED MORE PRISON SPACE.

SO, AS INCREDIBLE AS IT SEEMS, THE HOUSE REPUBLICANS HAVE SUCCEEDED IN WRITING A PROGRAM THAT WILL ACTUALLY PRODUCE FEWER PRISON CELLS -- FEWER PRISONS -- THAN WHAT IS IN CURRENT LAW. RECOGNITION OF THIS PROBLEM WAS THE POINT, AS I UNDERSTOOD IT, OF WHAT THE NATIONAL GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION WROTE TO ME JUST A FEW MONTHS AGO -- A LETTER, SIGNED BY GOVERNOR WILSON, AMONG OTHERS. IT SAID: "WE URGE YOU TO RESIST ANY EFFORT TO IMPOSE A STRINGENT SET OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURES AND SENTENCING

REQUIREMENTS ON THE STATES AS A CONDITION OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO INCARCERATE VIOLENT CRIMINALS." I ALSO TRUST THAT THIS PROBLEM IS THE REASON THE SENATE REPUBLICANS HAVE STAYED WITH THE REPEAT VIOLENT OFFENDER STANDARD IN THEIR VERSION OF THE PRISON GRANT PROGRAM.

NOW IT IS NICE TO SEE THAT, DESPITE WHAT MY REPUBLICAN COLLEAGUES IN THE SENATE SAID DURING THE DEBATE LAST SUMMER, ABOUT HOW THE 85 PERCENT STANDARD MUST HOLD FOR FIRST-TIME OFFENDERS, THEY HAVE CHANGED THEIR VIEW. IN THEIR NEW BILL, THE SENATE REPUBLICANS APPLY THE 85 PERCENT STANDARD TO REPEAT VIOLENT OFFENDERS, WHICH IS WHAT IS IN THE CURRENT LAW. WHAT'S INTERESTING IS THAT THE CURRENT LAW WAS THE RESULT OF A COMPROMISE THAT I WORKED OUT WITH CONGRESSMAN MCCOLLUM OVER IN THE HOUSE. BUT NOW CONGRESSMAN MCCOLLUM IS BACK OVER THERE REWRITING THE VERY COMPROMISE WE AGREED ON, MAKING THE 85 PERCENT STANDARD APPLY TO EVERYBODY.

SO WE HAVE THE SENATE REPUBLICANS SWITCHING FROM FIRST-TIME TO REPEAT OFFENDERS, AND THE HOUSE REPUBLICANS FLIP-FLOPPING IN THE OPPOSITE DIRECTION, FROM REPEAT OFFENDERS TO FIRST-TIMERS. THESE POLITICAL GAMES MAY BE FASCINATING TO A LOT OF PEOPLE IN WASHINGTON. BUT WHILE WE'RE UP HERE PLOWING BACK OVER OLD GROUND, SWAPPING POSITIONS, CLAIMING WE'RE TOUGHER THAN THE NEXT GUY AND HAVING A GRAND OLD TIME, WE AREN'T HELPING ANYBODY BUILD ANY MORE PRISONS.

UNDER THE NEW REPUBLICAN PLAN, IT IS LIKELY THAT FEWER THAN 10,000 PRISON CELLS WILL BE BUILT. THE MONEY WILL BE SITTING HERE IN WASHINGTON, IN THE TRUST FUND, WAITING TO BE SENT OUT TO THE

STATES, BUT NO ONE WILL BE ABLE TO QUALIFY FOR IT. THE END RESULT WILL BE NO JAILS, NO PRISONS, NO MORE VIOLENT OFFENDERS BEHIND BARS.

FINALLY, THE REPUBLICAN PROPOSAL ACTUALLY WEAKENS THE RIGHTS OF CRIME VICTIMS. UNDER THE PROGRAM WE HAVE NOW, THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT IS IMPLEMENTING GUIDELINES THAT ENSURE VICTIMS' INTERESTS ARE CONSIDERED AT EVERY STEP OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROCESS: THAT VICTIMS ARE NOTIFIED OF THE STATUS OF THEIR CASES AND THE OFFENDERS; THAT THEY ARE PROVIDED THE CHANCE TO GO TO ALL PUBLIC HEARINGS AND PROCEEDINGS; THAT THEY HAVE THE RIGHT TO TESTIFY AT SENTENCING AND PAROLE HEARINGS; AND THAT THEY GET RESTITUTION FROM THEIR ASSAILANTS. THE REPUBLICAN PROPOSAL REFERS ONLY TO VICTIMS' RIGHT TO BE HEARD AT SENTENCING AND RELEASE HEARINGS, AND IT LIMITS THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT'S ABILITY TO ENCOURAGE THE BROADEST POSSIBLE RANGE OF VICTIM INPUT INTO THE SYSTEM.

THE REPUBLICAN PRISON PROPOSAL WILL BUILD FEWER PRISONS, IT WILL KEEP FEWER VIOLENT FELONS BEHIND BARS, AND IT WILL SHORTCHANGE THE RIGHTS OF CRIME VICTIMS. IT SHOULD BE REJECTED.

PREVENTION PROGRAMS

I TURN NOW TO AN ISSUE THAT HAS BEEN THE SUBJECT OF MORE MISINFORMATION AND OUTRIGHT MISCHARACTERIZATION THAN PERHAPS ANY OTHER IN THE CRIME DEBATE -- AND THAT'S SAYING QUITE A LOT! I REFER, OF COURSE TO THE QUESTION OF WHETHER THE NATION OUGHT TO PREVENT CRIME BEFORE IT HAPPENS, INSTEAD OF CONTINUING TO DO NOTHING UNTIL AFTER THE SHOTS ARE FIRED, UNTIL AFTER OUR CHILDREN

BECOME ADDICTED TO DRUGS, UNTIL AFTER MORE AMERICANS' LIVES ARE RUINED, BEFORE WE TAKE ACTION.

THE ANTI-CRIME LAW ENACTED LAST YEAR ANSWERED THAT QUESTION BY JOINING THE COMMITMENT MADE TO LAW ENFORCEMENT -- TO 100,000 MORE POLICE OFFICERS, TO 100,000 TO 125,000 MORE PRISON CELLS -- WITH A COMMITMENT TO CRIME PREVENTION. IT SAID LOUD AND CLEAR THAT WE CANNOT KEEP EXPANDING THE SINK WITHOUT ALSO TRYING TO SHUT OFF THE FAUCET.

THE STRAIGHTFORWARD LOGIC OF THIS PROPOSITION IS SUPPORTED BY THE CONCLUSION OF VIRTUALLY EVERY CRIMINOLOGIST, EVERY LEGAL SCHOLAR, EVERY SOCIOLOGIST, EVERY PSYCHOLOGIST, EVERY MEDICAL AUTHORITY. THOSE WHO STUDY THIS ISSUE AGREE THAT BREAKING THE CYCLE OF VIOLENCE AND CRIME REQUIRES AN INVESTMENT IN THE LIVES OF OUR CHILDREN, IN THE FORM OF SUPPORT AND GUIDANCE THAT HELPS THEM REJECT THE VIOLENCE AND ANARCHY OF THE STREETS IN FAVOR OF TAKING POSITIVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THEIR OWN LIVES.

MOST IMPORTANTLY, PREVENTION IS WHAT COPS WANT -- WHAT VIRTUALLY EVERYONE IN LAW ENFORCEMENT WANTS. EVERY COP I HAVE TALKED TO, EVERY PROSECUTOR, EVERY PRISON WARDEN, EVERY PROBATION OFFICER LITERALLY SAYS THE SAME THING -- WE CAN'T DO IT ALONE.

LISTEN TO THE COPS:

"LAW ENFORCEMENT IS MORE THAN JUST ARRESTING PEOPLE AND PUTTING PEOPLE IN PRISON," SAID BUD MEEKS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION. "IT'S ALSO TRYING TO KEEP PEOPLE FROM GOING TO PRISON." [WASHINGTON TIMES, AUG. 2, 1994]

BOB SCULLY OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POLICE ORGANIZATIONS SAYS: "IF YOU DON'T HAVE THE PREVENTION PORTION, YOU BETTER GO OUT AND MORTGAGE THIS COUNTRY TO BUILD PRISONS..." [LAW ENFORCEMENT NEWS, DEC. 31, 1994]

THE FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE SAID THE 1994 CRIME ACT "HAS A BALANCE OF ENFORCEMENT, PROSECUTION/COURTS, PRISONS, PREVENTION, WHICH WILL MAKE A REAL DIFFERENCE IN THE INCIDENCE OF CRIME OVER THE NEXT FIVE YEARS."

AND THE INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF POLICE OFFICERS SAYS "THE CRIME BILL IS AN APPROPRIATE BALANCE OF POLICE, PUNISHMENT AND PREVENTION, A HOLISTIC APPROACH CRITICAL TO A LONG TERM CURE."

LISTEN TO PROSECUTORS AS WELL:

THE NATIONAL DISTRICT ATTORNEYS ASSOCIATION SAID, "WHILE MANY MAY CRITICIZE SPECIFIC COMPONENTS ... WE BELIEVE THAT THE FINAL EFFORT PROVIDES A BALANCE OF PROGRAMS THAT HOLD THE POTENTIAL FOR MAKING A VAST DIFFERENCE FOR OUR NATION IN REDUCING THE CRIME RATE."

LISTEN TO PRISON WARDENS:

IN A RECENTLY RELEASED SURVEY OF WARDENS ACROSS THE COUNTRY, PRISON OFFICIALS SAID IF THEY HAD AN EXTRA \$10 MILLION TO SPEND FIGHTING CRIME, THEY WOULD SPEND MORE THAN HALF -- 57 PERCENT OF IT -- ON PREVENTION PROGRAMS.

AND LISTEN TO LOCAL OFFICIALS, THOSE IN GOVERNMENT WHO ARE CLOSEST, FACE-TO-FACE WITH THE SCOURGE OF DRUGS AND VIOLENCE

EVERY DAY, THE VERY PEOPLE WHOM THE REPUBLICANS -- AND I BELIEVE RIGHTLY SO -- WANT TO GIVE GREATER VOICE:

LISTEN TO REPUBLICAN MAYORS GIULIANI OF NEW YORK AND RIORDAN OF LOS ANGELES -- QUOTE: "BY FUNDING PROVEN PREVENTION PROGRAMS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE, THE CRIME BILL OFFERS HOPE -- HOPE THAT IN THE FUTURE WE CAN REDUCE THE NEED FOR SO MANY POLICE OFFICERS AND JAILS." [USA TODAY, AUG. 17, 1994, OP-ED]

LISTEN TO PAUL HELMKE, THE REPUBLICAN MAYOR OF FORT WAYNE, INDIANA: "IT'S A LOT LESS EXPENSIVE TO DO THINGS ON THE PREVENTION SIDE THAN ON THE POLICE SIDE."

AND MAYOR HELMKE GETS ANOTHER CRUCIAL POINT AS WELL: "THERE HASN'T BEEN A CHANCE FOR THE CRIME BILL TO HAVE AN EFFECT. IT DOESN'T MAKE SENSE TO CHANGE THE RULES BEFORE WE CAN SEE IF THIS BILL REALLY WORKS." [USA TODAY, JAN. 19, 1995]

THIS UNITY AMONG LAW ENFORCEMENT WAS THE FORCE THAT DROVE THE PREVENTION PROGRAMS INTO THE CRIME LAW. WE NEED TO GIVE THESE PROGRAMS A CHANCE. IF AFTER A FEW YEARS THE PREVENTION PROGRAMS IN THE ANTI-CRIME LAW DO NOT WORK, I WILL BE FIRST IN LINE TO CHANGE IT.

NOW MY REPUBLICAN COLLEAGUES ARE CLEVER, AND THEY KNOW THAT EXPERT, POLICE, AND THE AMERICAN PUBLIC STRONGLY SUPPORT UNDERTAKING PREVENTION EFFORTS HAND IN HAND WITH INCREASING ENFORCEMENT -- JUST AS THE CRIME LAW PROVIDES. SO LAST YEAR, MY REPUBLICAN COLLEAGUES EMBARKED ON A CAMPAIGN OF CHARACTER

ASSASSINATION, IF YOU WILL -- THEY SET OUT TO DESTROY THE REPUTATION OF THE PREVENTION PROGRAMS IN THE CRIME LAW. AND THEY DID IT WITH ONE WORD -- THE DREAD LABEL OF "PORK." FOR MONTHS, THEY INDISCRIMINATELY AND CONSISTENTLY APPLIED THE LABEL "PORK" TO ANYTHING AND EVERYTHING CALLED PREVENTION. I GUESS THEY WERE PURSUING THE APPROACH THAT IF YOU SAY SOMETHING OFTEN ENOUGH, PEOPLE WILL START TO BELIEVE IT, WHETHER IT IS TRUE OR NOT.

THE TRUTH OF COURSE IS THAT THERE IS NO PORK IN THIS BILL; THERE IS NO MONEY SPECIFICALLY MARKED FOR A SINGLE DISTRICT OR STATE; NO MONEY TO FUND A PET PROJECT BACK HOME FOR ANY MEMBER OF CONGRESS. THERE IS NOT ONE SINGLE POUND, THERE IS NOT EVEN AN OUNCE OF PORK IN THIS BILL -- THERE IS NO PORK IN HERE WHATSOEVER. NONE.

LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT WHAT THE BILL DOES FUND. THE BILL CONTAINS A \$30.2 BILLION TRUST FUND, FILLED WITH THE SAVINGS FROM REDUCING THE FEDERAL WORKFORCE. MORE THAN 80 PERCENT OF THE MONEY -- ABOUT \$25 BILLION -- PAYS FOR 100,000 MORE STATE AND LOCAL POLICE OFFICERS AND 100,000 MORE STATE PRISON CELLS. ANOTHER \$1.6 BILLION PAYS FOR MORE AGGRESSIVE PROSECUTION OF VIOLENT CRIMES AGAINST WOMEN. \$2.6 BILLION PAYS FOR MORE FBI AGENTS, MORE DEA AGENTS, MORE BORDER PATROL AGENTS, MORE TREASURY AGENTS, MORE PROSECUTORS, MORE U.S. ATTORNEYS, AND MORE AGGRESSIVE PROSECUTION OF VIOLENT CRIMES AGAINST WOMEN.

SO, OUT OF THE ENTIRE \$30.2 BILLION, \$5.4 BILLION -- JUST UNDER 18 PERCENT -- IS FOR PROGRAMS TO PREVENT CRIME BEFORE IT HAPPENS. THE REPUBLICANS HAVE TARGETED EVERY SINGLE PREVENTION GRANT TO

STATES OR LOCALITIES -- FOR COMPLETE ELIMINATION. LET'S GET PAST THE LABELS AND SEE WHAT THIS MONEY PAYS FOR. THE FIRST MYSTERY WE MUST UNRAVEL IS WHY THE REPUBLICANS OPPOSE THE DRUG COURT PROGRAM, A \$1 BILLION GRANT PROGRAM TO ENABLE STATES TO TOUGHEN ENFORCEMENT AGAINST FIRST-TIME AND MINOR NONVIOLENT DRUG OFFENDERS.

DRUG COURT PROGRAMS TARGET LOW-LEVEL DRUG OFFENDERS, WHO ARE OUT ON THE STREETS BREAKING INTO CARS AND STEALING TO SUPPORT THEIR HABITS. IN MOST COMMUNITIES, THESE OFFENDERS ARE NOW LARGELY IGNORED BY OUR SYSTEM. THEY DO NOT GO TO PRISON AND THEY ARE NOT REQUIRED TO COMPLY WITH DRUG TESTING OR TO GET TREATMENT. MOST ARE SIMPLY SENT RIGHT BACK OUT ON THE STREETS ON LARGELY UNSUPERVISED PROBATION. BACK OUT ON THE STREET, THESE OFFENDERS GO RIGHT BACK TO THE CYCLE OF DRUG USE -- AND THEN TO CRIME IN SUPPORT OF THEIR HABITS. ALL TOO OFTEN, THEIR CRIMINAL ACTIVITY SPIRALS UP TO MORE SERIOUS, VIOLENT OFFENDERS AS THEIR ADDICTIONS GET DEEPER.

THE HEART OF THE PROBLEM, HERE, IS THAT THE PROBATION AND PAROLE POPULATIONS HAVE BOOMED, JUST LIKE THE PRISON POPULATIONS. MORE THAN 3.5 MILLION OFFENDERS -- HALF OF THEM DRUG ADDICTS -- ARE NOW LIVING IN THEIR COMMUNITIES UNDER THE NOMINAL SUPERVISION OF COURT OR CORRECTIONS OFFICERS. ACCORDING TO THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT, SOME 135,000 DRUG-ADDICTED THIEVES AND OTHER OFFENDERS ARE RELEASED ON PROBATION EVERY YEAR. WITH AN AVERAGE PROBATION SENTENCE OF FOUR YEARS, THIS MEANS THAT ABOUT 600,000 DRUG-ADDICTED OFFENDERS ARE ON OUR NATION'S STREETS EACH DAY.

MANY OF THESE PROBATIONERS ARE HIGH-RATE OFFENDERS; HARD-CORE ADDICTS ARE ESTIMATED TO COMMIT UP TO 200 CRIMES A YEAR TO SUPPORT THEIR HABITS. AND WE KNOW WHO THESE PEOPLE ARE. JUDGES AND PROBATION OFFICERS HAVE THEIR NAMES. SO WHY DO WE IGNORE THEM? BECAUSE THE NUMBER OF PROBATION OFFICERS HAS NOT KEPT PACE WITH THE GROWTH IN THE PROBATION POPULATION, PROBATION CASELOADS NOW AVERAGE 118 OFFENDERS. IN SOME AREAS, CASELOADS CAN EXCEED 200! WITH SO MANY OFFENDERS, OFFICERS ARE ABLE TO CONDUCT ONLY MINIMAL SUPERVISION AT BEST -- PERHAPS 15 MINUTES A WEEK.

DRUG COURTS ARE DESIGNED TO TAKE THESE OFFENDERS AND THEIR CRIMES SERIOUSLY. DRUG COURTS GIVE THESE OFFENDERS A CHANCE TO STAY OUT OF JAIL -- BUT IT IS A CHANCE NOT A FREE PASS.

DRUG COURTS REQUIRE OFFENDERS TO SUBMIT TO MANDATORY DRUG TESTING AND TREATMENT, STRICT SUPERVISION BY A COURT OFFICER, BACKED UP BY SANCTIONS IF THEY FAIL. HOW CAN ANYONE CALL THIS "PORK" OR EVEN A "SOCIAL PROGRAM?" WHAT CONCEIVABLE DEFINITION OF PORK WOULD INCLUDE AN ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM THAT SUBJECTS DRUG OFFENDERS TO A TOUGHER RESPONSE FROM OUR COURT AND CORRECTIONS SYSTEM?

PROSECUTORS, JUDGES AND CORRECTIONS OFFICIALS ACROSS THE COUNTRY WANT TO ADOPT DRUG COURT PROGRAMS. FRANKLY, THE MONEY IN THE CRIME LAW IS MODEST IN FACE OF THE NEED AND THE DESIRE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT FOR THIS TOOL. SO \$1 BILLION OF THE \$5.4 BILLION THE REPUBLICANS HAVE TARGETED AS "WASTEFUL PREVENTION SPENDING" IS ACTUALLY FOR DRUG COURTS. WHAT DOES THE REMAINING \$4.4 BILLION DO?

THE NEXT \$2 BILLION IS ALREADY IN THE FORM OF BLOCK GRANTS -- THE PRECISE, FLEXIBLE FUNDING MECHANISM THE REPUBLICANS FAVOR. UNDER CURRENT LAW, CITIES, TOWNS AND COUNTIES GET \$2 BILLION TO SPEND ON PROGRAMS THEY DEVELOP TO PREVENT CRIME. IN FACT, NEARLY \$400 MILLION OF THE MONEY IS IN A BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM AUTHORED BY HOUSE REPUBLICANS, THAT LETS A COMMUNITY CHOOSE WHETHER IT WANTS A BOYS OR GIRLS CLUB, AN ATHLETIC LEAGUE, AMONG OTHER PROGRAMS.

WITH \$2 BILLION ALREADY IN BLOCK GRANTS, THAT LEAVES \$2.4 BILLION IN PREVENTION FUNDING. OF THAT \$2.4 BILLION, MORE THAN \$800 MILLION IS IN THE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS PROGRAM, WHICH KEEPS SCHOOLS OPEN IN THE AFTERNOONS AND EVENINGS AND ON WEEKENDS, SO KIDS LIVING IN DRUG AND CRIME-INFESTED NEIGHBORHOODS CAN HAVE A SAFE PLACE TO GO, AND WORK OR PLAY SPORTS WITH POSITIVE MENTORS INSTEAD OF GANG MEMBERS. EIGHTEEN MONTHS AGO, THIS PROGRAM HAD STRONG BIPARTISAN SUPPORT -- IT WAS ORIGINALLY SPONSORED BY SENATORS DOMENICI AND DANFORTH AS WELL AS SENATORS DODD AND BRADLEY -- AND WAS ENDORSED BY MAYORS OF ALL POLITICAL STRIPES -- INCLUDING MAYORS GIULIANI AND RIORDAN.

ANOTHER \$625 MILLION IS IN THE MODEL INTENSIVE GRANTS PROGRAM -- WHICH TARGETS THE CITIES AND TOWNS HARDEST HIT BY VIOLENCE FOR COORDINATED PREVENTION AND LAW ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS. THIS PROGRAM IS SUBSTANTIALLY SIMILAR TO THE WEED AND SEED PROGRAM CHAMPIONED BY THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION AND TO THE DRUG EMERGENCY AREAS PROGRAM, WHICH RECEIVED BI-PARTISAN SPONSORSHIP FROM SENATORS GORTON AND D'AMATO WHEN IT PASSED THE SENATE IN 1990.

NOW WE'RE DOWN TO AN EVEN \$1 BILLION. OF THAT BILLION, \$200 MILLION IS FOR MORE EFFECTIVE PROSECUTION AND PUNISHMENT OF YOUNG OFFENDERS. WITH THE RISE IN SERIOUS JUVENILE VIOLENCE THAT WE'VE SEEN OVER THE PAST SEVERAL YEARS, \$200 MILLION COMMITMENT IN A \$30 BILLION BILL SEEMS TO BE TO BE A MODEST AMOUNT TO FOCUS ON HELPING STATES REFORM THEIR JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM TO DEAL WITH THESE DELINQUENTS.

THAT LEAVES \$800 MILLION. \$400 MILLION OF THAT IS TARGETED AT DRUG TREATMENT IN PRISONS. NOW, LOGIC TELLS US THAT IF A LOT OF CRIME IS COMMITTED BY PEOPLE WHO ARE ADDICTED TO DRUGS, HELPING A CRIMINAL ADDICT KICK HIS HABIT BEFORE RELEASING HIM FROM PRISON MAKES SENSE. PRESIDENT BUSH'S DRUG CZAR, WILLIAM BENNETT, ISSUED A REPORT BACK IN 1990 THAT FOUND TREATMENT CUTS OFFENDERS' CRIME RATES IN HALF. AND SENATOR GRAMM OF TEXAS ENDORSED PRISON DRUG TREATMENT ON THE SENATE FLOOR DURING THE CRIME BILL DEBATE LAST NOVEMBER. YET TODAY, THE REPUBLICAN PROPOSAL WIPES OUT FUNDING FOR TREATING DRUG-ADDICTED STATE PRISONERS. INEXPLICABLY, THEY KEEP THE \$100 MILLION FOR TREATING FEDERAL PRISONERS, BUT GONE IS THE EFFORT TO HELP STATES -- WHERE THE VAST MAJORITY OF THESE OFFENDERS ARE.

NOW, WE'RE DOWN NOW TO \$500 MILLION. NEARLY \$100 MILLION OF THAT IS FOR COORDINATION OF PREVENTION EFFORTS AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL -- TO REDUCE ANY DUPLICATION, TO TARGET APPROPRIATE AREAS AND POPULATIONS WITH THE MOST EFFECTIVE PROGRAMS. \$270 MILLION IS FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATIONS TO CREATE JOBS THAT PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR INNER-CITY YOUTHS IN THE LEGITIMATE ECONOMY.

ALMOST \$40 MILLION IN THE LAW IS FOR, DARE I SAY IT, ORPHANAGE-LIKE, RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES FOR TROUBLED YOUTHS. \$45 MILLION IS FOR THE "G.R.E.A.T." PROGRAM, WHICH SEEKS TO KEEPS KIDS OUT OF GANGS THE WAY THE "DARE" PROGRAM SEEKS TO KEEP KIDS OFF OF DRUGS. AND FINALLY, THERE IS \$1 MILLION DEVOTED TO A NATIONAL COMMISSION TO STUDY THE CAUSES OF VIOLENCE AND COME UP WITH EVER MORE EFFECTIVE SOLUTIONS DOWN THE ROAD.

SO I THINK IT IS CLEAR, MR. PRESIDENT, THAT ONCE YOU GET PAST ALL OF THE POLITICAL POSTURING AND GAMESMANSHIP, THE 1994 ANTI-CRIME LAW IS A SOUND AND MEASURED CRIME-FIGHTING STRATEGY. IT DOESN'T WASTE TAXPAYERS' DOLLARS. ON THE CONTRARY, IT WILL SAVE TAXPAYERS' LIVES. UNFORTUNATELY, FOR THE MILLIONS OF VIOLENCE-WEARY AMERICANS, INSTEAD OF MOVING FORWARD, WE ARE SCHEDULED TO RETURN TO YESTERDAY'S DEBATE. ALL I CAN SAY IS THAT REPUBLICANS SEEM MORE INTERESTED IN FIGHTING DEMOCRATS, THAN IN FIGHTING CRIME.

CONCLUSION

I HAVE TRIED TODAY TO OUTLINE MY OBJECTIONS TO THE REPUBLICANS RETREAT ON THE KEY PROVISIONS OF THE ANTI-CRIME LAW ENACTED LAST YEAR. I WILL RETURN TO ADDRESS OTHER PROVISIONS OF EQUAL SIGNIFICANCE THAT THE REPUBLICANS WILL RAISE, BUT THAT WERE NOT A PART OF LAST YEAR'S ANTI-CRIME LAW. MOST SIGNIFICANT AMONG THESE, PERHAPS, IS REFORM OF HABEAS CORPUS -- AN AREA WHERE REFORM IS LONG OVERDUE, BUT WHERE THE REPUBLICAN PROPOSAL, WHILE LABELED REFORM, ACTUALLY AMOUNTS TO ELIMINATION OF THE HISTORIC WRIT. I WILL ALSO ADDRESS THE SO-CALLED REFORM OF THE EXCLUSIONARY RULE, WHICH AGAIN THE REPUBLICANS EFFECTIVELY SEEK TO ELIMINATE.

Crime Strategy

PROPOSED CRIME STRATEGY

OVERALL MESSAGE

- * **DEFEND CRIME LAW AS THE DOWNPAYMENT ON REPAIRING KEY DEFECTS IN CURRENT SYSTEM:**
 - ** **THE SHORTAGE OF POLICE OUT ON THE STREETS OF OUR COMMUNITIES;**
 - ** **THE SHORTAGE OF PRISON SPACES AND THE NEED FOR SENTENCING REFORM;**
 - ** **THE SHORTAGE OF EFFECTIVE RESPONSES TO DRUG OFFENDERS;**
 - ** **THE LACK OF A SERIOUS RESPONSE TO RAPE AND FAMILY VIOLENCE; AND**
 - ** **THE LACK OF SAFE PLACES AND POSITIVE ACTIVITIES FOR THOSE CHILDREN GROWING UP SURROUNDED BY ILLEGAL DRUGS, CRIME, AND VIOLENCE.**

- * **THE CRIME LAW TAKES POSITIVE STEPS TOWARD REDRESSING EACH OF THESE SHORTCOMINGS. IT FOCUSES ON THE RIGHT GOALS AND IS ALREADY AT WORK. WE NEED TO MOVE FORWARD IN FIGHTING CRIME TO FOLLOW THROUGH ON THESE EFFORTS AND TO RESPOND TO ADDITIONAL CHALLENGES SUCH AS FIGHTING DRUGS AND REFORMING THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM.**

- * **THE REPUBLICAN EFFORTS IN CONGRESS REPRESENT NOT FORWARD MOVEMENT, BUT A RETREAT. THEY WANT TO STOP A LAW THAT IS ALREADY AT WORK FOR THE CYNICAL PURPOSE OF TAKING CREDIT FOR FIGHTING CRIME.**

- * **ANNOUNCE NEXT STEPS IN FIGHTING CRIME:**
 - ** **FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DRUG STRATEGY;**
 - ** **AGGRESSIVE ENFORCEMENT STRATEGY TO KEEP GUNS OUT OF THE HANDS OF CHILDREN; AND**
 - ** **SUMMIT ON JUVENILE JUSTICE REFORM.**

OVERVIEW OF STRATEGY

I. MOUNT STRONG PUBLIC DEFENSE OF THE CRIME LAW

- * SEEK TO MOVE HOUSE-PASSED RESTITUTION BILL (WHICH WAS PART OF ORIGINAL BIDEN BILL) ON ITS OWN.**
- * FIGHT ANY CHANGE TO 100,000 COPS PROGRAM.**
- * FIGHT ANY CHANGE TO DRUG COURT PROVISION.**
- * FIGHT REPEAL OR MODIFICATION OF ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN AND BRADY.**
- * FIGHT ELIMINATION OF ALL PREVENTION EFFORT, FOCUSING ON PROTECTING THE TESTED PROGRAMS:**
 - ** COMMUNITY SCHOOLS (\$800 MILLION), DRUG TREATMENT IN STATE PRISONS (\$270 MILLION), G.R.E.A.T. PROGRAM (\$45 MILLION), RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES FOR VIOLENT JUVENILES (\$36 MILLION); AND**
 - ** KEEPING THE CURRENT LAW'S "PURPOSES" FOR BLOCK GRANTS, WHICH INCLUDE BOYS & GIRLS CLUBS, ATHLETIC LEAGUES, AND OTHER CHILD-FOCUSED EFFORTS.**
- * OPPOSE REPUBLICAN PRISON PROVISION, WORK TO INCLUDE BOOT CAMPS AS PERMISSIBLE USE OF FUNDS.**
- * FIGHT REPUBLICAN HABEAS CORPUS AND EXCLUSIONARY REFORM, OFFER ALTERNATIVE DEMOCRATIC PROPOSALS. (INTRODUCE ALTERNATIVES NOW AS STAND-ALONE BILLS.)**
- * OFFER AFFIRMATIVE AMENDMENTS – FOR EXAMPLE, AN IMPROVED BAN ON "COP-KILLER" BULLETS, STEPPED-UP ENFORCEMENT OF ILLEGAL GUN TRAFFICKING.**

II. SPECIFIC EFFORTS IN SUPPORT OF STRATEGY

- * A MAJOR SPEECH BY THE PRESIDENT ANNOUNCING THE DEMOCRATIC STRATEGY;**
- * FOLLOWED BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL AND DEMOCRATIC CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS REPEATING THE MESSAGE IN SPEECHES AND PRESS EVENTS.**
- * SERIES OF REGIONAL FORUMS ON CRIME AND DRUGS CHAIRED BY DEMOCRATIC SENATORS AND THE ATTORNEY GENERAL. THESE HEARINGS COULD FOCUS ON THE CRIME LAW EFFORTS UNDERWAY IN FY 1995 (COMMUNITY POLICE, DRUG COURTS, VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ENFORCEMENT), AS WELL AS ON FORWARD MOVING DEMOCRATIC STRATEGY.**
- * LETTERS TO GOVERNORS AND MAYORS LAYING OUT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN APPROACHES ON PRISONS OR BLOCK GRANTS OR OTHER ISSUES AS APPROPRIATE AND SOLICITING THEIR VIEWS.**

III. IMPLEMENT NATIONAL DRUG STRATEGY

- * HOLD FORUMS IN MAJOR DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS TO HIGHLIGHT EFFORTS TO IMPLEMENT DRUG STRATEGY --**
 - ** ILLUSTRATING HOW THE CRIME LAW IS ALREADY FIGHTING ILLEGAL DRUGS THROUGH COMMUNITY POLICING, DRUG COURTS, AND DRUG TREATMENT IN PRISONS; AND**
 - ** HIGHLIGHTING HOW OTHER CRIME LAW PROVISIONS WILL BEGIN WORKING IN FY 1996, INCLUDING PRISON AND BOOT CAMP FUNDING.**
- * SEEK FULL FUNDING FOR DRUG TREATMENT, PHARMACOTHERAPIES, AND ANTI-DRUG EDUCATION CALLED FOR IN STRATEGY.**
- * RAISE THE LEVEL OF THE DEBATE ON DRUGS -- INCLUDING CALLING ON MEDIA TO STOP GLAMORIZING DRUG USE -- TO INCREASE SOCIAL DISAPPROBATION.**

IV. KEEPING GUNS OUT OF THE HANDS OF KIDS

- * ANNOUNCE A COMPREHENSIVE ENFORCEMENT STRATEGY TO IMPLEMENT THE KIDS AND GUNS PROVISION OF THE CRIME LAW. ALL GUN TRANSFERS TO JUVENILES ARE NOW ILLEGAL; BUT THE EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE LAW REQUIRES AN AGGRESSIVE STRATEGY TO BREAK UP BLACK MARKETS -- THIS MEANS A MASSIVE EFFORT BY STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT IN PARTNERSHIP WITH FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT.**
- * CONVENE REGIONAL MEETINGS WITH LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TO OFFER FEDERAL HELP -- IN THE FORM OF AGENTS AND PROSECUTORS -- IN GETTING AND KEEPING GUNS OUT OF THE HANDS OF KIDS.**
- * ANNOUNCE A "DISARMING KIDS SUMMER" WITH MONTHLY TARGETS FOR DESTROYING GUNS SEIZED BY LAW ENFORCEMENT CRACKING DOWN ON THOSE WHO TRANSFER GUNS TO KIDS AND MONTHLY REPORTS ON PROGRESS.**

V. SUMMIT ON JUVENILE JUSTICE REFORM

- * CALL TOGETHER EXPERTS FROM ACROSS THE COUNTRY TO DISCUSS THE CAUSES OF THE EXPLOSION OF JUVENILE VIOLENCE AND TO IDENTIFY HOW STATES CAN IMPROVE THEIR SYSTEMS FOR HANDLING VIOLENT JUVENILES AND FOR DEALING WITH DELINQUENCY BEFORE IT TURNS VIOLENT.**
- * ASK TASK FORCE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE EXPERTS AND STATE AND FEDERAL LEADERS TO DRAFT A STATE JUVENILE JUSTICE REFORM MODEL.**

DECISIONS FOR DASCHLE/BIDEN

TO PLAN AN EFFECTIVE LEGISLATIVE STRATEGY, WE NEED TO KNOW WHERE WE WANT TO END UP -- DO WE WANT THE PRESIDENT TO VETO WHATEVER BILL THE REPUBLICANS PASS, OR DO WE WANT TO IMPROVE A REPUBLICAN BILL SO THAT ULTIMATELY THE PRESIDENT COULD SIGN IT?

KEY QUESTIONS

- * WHAT PROVISIONS, IF ANY, IN ADDITION TO COPS PROGRAM AND ASSAULT WEAPONS, WILL DRAW A PRESIDENTIAL VETO?**
- * CAN THE SENATE SUSTAIN A VETO?**

STEPS TO GENERATE SUPPORT FOR CRIME LAW

- * ORGANIZE LAW ENFORCEMENT WITHIN STATES TO LOBBY SENATORS TO PRESERVE COPS FUNDING, DRUG COURTS, AND PREVENTION EFFORT.**
- * ORGANIZE STATE COURT JUDGES TO LOBBY SENATORS TO PRESERVE DRUG COURT PROGRAM.**
- * WORK ON MAYORS TO FIGHT FOR PREVENTION AND DRUG COURT EFFORTS.**

June 14, 1994

MEMORANDUM FOR MACK MCLARTY

FROM: RAHM EMANUEL, PAT GRIFFIN, BRUCE REED,
RON KLAIN AND KAREN HANCOX

SUBJECT: CRIME BILL -- LEGISLATIVE STRATEGY ISSUES

Since the Attorney General met with all the House and Senate Democratic Conferees last Thursday, vast strides have been made toward agreement on a potential Crime Bill Conference Report. The purpose of this memorandum is to update you on this progress, discuss the timing of the next steps towards enactment, and identify five major problems that remain.

Items included in the "Chairmen's Mark"

For the past two weeks, we have been working with Chairmen Biden and Brooks to develop a "Chairmen's Mark," to guide the subsequent development of the Conference Report. Substantively, this has been very successful for us: though we have not gotten every program we wanted, the Chairmen's Mark will ultimately include every one of the seven major initiatives the President proposed to fight crime. These are:

- 100,000 more police, engaged in community policing;
- A ban on semi-automatic assault weapons;
- Stiffer punishments for violent criminals, including a federal death penalty and "three strikes and you're out;"
- An attack on youth crime, including boot camps, drug courts, and anti-gang measures;
- New crime prevention programs, including the "YES" program funded at \$900 million (we asked for \$1 billion);
- Initiatives to combat violence against women, rural crime, and protect victims' rights; and
- Funding for states to increase certainty of punishment, and build prisons to lengthen sentences for violent criminals.

These measures would be paid for by a Crime Trust Fund, totalling \$30 billion over a six-year period (we had wanted to keep the spending to \$28 billion), funded with the savings from a 252,000 person reduction in federal employment.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. memo	Rahm Emanuel, Pat Griffin, Reed et al. to McLarty re: Crime Bill-- Legislative Strategy Issues (partial) (1 page)	06/14/94	P5

**This marker identifies the original location of the withdrawn item listed above.
For a complete list of items withdrawn from this folder, see the
Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet at the front of the folder.**

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential records
Domestic Policy Council
Bruce Reed (Crime)
OA/Box Number: 8413

FOLDER TITLE:

Strategy

rs17

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advise between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Remaining Potential Pitfalls

There are five potential pitfalls, listed in escalating significance, that could derail a final agreement:

- (2) **YES.** The House and Senate Labor Committees want us to abandon this as a distinct program, and consolidate it with existing job training efforts. We need to boost Kennedy and Ford's support for our program if we want to see it included as a separate initiative.
- (3) **Prisons.** We have yet to achieve an agreement on a grant program that satisfies all the major House and Senate players. To win passage of the Bill, the result on this issue must satisfy House moderates (led by Rep. Chapman) and Senate moderates (led by Sens. Dorgan and Conrad) -- but the two groups themselves are at odds.
- (4) **Assault Weapons.** Unless we compromise with ban opponents, the inclusion of this in the Crime Bill may cost us 35-45 Democratic votes, and 40-50 Republican votes in the House -- enough to prevent final passage. We believe we can achieve an agreement with Chairman Brooks on a ban that is more sweeping than Sen. DeConcini's original proposal, but more narrow than the House-passed bill. It would ban 18 (of 19) listed guns, "copy cats" of those guns, and magazines holding 15 or more rounds; it would not ban additional guns based on their characteristics.
- (5) **Racial Justice Act.** This is clearly the most difficult. Brooks says he cannot get the House Democratic Conferees to support a bill that drops it; Biden says he cannot win Senate passage of a bill that includes it. We continue to work around the clock with prosecutors and RJA proponents on potential compromise texts -- but if no compromise can be achieved (a substantial prospect), we will have to take a great gamble by either including or dropping this provision.

Notwithstanding these difficulties, Chairmen Biden and Brooks have agreed to work towards a June 21 deadline, so as to permit enactment of the Crime Bill before the July 4th recess.

Proposal for June 21 Event and Subsequent Strategy

We will continue our talks and negotiations, in anticipation of formal Conference meetings beginning on June 15th. We will need an aggressive communications plan in the week of June 15 to June 22, the period when the debate over the Conference Report will be joined, and the images associated with each side will be shaped in the public mind.

The Conference meeting on June 15 will be devoted to posturing -- and be followed by some outreach efforts to Republicans, who we fear will remain unwilling to join us in breaking gridlock on this issue. Thus, the Chairs currently plan to set a second, and final Conference meeting for June 21st.

On that morning, Brooks and Biden would come to the White House with all of the Democratic Conferees, to announce their agreement with you on a final Conference Report. They would reconvene the Conference that afternoon to ratify that agreement.

We would then anticipate House action on the Conference Report later in that week, and Senate action during the week of June 27th. The timing on the Senate vote is set to back a Republican filibuster up against the recess, and to take advantage of Senator Mitchell's offer to threaten to keep the Senate in to break the filibuster.

We need to begin talks with the House and Senate leadership to attempt to "lock in" this timetable. We need their support and commitment to insure that floor time is available to get this bill done.

Additional Republican Strategy

In addition to continuing to work to develop a Conference Report that is consistent with the President's objectives, and capable of winning broad support in Congress, we need to focus on House and Senate Republicans specifically:

- House GOP: We should target those 65 Members who voted for the Crime Bill on final passage initially.
- Senate GOP: Winning some early endorsements -- before Sen. Dole issues the filibuster rallying cry -- is critical to our success.

Keep in mind also that if House Republican votes can be mustered for the Crime Bill, it will be harder for the Senate Republicans to sustain their filibuster.

Crime Bill -
Strategy

CRIME BILL LEGISLATIVE STRATEGY OUTLINE

March 11, 1994

A. Calendar

(1) Pre-Mark-Up (February 14-March 9)

- Nailing down key positions
- Outreach and building good will
- Presidential profile and concern raised

• Ed-Labor waiver likely
for jobs program
• Brookes won't allow
Schumer + 18 slash fund

(2) House Judiciary Committee Mark-Up (March 10-17)

- Subcommittee Markups (3/9-3/11)
- Full Committee Mark-Up (3/15-17)

(3) Development and Passage of the Rule (March 18-22)

- "Stitch-and-Drop"
- Securing Progressive, Conservative Votes on Rule

(4) House Floor Consideration (March 22-25)

- Key Issues in Contention
- Final Passage Targets: press on Republicans

where will CBC vote on rule?
Up or down on Washington
+ GOP bills - King of Hill
20 solid anti-death votes

(5) Informal and Formal Conference (March 28-April 22)

- Staff Negotiations (3/28-4/8)
- Formal Conference (4/11-4/22)

(6) Final Passage of the Conference Report (April 24-29)

- Presidential profile, once again
- Use of outside groups
- Full-scale push on targets

B. Strategy Issues

(1) Demonstrate Our Presidential Interest in the Crime Bill

- Private meeting with Congressional leaders
- Presidential events: Columbus, Radio address, New York
- Need to continue with both of above
- Communicating our involvement (inside story)

(2) Detail Previously Unresolved Policy Positions

- "Three strikes and you're out"
- Opposing controversial Republican amendments to federalize crimes, like the D'Amato amendment
- Package of crime prevention proposals
- Anti-child pornography legislative proposal
- Alternative to the Republican Regional Prisons plan, that is both "tough" but palatable to Governors;
- Support for tough sentences, but also, a mandatory minimum "safety valve" for low-level drug sellers;

(3) Work with the Leadership to Get the Bill To The Floor (Judiciary Committee Strategy and Rules Committee Strategy)

- Necessity of leadership driven strategy
- Pitfalls: History of Previous Failures
- First Danger Spot: Vote on the Rule

*Joint Leadership mtg.
Mack, Geagan, Pat +
Dole*

(4) Conduct Broad Outreach Among House Democrats (Floor Strategy - Part I)

- Moderate/Conservative Democrats who may go w/GOP (26)
- Progressive Democrats, many of whom are lost (54)
- Approaches:
 - Leadership Days
 - AG Meetings
 - AG Phone Calls
 - Other Cabinet Calls
 - Presidential calls (or defer)
- Major Challenge: Final passage of House Bill

*Bring Reno to Whip mtg.
w/ Leadership mtg.*

(5) Continue with Black Caucus Strategy (Floor Strategy - Part II)

- Long-term relationship: not fighting for fighting's sake
- Efforts to date: solid results thus far
- Target of individual caucus members
- Minimum of 20 "no" votes on final passage/Conference Report

*Craig Washington
Black mayors*

(6) Launch/Expand our Republican Strategy
(Floor Strategy - Part III)

- Their strategic options:
 - (a) seek victory (Congressional politics)
 - (b) seek to defeat us (Presidential/national politics)
- Outreach to Gingrich and Michel
- Existing efforts with Judiciary Republicans
- AG Contacts with Senate moderates
- House Republican targets (49):
 - Inside approaches: *Cop grant applicant mayors to call Members (list by CD)*
 - Outside approaches

(7) Conference Strategy

- Need to Thread the Needle
- Presidential involvement:
 - Outside: pressure to complete
 - Inside: brokering differences
- Preparing outside groups for the final push

(8) Final Conference Passage Strategy

- High profile Presidential involvement (late April)
- Strong push by outsiders:
 - Mayors, Governors
 - Police Groups
 - Prosecutors, Victims, Other Concerned
- Cabinet travel and involvement
- Anticipating clash w/GOP; Healing intra-party wounds

January 27, 1994

Crime Bill -
Strategy

MEMORANDUM FOR CIRCULATION

FROM: RAHM EMANUEL
MICHAEL WALDMAN

Subject: Proposed Communications Strategy and Schedule for Crime

I. INTRODUCTION

The strong positive response to the President's discussion of crime in the State-of-the-Union suggests that the President has an opportunity to make the issue "his." This memo outlines a communications strategy with the goals of (1) passing the Crime Bill; and (2) identifying the President with the issue of crime and violence.

The President has succeeded in redefining the debate on crime. No longer is it prevention vs. punishment. Instead, the issue of crime and violence has been changed to punishment and values (learning the difference between right and wrong.)

Polls show that the issue of crime, along with health care and the economy, tops the public's list of concerns. In addition, polls show that a majority of Americans feel that the moral fabric of our society is disintegrating. Therefore, by redefining the issue of crime in terms of punishment and values, we get the best of both worlds.

II. LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

The next eight weeks until the congressional conference report is issued are critical. Legislatively, our goal is the passage of the Crime Bill. However, the Crime Bill is a means to a further end. The Crime Bill is also a vehicle to communicate to the public a set of strongly-held values that the President embraces, as well as the President's tough stance on crime and criminals.

The legislative schedule, which serves as our window of opportunity, is as follows:

February '94	- House committee and sub-committee action
Early-Mid March	- House Crime Bill
Late March	- Conference
March 28-April 10	- Recess
Mid April	- Crime Conference Report

III. COMMUNICATIONS MESSAGE

Our communications strategy should initially focus on the 6-10 week window while the House considers the crime bill(s). Our principal goal in this period is to identify the President with the crime issue. We must both present the President as tough on crime, and define the his values.

To this end, the President should focus on three key parts of the crime package: "three strikes you're out;" 100,000 police officers; and the ban on assault weapons. The first thematic bloc should be on 3-Strikes-You're-Out (tough on crime); then, more broadly, to cops (values); and then close with guns (again, values).

These three components demonstrate that the President is serious about fighting crime and restoring the moral fabric of our society. In particular, the 100,000 police officers provision is Clinton's signature on the Crime Bill.

Considering the fact that Newt Gingrich is attacking the President's crime proposals as too weak, Democratic House members should highlight the fact that Gingrich's crime proposals have never included funds for more cops.

IV. SCHEDULING

We should consider some events that underscore the "values" orientation of the State-of-the-Union. These events fall into two categories: over-the-top events that address the big picture of crime and societal values; and smaller events that underscore the three key components of the President's crime proposal (listed above). The over-the-top events must be scheduled by April 1, 1994. The smaller events should be ongoing over time.

A. OVER THE TOP EVENTS: THE PRESIDENT'S VALUES

The goal of these events is to identify the President with the issue of crime.

- National Town Hall on Crime: In a select city, the President could hold a televised, national "town hall" on crime and violence. We should start working with one of the networks to set this up. ABC News has indicated interest in a town hall on violence and crime. It would be smart to do this over the February recess, when Members of Congress are at home.
- Interview/Essay for Mass Publication: The President could give an interview to or write an essay on crime and violence in America for a mass publication such as Reader's Digest, TV Guide, or Parade Magazine.
- Counter-Scheduling: The President should go into the lion's den, so to speak, by giving a speech to a group of manufacturers of assault weapons.

- **Open Letter to NRA:** The President should write an open letter to NRA members, as a fellow sportsman, calling on them to support the ban on semi-automatic weapons. This letter could be submitted to a magazine as an advertisement.
- **Church Sermon:** The President could deliver a sermon to a church congregation.

B. ONGOING EVENTS: THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL

The role of these events is to highlight the three major components of the President's crime bill: "3 Strikes," 100,00 cops, and assault weapons.

1) COPS

- **New Cops:** The President could speak to a graduating class of a police academy. This speech would give the President the opportunity to both highlight the 100,00 cops provision, and also talk about values. In this speech, the President would highlight the importance of police officers, not only in terms of deterring crime, but also in terms of strengthening communities. The police officers have a responsibility to be role models, to reach out to kids, and to try to instill in them a sense of right and wrong.
- **Community Policing:** The President could spend the day in a city that has community policing. Some ideas for this day include visiting a police station, walking a police beat, and addressing to cops involved in the program.
- **Neighborhood Safety:** The President could accompany the mayor and neighborhood watch-group participants on a block patrol, or he could visit a victims rights group.
- **Surprise Visit to Police Precinct:** The President should do a surprise visit (not on schedule) to a police precinct.
- **Hero Cops:** We should bring in hero cops to the White House at every opportunity (e.g., for Thursday photo shoots). It's not big national news, but huge locally.
- **Spouses of murdered cops:** We should invite the spouses of murdered cops to the White House for a speech by or session with the President.
- **Radio Address:** The President should broadcast one of his Radio Addresses from a police precinct.
- **Boot Camp:** The President could visit a boot camp.

2) VALUES

- Boys & Girls Club: Visit a boys and girls club or some other "take back the streets" initiative in a housing project in a major city. This could be the opportunity for straight talk about responsibility and right and wrong.
- Teen Pregnancy: The President could visit a teen pregnancy prevention program, and speak to young people about responsibility and family.
- CDC Study on Violence: The Centers for Disease Control will release a study on causes of death, which will show the toll of violence. The President could make a statement, followed by the head of CDC, or Shalala, who would release the study and takes questions (could be in the briefing room, or in front of an audience).
- NBA Role Models: NBA players are holding a conference on February 12 in Minnesota. They could come to the White House the day before the conference begins. As role models to kids, the players could deliver a message of responsibility, education, and family values.

3) GUNS

- Mr. Toys for Guns: We could invite Ferdinand (?) Mateo (Mr. Toys for Guns) to the White House. This meeting would be similar to the meeting with Mark Klaas last month.

4) MISCELLANEOUS

- Cabinet Crime Fighters: Bring in the crime fighters (Reno, Lee Brown, Freeh) to report on unified, administration-wide crime effort.
- Petaluna, California: Visit Petaluna, California next time in the state.
- Conference Committee Kick-Off: The conferees should be brought in for a speech on crime.

V. CONCLUSION

In short, we want to accomplish the following beyond the passage of the Crime Bill: (1) identify the President as tough on crime by highlighting specific components of his crime bill proposal; (2) identify the President as a person of deeply-held values, a moral leader for this country. To achieve these goals, we need to schedule as many of the above events as soon as possible.

This memo deals primarily with the President's schedule, which should be developed immediately. There is, of course, a whole other surrogate schedule that needs to be developed. Members of Congress, Mayors, Police Chiefs, and the Cabinet should all be dispatched to talk about the President's agenda on crime.

Crime - Strategy

Bruce

Reed

from Rahm

July 8, 1994

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

From: Rahm Emanuel, Pat Griffin, and Ron Klain
Subject: General Update on Crime Bill Conference, Rule, and Final Passage

This memo attempts to explain the strategy we are pursuing to produce a conference report without RJA that Reps. Conyers and Edwards will support. In addition, this memo outlines what needs to be done to secure the support of targeted CBC members for the rule and final passage of the Crime Bill.

The core of this strategy is as follows:

1. We finalize our work on getting Reps. Conyers and Edwards to vote out of Conference a bill that does not include racial justice.
2. We call on the Conferees to move a bill immediately and indicate that we believe that racial justice cannot be included in the bill.
3. We prevent excessive defections from liberal Democrats (upset about racial justice not being in the bill) and from conservative Democrats (upset about the inclusion of the assault weapon ban and extensive prevention funding) to win passage of the Rule in the House.
4. We then take the bill to the Senate for final passage.

It is important to note that the timeline could be imperiled by Edwards and Conyers refusing to go along. If CBC resentment of the absence of racial justice is a firestorm, they could keep the bill deadlocked in Conference for some time. But it is our view that we would stick with this strategy, even if it meets resistance, for two reasons.

First, ultimately, Conyers and Edwards will be pressured by Democratic colleagues -- left, right, and center -- to move the Crime Bill. Second, the bill is unpassable with racial justice in, and any shift in strategy in that direction only diminishes the ultimate prospects for enactment.

I. TIMELINE

The goal of the week of July 11-15 is to produce a Conference report that does not include racial justice.

The Conferees have indicated that if you issue a statement on the Crime Bill and your RJA position on Wednesday, they will have enough time to finish their work by Friday. Our goal between now and Wednesday is to secure the support of Conyers and Edwards for a conference report that excludes RJA.

The following is a timeline that reflects how we see events unfolding next week.

Tuesday, July 12

- **NAACP National Conference**

The NAACP is holding its national conference in Chicago on July 12-14. The Vice President is speaking at the conference on the morning of July 12.

Among other issues, the Vice President will speak about the Crime Bill. He will address how crime and violence has paralyzed the nation, and how black Americans have been disproportionately affected. He will emphasize that the Administration has worked with the NAACP to construct a balanced Crime Bill that includes 100,000 police officers, a ban on assault weapons, substantial resources for prevention programs that give kids something to say yes to, and funding for drug treatment services. The Vice President will not make a statement on Racial Justice.

- **Securing Support of Conyers and Edwards**

We are asking Senator Mitchell to call Reps. Mfume, Conyers, and Edwards to inform them that opposition to RJA is hardening in the Senate, and a Crime Bill that includes RJA will definitely be filibustered. This filibuster will be bipartisan, and therefore impossible to beat. In this sense, Mitchell will act as a validator of what the White House has been saying, and may be more persuasive.

Wednesday, July 13

- **Letter to Conferees**

On Wednesday afternoon, you will send a letter to the Conferees calling for immediate action on the Crime Bill. Justice is drafting this letter, which will be reviewed by the appropriate White House staff.

Your letter will stress that, after six years of gridlock, it is imperative to produce a comprehensive Crime Bill that

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. memo	Emanuel, Griffin and Ron Klain to POTUS re: General Update on Crime Bill Conference, Rule, and Final Passage (partial) (2 pages)	07/08/94	P5

**This marker identifies the original location of the withdrawn item listed above.
For a complete list of items withdrawn from this folder, see the
Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet at the front of the folder.**

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential records
Domestic Policy Council
Bruce Reed (Crime)
OA/Box Number: 8413

FOLDER TITLE:

Strategy

rs17

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advise between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

responds to the urgency that the American people feel about the issue of crime and violence. We need a strong bill that puts more police on the streets; gets kids and guns off the streets; puts three-time violent offenders away for life; and gives kids something to say yes to.

You will also say in this letter that RJA should not be included in this Crime Bill.

- **Calls to CBC members and other leaders in the Black Community**

Although Wednesday is technically a day off for you, it would be helpful if you made a few calls to leaders in the black community, in particular the CBC Leadership and Ben Chavis, to prepare them for your statement on RJA. This statement will come in the form of a letter to conferees (see above).

If your schedule allows, these calls could begin on Tuesday, but only after Mitchell has made his calls. The call to Ben Chavis should occur after the Vice President has spoken to the NAACP conference in Chicago.

The Vice President and Leon will also make calls to CBC members on Tuesday and Wednesday.

Friday, July 15

- **Conference Report Completed**

The conferees anticipate being able to complete work on the conference report on Friday afternoon.

[2600460]

[REDACTED]

III. RULE AND FINAL PASSAGE

Assuming that we get a Conference report that excludes RJA, the next phase is to secure votes for the Rule and final passage. Assuming also that no Republicans will vote for the Rule, we need to focus on members of the CBC who may be willing to vote for a Crime Bill without RJA.

In addition to Conyers and Edwards, there are approximately 20 members of the CBC who have indicated in past votes or statements that they will support a Crime Bill that does not include RJA. We will try to enlist the help of some of the deans of the caucus, in particular Reps. Rangel, Waters, Dellums, and Stokes, who may be able to neutralize some of the opposition that exists.

cc: Leon Panetta

BRUCE PEED

July 5, 1994

Crime Strategy

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION

FROM: RAHM EMANUEE²⁶ AND RON KLAIN
Subject: Suggested July Schedule for Crime Bill

The following is a suggested timeline for the Crime Bill. It is based on two key assumptions: (1) that the Crime Bill will be the first order of business on the President's domestic agenda when he returns from the G-7 Summit; and (2) that the Justice Department and the White House will continue to work with Reps. Conyers and Edwards, as well as other key members of Congress, over the recess to address their specific concerns.

July 12: Crime Bill Conference Reconvenes

The conferees reconvene to work out the final details of the bill, including Racial Justice, assault weapons, prison funding, and the policing formula.

July 12: The President Returns from G-7

Upon the President's return from the G-7 Summit, he should make a statement on the Crime Bill to the press pool on the plane. In particular, the President should stress that he wants to see a Crime Bill passed as soon as possible that protects the critical principles -- cops on the streets; kids and guns off the streets; criminals behind bars; and three-strikes-your-out for violent offenders.

The press will inevitably ask about Racial Justice. The President should underscore the fact that the nation is calling for action to end the cycle of crime and violence, and that we must move immediately to pass a comprehensive Crime Bill. We cannot afford to wait any longer. The inclusion of RJA will only further delay action. (Justice will develop talking points and a statement for the President this week to be reviewed by the White House.)

The President should state strongly that it is imperative that the Congress pass a Crime Bill as quickly as possible. He therefore does not support the inclusion of Racial Justice in the bill.

July 13, 14 & 15: Agreement Announced

The conferees will spend the 13th finalizing the details of the bill. On the 14th or 15th, the conferees, led by Chairmen Brooks and Biden, should come to the White House to announce with the President that they have reached an agreement on the Crime Bill. This event would be similar to the Rose Garden crime event we organized last August.

July 18-22: Possible Votes

The House goes back into session on the 18th. The bill could be in the Rules Committee on the 19th, and a vote on the House rule and bill could occur on the 20th. The Senate has indicated that they would take up the bill immediately following House action.

The President's communications activity on the Crime Bill should be straightforward this week. In general, he should focus his rhetoric on trying to make a few comments about what the Crime Bill will do that could be used as sound bites on the evening news. His comments should also call for swift action in the Congress: the Congress must pay heed to the #1 problem in America -- crime and violence.

If there is time for a crime event that week, I recommend that the President participate in the DARE event at which he would sign a Bill of Rights for kids. The visual would be of the President surrounded by kids and police officers. This event should preferably occur early in the week, so that the visual could be used on the news throughout the week. The event and picture also emphasizes children and cops: the two centerpieces of the bill.

Again, this schedule assumes that we work out an exit strategy for Conyers, and also work with Edwards. In addition, we should continue to reach out to specific members of the CBC as well as to members who voted for the Crime Bill but against the ban assault weapons in the House.