

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records

Subgroup/Office of Origin: Domestic Policy Council

Series/Staff Member: Christa Robinson

Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 17161

FolderID:

Folder Title:

Crime - Memos [4]

Stack:

S

Row:

96

Section:

4

Shelf:

8

Position:

1

REPUBS WHO VOTED NO (BUT VOTED FOR HOUSE CRIME BILL AND ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN IN PAST)

California

Horn	Long Beach
Huffington	Santa Barbara

Florida

Ros-Lehtenen	Miami
--------------	-------

Maryland

Gilchrest	Kennedyville
-----------	--------------

New Jersey

Smith	Robbinsville
Franks	New Providence

New York

Levy	Hempstead
Lazio	Bay Shore
Molinari	Staten Island

Ohio

Pryce	Dublin
McDade	Scranton
Ridge	Erie

PA

Rhode Island

Machtley	Portsmouth
----------	------------

Wisconsin

Klug	Madison
------	---------

DEMS WHO VOTED NO

Alabama

Browder	Jacksonville
Hilliard*	Birmingham

California

Waters*	Los Angeles
---------	-------------

Florida

Peterson	Jackson City
Thurman	Dunnellon

Georgia

Deal	Gainesville
Lewis*	Atlanta

Idaho

LaRocco	Boise
---------	-------

Illinois

Costello	Belleville
Poshard	Carterville

Indiana

Hamilton	Nashville
----------	-----------

Iowa

Smith	Altoona
-------	---------

Louisiana

Fields*	Baton Rouge
Hayes	Lafayette
Tauzin	

Michigan

Barcia	Bay City
Stupak	Menominee

Minnesota

Peterson	Detroit Lakes
----------	---------------

Mississippi

Parker	Brookhaven
Taylor	Bay St. Louis

Missouri

Clay*	St. Louis
Volkmer	Hannibal
Skelton	Lexington
Danner	Kansas City

Montana

Williams	Helena
----------	--------

New York

Rangel*	New York City
---------	---------------

North Carolina

Lancaster	Goldboro
Watt*	Charlotte

Ohio

Stokes*	Cleveland
Strickland	Lucasville

Oklahoma

Brewster	Marietta
McCurdy	Norman

Oregon

DeFazio	Springfield
---------	-------------

Pennsylvania

Holden	St. Clair
--------	-----------

Klink	Pittsburgh
-------	------------

Tennessee

Cooper	Shelbyville
Tanner	Union City

Texas

Tejeda	San Antonio
Chapman	Sulpher Springs
de la Garza	Mission
Geren	Fort Worth
Hall	Rockwall
Laughlin	West Columbia
Sarpalius	Amarillo
Stenholm	Stamford
Wilson	Lufkin

Ortiz	Corpus Christi
Washington*	Houston

Utah

Orton	Sundance
-------	----------

Virginia

Boucher	Abingdon
Pickett	Virginia Beach
Scott*	Newport News
Payne	Nellysford
Sisisky	Petersburg

Washington

Onsoeld	Olympia
---------	---------

West Virginia

Rahall	Beckley
Wise	Clendenin
Mollohan	Pairmont

REPUBLICANS (65)

Bentley H (MD)
Bilirakis M (FL)
Blute P (MA)
Boehlert S (NY)
Bonilla H (TX)
Buyer S (IN)
Calvert K (CA)
Camp D (MI)
Canady C (FL)
Cunningham R (CA)
+ Diaz-Balart L (FL)
Ewing T (IL)
Fowler T (FL)
+ Franks B (NJ)
Franks G (CT)
Gallegly E (CA)
+ Gilchrest W (MD)
Gillmor P (OH)
Gilman B (NY)
+ Greenwood J (PA)
Hastert D (IL)
Hobson D (OH)

+ Horn S (CA)
Houghton A (NY)
+ Huffington M (CA)
Hunter D (CA)
Johnson N (CT)
+ Kasich J (OH)
+ Klug S (WI)
+ Lazio R (NY)
+ Leach J (IA)
+ Levy D (NY)
+ Machtley R (RI)
McCandless A (CA)
+ McDade J (PA)
McHugh J (NY)
Meyers J (KS)
Mica J (FL)
+ Molinari S (NY)
Morella C (MD)
+ Pryce D (OH)
Quillen J (TN)
Quinn J (NY)
Ramstad J (MN)

Ravenel A (SC)
Regula R (OH)
+ Ridge T (PA)
Rogers H (KY)
+ Ros-Lehtinen I (FL)
Roth T (WI)
Roukema M (NJ)
Royce E (CA)
Santorum R (PA)
+ Shaw E (FL)
Shays C (CT)
+ Smith C (NJ)
Snowe O (ME)
Spence F (SC)
Sundquist D (TN)
Talent J (MO)
Torkildsen P (MA)
Upton F (MI)
Walsh J (NY)
Weldon C (PA)
Young C (FL)

REPUBLICANS (65)

Bentley H (MD)
Bilirakis M (FL)
Blute P (MA)
Boehlert S (NY)
Bonilla H (TX)
Buyer S (IN)
Calvert K (CA)
Camp D (MI)
Canady C (FL)
Cunningham R (CA)
+ Diaz-Balart L (FL)
Ewing T (IL)
Fowler T (FL)
+ Franks B (NJ)
Franks G (CT)
Gallegly E (CA)
+ Gilchrest W (MD)
Gillmor P (OH)
Gilman B (NY)
+ Greenwood J (PA)
Hastert D (IL)
Hobson D (OH)

+ Horn S (CA)
Houghton A (NY)
+ Huffington M (CA)
Hunter D (CA)
Johnson N (CT)
+ Kasich J (OH)
+ Klug S (WI)
+ Lazio R (NY)
+ Leach J (IA)
+ Levy D (NY)
+ Machtley R (RI)
McCandless A (CA)
+ McDade J (PA)
McHugh J (NY)
Meyers J (KS)
Mica J (FL)
+ Molinari S (NY)
Morella C (MD)
+ Pryce D (OH)
Quillen J (TN)
Quinn J (NY)
Ramstad J (MN)

Ravenel A (SC)
Regula R (OH)
+ Ridge T (PA)
Rogers H (KY)
+ Ros-Lehtinen I (FL)
Roth T (WI)
Roukema M (NJ)
Royce E (CA)
Santorum R (PA)
+ Shaw E (FL)
Shays C (CT)
+ Smith C (NJ)
Snowe O (ME)
Spence F (SC)
Sundquist D (TN)
Talent J (MO)
Torkildsen P (MA)
Upton F (MI)
Walsh J (NY)
Weldon C (PA)
Young C (FL)

LCSVAX:: \$ type stp_prty.394

ROLL NO. 394

H RES 517

RECORDED VOTE

CLOSED 11 AUG. 1994 17:14

AUTHOR(S):

ON AGREEING TO THE RESOLUTION

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST THE CONFERENCE REPORT
ON H.R. 3355; OMNIBUS CRIME CONTROL ACT

	AYES	NOES	PRES	NV
DEMOCRATIC	198	58		
REPUBLICAN	11	167		
OTHER	1			
TOTAL	210	225		

DEM

YEA

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barca
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski

Brooks
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Coppersmith
Coyne
Cramer
Darden
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost

Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Harman
Hastings
Hefner
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lantos
Lehman
Levin
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann

Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Montgomery
Moran
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Penny
Pickle
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard

Rush
Sabo
Sangmeister
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Skaggs
Slattery
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Studds
Swett
Swift
Synar
Thompson
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NAY

Barcia
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Chapman
Clay
Cooper
Costello

Danner
DeFazio
Deal
Fields (LA)
Geren
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hayes
Hilliard
Holden
Klink
LaRocco
Lancaster
Laughlin
Lewis (GA)
McCurdy
Mollohan
Ortiz
Orton
Parker
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Sarpalius
Scott
Sisisky
Skelton
Smith (IA)
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thurman
Unsoeld
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Watt
Williams

Wilson
Wise
de la Garza

REP

YEA

Blute
Boehlert
Grandy
Houghton
Johnson (CT)
Meyers
Morella
Quinn
Ramstad
Roukema
Shays

NAY

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clinger

Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
 Kingston
Klug Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Huffington

Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Lucas
Machtley
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Myers
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Pombo

Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

OTH

YEA

Sanders

LCSVAX:: \$

REPUBS WHO VOTED NO (BUT VOTED FOR HOUSE CRIME BILL AND ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN IN PAST)

California

Horn	Long Beach
Huffington	Santa Barbara

Florida

Ros-Lehtenen	Miami
--------------	-------

Maryland

Gilchrest	Kennedyville
-----------	--------------

New Jersey

Smith	Robbinsville
Franks	New Providence

New York

Levy	Hempstead
Lazio	Bay Shore
Molinari	Staten Island

Ohio

Pryce	Dublin
McDade	Scranton
Ridge	Erie

Rhode Island

Machtley	Portsmouth
----------	------------

Wisconsin

Klug	Madison
------	---------

REPUBS WHO VOTED YES

Connecticut

Shays

Johnson

Iowa

Grandy

Kansas

Meyers

Maryland

Morella

Massachusetts

Blute

Minnesota

Ramstad

New York

Boehlert

Houghton

Quinn

New Jersey

Roukema

DEMS WHO VOTED NO*** = CBC Member****Alabama**

Browder
Hilliard* Jacksonville
Birmingham

California

Waters* Los Angeles

Florida

Peterson Jackson City
Thurman Dunnellon

Georgia

Deal Gainesville
Lewis* Atlanta

Idaho

LaRocco Boise

Illinois

Costello Belleville
Poshard Carterville

Indiana

Hamilton Nashville

Iowa

Smith Altoona

Louisiana

Fields* Baton Rouge
Hayes Lafayette
Tauzin

Michigan

Barcia Bay City
Stupak Menominee

Minnesota

Peterson Detroit Lakes

Mississippi

Parker Brookhaven
Taylor Bay St. Louis

Missouri

Clay* St. Louis
Volkmer Hannibal
Skelton Lexington
Danner Kansas City

Montana

Williams Helena

New York

Rangel* New York City

North Carolina

Lancaster Goldboro
Watt* Charlotte

Ohio

Stokes* Cleveland
Strickland Lucasville

Oklahoma

Brewster Marietta
McCurdy Norman

Oregon

DeFazio Springfield

Pennsylvania

Holden St. Clair
Klink Pittsburgh

Tennessee

Cooper Shelbyville
Tanner Union City

Texas

Tejeda San Antonio
Chapman Sulphur Springs
de la Garza Mission
Geren Fort Worth
Hall Rockwall
Laughlin West Columbia
Sarpalius Amarillo
Stenholm Stamford

Wilson	Lufkin
Ortiz	Corpus Christi
Washington*	Houston

Utah

Orton	Sundance
-------	----------

Virginia

Boucher	Abingdon
Pickett	Virginia Beach
Scott*	Newport News
Payne	Nellysford
Sisisky	Petersburg

Washington

Onsoeld	Olympia
---------	---------

West Virginia

Rahall	Beckley
Wise	Clendenin
Mollohan	Pairmont

REPUBS WHO VOTED NO (BUT VOTED FOR HOUSE CRIME BILL AND ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN IN PAST)

Diaz-Balart, FL
Franks, NJ
Gilchrest, MD
Greenwood, PA
Horn, CA
Huffington, CA
Kasich, OH
Klug, WI
Lazio, NY
Leach, IA
Levy, NY
Mchtlely, RI
McDade, PA
Molinari, NY
Pryce, OH
Ridge, PA
Los-Lehtenen, FL
Shaw, FL
Smith, NJ

DEMS WHO VOTED NO

Alabama

Browder	Jacksonville
Hilliard*	Birmingham

California

Waters*	Los Angeles
----------------	--------------------

Florida

Peterson	Jackson City
Thurman	Dunnellon

Georgia

Deal	Gainesville
Lewis*	Atlanta

Idaho

LaRocco	Boise
----------------	--------------

Illinois

Costello	Belleville
Poshard	Carterville

Indiana

Hamilton	Nashville
-----------------	------------------

Iowa

Smith	Altoona
--------------	----------------

Louisiana

Fields*	Baton Rouge
Hayes	Lafayette
Tauzin	

Michigan

Barcia	Bay City
Stupak	Menominee

Minnesota

Peterson	Detroit Lakes
-----------------	----------------------

Mississippi

Parker	Brookhaven
Taylor	Bay St. Louis

Missouri

Clay*	St. Louis
Volkmer	Hannibal
Skelton	Lexington
Danner	Kansas City

Montana

Williams	Helena
----------	--------

New York

Rangel*	New York City
---------	---------------

North Carolina

Lancaster	Goldboro
Watt*	Charlotte

Ohio

Stokes*	Cleveland
Strickland	Lucasville

Oklahoma

Brewster	Marietta
McCurdy	Norman

Oregon

DeFazio	Springfield
---------	-------------

Pennsylvania

Holden	St. Clair
--------	-----------

Klink	Pittsburgh
-------	------------

Tennessee

Cooper	Shelbyville
Tanner	Union City

Texas

Tejeda	San Antonio
Chapman	Sulpher Springs
de la Garza	Mission
Geren	Fort Worth
Hall	Rockwall
Laughlin	West Columbia
Sarpalius	Amarillo
Stenholm	Stamford
Wilson	Lufkin

Ortiz	Corpus Christi
Washington*	Houston

Utah

Orton	Sundance
-------	----------

Virginia

Boucher	Abingdon
Pickett	Virginia Beach
Scott*	Newport News
Payne	Nellysford
Sisisky	Petersburg

Washington

Onsoeld	Olympia
---------	---------

West Virginia

Rahall	Beckley
Wise	Clendenin
Mollohan	Pairmont

Crime Bill Conference Authorizations

(\$ IN MILLIONS)

<u>Conference Crime Bill Authorizations</u>			<u>Six Year Conference Authorizations</u>					
Provision			FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000
PREVENTION:								
Model Intensive Prevention	DOJ	895	---	115	150	175	200	255
Ounce of Prevention Prevention Grants	HHS	100	3	15	20	20	21	21
FACES (Family & Community Endeavor Schools)	DofEd	900	37	115	135	170	215	228
** Midnight Sports League	HUD	40	---	5	8	8	9	10
Assist for Delinq'nt & At-Risk Youth [Youth Academies]	DOJ	40	---	6	7	8	9	10
Juvenile Drug Trafficking Gang Prevention	DOJ	125	---	15	21	25	30	34
Local Partnership Act [H.R. 581]	Treasury	1,800	---	300	315	395	395	395
Youth Employment & Skills "YES"	DOL	540	---	55	55	100	145	185
** Hope In Youth	HHS	20	---	3	3.5	4	4.5	5
Youth Violence Prevention (Development Ctrs)	DOJ	50	---	5	8	10	12	15
** Police Partnerships With Children	DOJ	30	---	4	5	6	7	8
Triads for Seniors	DOJ	6	---	2	2	2	---	---
Community Economic Partnership	HHS	300	---	50	80	85	85	---
** Gang Prevention Services	DOJ	20	---	3	3	4	5	5
Olympic Youth Development Centers	HUD	49	---	7	8	10	11	13
** Anticrime Youth Councils	DOJ	5	---	0.5	0.8	1	1.3	1.4
** Boys & Girls Clubs in Public Housing (Rostenkowski)	HUD	30	---	4	5	6	7	8
** Safe Low Income Housing	HUD	0	---	---	---	---	---	---
** Child Visitation	HHS	30	---	4	5	6	7	8
GREAT (Gang Resistance Education & Training)	Treasury	50	10	8	8	8	8	8
Missing Alzheimer's Patients	DOJ	3	---	1	1	1	---	---
Safe Seniors Corridors	DOJ	2	---	1	1	---	---	---
Urban Parks and Recreation	DOI	5	---	3	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
Prison Drug Treatment (State)	DOJ	300	---	30	40	70	80	80
Prison Drug Treatment (Federal)	DOJ	125	---	15	21	28	30	31
TB Prevention & Treatment In Correctional Institutions	DOJ	5	---	0.7	1	1	1.1	1.2
Violence Against Women Act								
Law Enforcement & Prosecution Grants	DOJ	1,000	85	150	175	190	195	205
Rape Prevention	HHS	220	---	35	40	45	50	50
Runaway, Homeless, and Street Youth	HHS	30	---	7	8	15	---	---
** Domestic Violence Hotline	HHS	3	1	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4
Encouraging Arrest Policies	DOJ	120	---	28	33	59	---	---
Battered Women's Shelters	HHS	325	---	50	60	70	72.5	72.5
Rural Domestic Violence Enforcement	DOJ	30	---	7	8	15	---	---
Community Programs On Domestic Violence	HHS	10	---	4	6	---	---	---
Safe Campuses	DofEd	0.2	---	0.2	---	---	---	---
Misc. Provisions		18.3	---	6	3	3	3	3.3
Victims of Child Abuse	HHS	38	---	6	6	7	9	10
Access To Federal Criminal Information - Stalker	DOJ	6	---	1.5	1.75	2.75	---	---
Total Prevention		7,271	136	1,062	1,245	1,551	1,613	1,663

** = Priority Program [Under \$50M]

Crime Bill Conference Authorizations

(\$ IN MILLIONS)

Conference Crime Bill Authorizations		Six Year Conference Authorizations						
Provision			FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000
LAW ENFORCEMENT:								
STATE & LOCAL								
Community Policing Grants	DOJ	8,800	1,332	1,850	1,950	1,700	1,700	268
DNA Grants to States	DOJ	40	—	1	3	5	13.5	17.5
Law Enforcement Family Support	DOJ	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Police Recruitment	DOJ	24	—	2	4	5	6	7
State Courts	DOJ	150	—	23	30	30	32	35
Technical Assistance	DOJ	119	—	14	22	25	28	30
Brady - Criminal Records Upgrade	DOJ	150	100	25	25	—	—	—
Community Based Prosecutors & Functions	DOJ	50	—	7	10	10	11	12
Rural Law Enforcement								
Rural Law Enforcement Grants	DOJ	240	—	24	40	50	60	66
Rural Drug Enforcement Training	DOJ	5	—	1	1	1	1	1
Criminal Justice/Substance Abuse Training	DOJ	1	—	1	—	—	—	—
Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention	DOJ	5	—	1.5	1.7	1.8	—	—
Byrne Grants	DOJ	1,000	580	130	100	75	70	45
Total State and Local		10,584	2,012	2,080	2,187	1,903	1,922	482
FEDERAL								
Treasury Authorizations	Treasury	550	30	70	90	110	125	125
Justice Authorizations	DOJ	220	—	45	55	60	60	—
FBI	DOJ	245	—	35	40	50	60	60
DEA	DOJ	150	—	12	20	30	40	48
AUSA	DOJ	50	—	5	8	10	12	15
SCAM	DOJ	20	—	2	4	4	5	5
Family Support	DOJ	25	—	2.5	4	5	6	7.5
Improving Border Controls	DOJ	484	181	137	156	10	—	—
Criminal Alien Tracking Center	DOJ	18.4	—	3.4	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.9
Expedited Deportation	DOJ	338	64	90	93	91	—	—
Expanded Special Deportation	DOJ	160	55	54	49	2	—	—
National Research Center	DOJ	10	10	—	—	—	—	—
DNA	DOJ	25	—	5.5	8	8	2.5	1
Courts	Judiciary	200	—	30	35	40	40	55
Total Federal		2,495	340	491	566	424	354	320
Drug Courts	DOJ	1,300	100	150	200	250	300	300

Crime Bill Conference Authorizations

(\$ IN MILLIONS)

<u>Conference Crime Bill Authorizations</u>		Six Year Conference Authorizations	<u></u>					
Provision			FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000
PRISONS:								
Violent Repeat Offender Incarceration								
Grants To States	DOJ	6,495	175	500	800	1300	1850	1870
Certain Punishment for Youthful Offenders	DOJ	150	—	20	25	30	35	40
Criminal Alien Incarceration	DOJ	1,800	130	300	330	350	350	340
Total Prisons		8,445	305	820	1,155	1,680	2,235	2,250
Total Law Enforcement		22,824	2,757	6,932	8,015	8,263	9,322	6,404
Total Authorizations		30,095	2,893	4,603	5,352	5,807	6,424	5,015
Total Trust Fund Available		30,210	2,423	4,287	5,000	5,500	6,500	6,500
Funds Under (Over) Allocated			(470)	(316)	(352)	(307)	76	1,485

** Shows Amounts Enacted by House Only

"ss" = Such Sums As Necessary.

Facsimile Transmittal Cover Sheet

Date:

To:

**Liz Bernstein
Jose Cerda
Rahm Emanuel
Karen Hancox
Joe Hernandez-Kolski
Lee Ann Inadomi
Chris Lin
Jennifer O'Connor
Carol Rasco
Bruce Reed
Shana Tesler**

From:

Betty Lewis

Facsimile No.

514-9077

Phone No.

514-5687

Crime Bill Talking Points

**Daily Talking Points on Anti-Crime Legislation
Tuesday, August 16, 1994**

**ONE FICTION AND TEN FACTS ABOUT PUTTING 100,000
NEW COMMUNITY POLICE OFFICERS ON THE STREETS**

- **Fiction:** The Heritage Foundation's recent "Issue Bulletin" regarding the Crime Bill falsely claimed that the Crime Bill would fund only 20,000 new cops over the next six years, that each would cost \$70,000 to \$80,000 per year, and that the Crime Bill would produce the equivalent of only one new police officer for every police department in the country.

This misinformation has been cited on the floor of Congress by Crime Bill opponents and echoed over and over by conservative commentators in the press and on the airwaves. But the facts tell a very different story.

- Fact 1:** ▶ The Crime Bill earmarks almost \$9 billion for hiring or rehiring of community police officers and/or for increases in community policing programs. That money will help put 100,000 additional cops on the street -- an almost 20 percent increase in the nation's 504,000 local law enforcement officers.
- Fact 2:** ▶ While some Republicans have been quoting the Heritage Foundation's attack of the President's crime bill plan to put 100,000 police on the streets, the Republicans' own alternative proposal offered during conference by Senator Hatch would have provided \$1.6 billion less (\$7.4 billion) for cops on the beat.
- Fact 3:** ▶ The Crime Bill utilizes the same basic funding mechanism to put 100,000 new police on the streets as last year's popular \$150 million Police Hiring Supplement program which awarded grants to hire 2080 new officers. Over 2000 cops for \$150 million -- means that 20,000 officers can be hired for \$1.5 billion not the \$8.8 billion claimed by the Heritage Foundation. Moreover, the Administration received 10 applications for each grant awarded.
- Fact 4:** ▶ The Crime Bill will put 100,000 new police on the streets of America's communities by the year 2000, starting with the 2,080 officers hired with this year's grants and adding:
- | |
|---|
| 14,822 new officers in 1995, |
| 20,586 in 1996, |
| 21,698 in 1997, |
| 18,916 in 1998, |
| 18,916 in 1999, and |
| + <u>2,982</u> in the year 2000, for a total of |
| 100,000. |
- Fact 5:** ▶ Over six years the Crime Bill generally will provide multi-year grants of up to \$75,000 to pay for up to 75% of the cost of salary and benefits for each new or rehired officer. Most communities will be expected to pay a 25% share of the salary and benefit costs.

Some communities may take advantage of a preference given for paying more than the 25% share. Needy communities that cannot afford to pay the 25% matching share or have much higher than average expenses may request a waiver of the matching requirement and the \$75,000 cap.

- Fact 6:** ▶ The median salary for entry level police officers last year for cities over 10,000 was \$23,546 according to a survey conducted by the International City/County Management Association (ICMA). (More than 2/3 of the eligible jurisdictions are lower cost communities under 10,000 in population.) Fringe benefits might add another third to the average cost, bringing the total average entry salary and benefit costs to approximately \$31,000. In order to allow for inflation and other variations, all the Justice Department's projections assume an average annual cost of salary and benefits of \$42,000 per officer, still far less than the Heritage Foundation's unrealistic estimate of \$70,000 to \$80,000.
- Fact 7:** ▶ The Crime Bill would help large cities like Los Angeles to hire 1000-1550 new officers.
- Fact 8:** ▶ The Crime Bill would help cities like Beverly, Mass. to hire 13-15 new officers.
- Fact 9:** ▶ The Crime Bill would help a small jurisdictions like Mineral County, Montana hire two deputy sheriffs and Lockhart, Texas hire two new police officers.
- Fact 10:** ▶ Cities, counties, and communities nationwide need and want the Crime Bill's nearly \$9 billion for community policing to hire 100,000 more police to help restore safety to our streets and neighborhoods.

Crime Bill Conference Authorizations

(\$ IN MILLIONS)

REVISED: 8-17-94

Conference Crime Bill Authorizations			Six Year Conference Authorizations						
Provision			FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	
PREVENTION:									
Model Intensive Prevention	DOJ	895	---	115	150	175	200	255	
Ounce of Prevention									
Prevention Grants	HHS	100	3	15	20	20	21	21	
FACES (Family & Community Endeavor Schools)									
Community Schools Youth Services Grants	HHS	630	26	80	95	119	150	160	
Family & Community Endeavor Schools Grants	DofEd	270	11	35	40	51	65	68	
** Midnight Sports League	HUD	40	---	5	8	8	9	10	
Assist for Delinq'nt & At-Risk Youth [Youth Academies]	DOJ	40	---	6	7	8	9	10	
Juvenile Drug Trafficking Gang Prevention	DOJ	125	---	15	21	25	30	34	
Local Partnership Act [H.R. 581]	HUD	1,800	---	300	315	395	395	395	
Youth Employment & Skills "YES"	DOL	540	---	55	55	100	145	185	
** Hope In Youth	HHS	20	---	3	3.5	4	4.5	5	
Youth Violence Prevention (Development Ctrs)	DOJ	50	---	5	8	10	12	15	
** Police Partnerships With Children	DOJ	30	---	4	5	6	7	8	
Triads for Seniors	DOJ	6	---	2	2	2	---	---	
Community Economic Partnership	HHS	300	---	50	80	85	85	---	
** Gang Prevention Services for Boys & Girls	DOJ	20	---	3	3	4	5	5	
Olympic Youth Development Centers	HUD	49	---	7	8	10	11	13	
** Anticrime Youth Councils	DOJ	5	---	0.5	0.8	1	1.3	1.4	
** Boys & Girls Clubs in Public Housing (Rostenkowski)	HUD	30	---	4	5	6	7	8	
** Child Safety - Visitation	HHS	30	---	4	5	6	7	8	
GREAT (Gang Resistance Education & Training)	Treasury	50	10	8	8	8	8	8	
Missing Alzheimer's Patients	DOJ	3	---	1	1	1	---	---	
Safe Seniors Corridors	DOJ	2	---	1	1	---	---	---	
Urban Recreation and At-Risk Youth	DOI	5	---	3	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	
Prison Drug Treatment (State)	DOJ	300	---	30	40	70	80	80	
Prison Drug Treatment (Federal)	DOJ	125	---	15	21	28	30	31	
Violence Against Women Act									
Law Enforcement & Prosecution Grants	DOJ/HHS	1,000	85	150	175	190	195	205	
Rape Prevention	HHS	220	---	35	40	45	50	50	
Runaway, Homeless, and Street Youth	HHS	30	---	7	8	15	---	---	
** Domestic Violence Hotline	HHS	3	1	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	
Encouraging Arrest Policies	DOJ	120	---	28	33	59	---	---	
Battered Women's Shelters	HHS	325	---	50	60	70	72.5	72.5	
Rural Domestic Violence Enforcement	DOJ	30	---	7	8	15	---	---	
Community Programs On Domestic Violence	HHS	10	---	4	6	---	---	---	
Baseline Study on Campus Sexual Abuse	DofEd	0.2	---	0.2	---	---	---	---	
Victims of Child Abuse	HHS	38	---	6	6	7	9	10	
Access To Federal Criminal Information - Stalker	DOJ	6	---	1.5	1.75	2.75	---	---	
Family Unity	DOJ	22	---	4	4	4	4	6	
Misc. Provisions		17.3	---	5	3	3	3	3.3	
Total Prevention		7,287	136	1,065	1,248	1,554	1,616	1,668	

" * * " = Priority Program [Under \$50M]

Crime Bill Conference Authorizations

(\$ IN MILLIONS)

REVISED: 8-17-94

<i>Conference Crime Bill Authorizations</i>			<i>Six Year Conference Authorizations</i>					
Provision			FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000
LAW ENFORCEMENT:								
STATE & LOCAL								
Community Policing Grants	DOJ	8,800	1,332	1,850	1,950	1,700	1,700	268
DNA Grants to States	DOJ	40	---	1	3	5	13.5	17.5
Law Enforcement Family Support	DOJ	0	---	---	---	---	---	---
Police Recruitment	DOJ	24	---	2	4	5	6	7
State Courts Assistance	DOJ	150	---	23	30	30	32	35
Technical Assistance	DOJ	130	---	24	22	26	28	30
Brady - Criminal Records Upgrade	DOJ	150	100	25	25	---	---	---
Community Based Prosecutors & Functions	DOJ	50	---	7	10	10	11	12
Rural Law Enforcement								
Rural Law Enforcement Grants	DOJ	240	---	24	40	50	60	66
Rural Drug Enforcement Training	Treasury	5	---	1	1	1	1	1
Criminal Justice/Substance Abuse Training	DOJ	1	---	1	---	---	---	---
TB Prevention & Treatment In Correctional Institutions	DOJ	5	---	0.7	1	1	1.1	1.2
Family Support	DOJ	25	---	2.5	4	5	6	7.5
Byrne Grants	DOJ	1,000	580	130	100	75	70	45
Total State and Local		10,620	2,012	2,091	2,190	1,908	1,929	490
FEDERAL								
Treasury Authorizations	Treasury	550	30	70	90	110	125	125
Justice Authorizations	DOJ	220	---	45	55	60	60	---
FBI	DOJ	245	---	35	40	50	60	60
DEA (Agents)	DOJ	150	---	12	20	30	40	48
AUSA	DOJ	50	---	5	8	10	12	15
SCAMS - Telemarketing Fraud (FBI/USA)	DOJ	20	---	2	4	4	5	5
Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention	DOJ	5	---	1.5	1.7	1.8	---	---
Improving Border Controls	DOJ	484	181	137	156	10	---	---
Criminal Alien Tracking Center	DOJ	18.4	---	3.4	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.9
Expedited Deportation	DOJ	338	64	90	93	91	---	---
Expanded Special Deportation	DOJ	160	55	54	49	2	---	---
National Center For Criminal Justice Research	DOJ	10	10	---	---	---	---	---
DNA (FBI)	DOJ	25	---	5.5	8	8	2.5	1
Presidential Summit On Violence/Nat'l Commission	DOJ	1	---	1	---	---	---	---
Courts	Judiciary	200	---	30	35	40	40	55
Total Federal		2,476	340	491	563	421	348	313
Drug Courts	DOJ	1,300	100	150	200	250	300	300

Crime Bill Conference Authorizations

(\$ IN MILLIONS)

REVISED: 8-17-94

Conference Crime Bill Authorizations

Provision		Six Year Conference Authorizations	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000
PRISONS:								
Violent Repeat Offender Incarceration								
Grants To States	DOJ	6,495	175	500	800	1300	1850	1870
Certain Punishment for Youthful Offenders	DOJ	150	---	20	25	30	35	40
Criminal Alien Incarceration	DOJ	1,800	130	300	330	350	350	340
Total Prisons		8,445	305	820	1,155	1,680	2,235	2,250
Total Law Enforcement		22,841	2,757	6,955	8,017	8,267	9,324	6,406
Total Authorizations		30,128	2,893	4,617	5,356	5,812	6,428	5,021
Total Trust Fund Available		30,210	2,423	4,287	5,000	5,500	6,500	6,500
Funds Under (Over) Allocated			(470)	(330)	(356)	(312)	72	1,479

SUMMARY BY DEPARTMENT

Department of Justice	24,965	2,342	3,514	4,210	4,518	5,428	5,439
Department of the Treasury	605	40	79	99	119	134	134
Department of Health & Human Services	1,706	30	254	324	371	399	327
Department of Housing & Urban Development	1,919	0	316	336	419	422	426
Department of Education	270	11	35	40	51	65	68
Department of Labor	540	---	55	55	100	145	185
Department of the Interior	5	---	3	1	1	1	1
The Judiciary	200	---	30	35	40	40	55

THE AMERICAN REHABILITATION ASSOCIATION'S POSITION ON REHABILITATION'S ROLE IN DECREASING CRIME AND VIOLENCE

Section I: INTRODUCTION

This document will outline the ways in which President Clinton's and Congress' goal of developing a crime policy which is both "tough and smart" can be realized. Specifically, it will explain the necessity of using not only the "tough" public safety approach but also "smart" public health techniques to solve the crime problem. It will analyze the emerging movement within the medical field which has recognized that crime and violence are health issues, and will propose ways in which the health field -- especially the rehabilitation sector -- should address these issues.

Section II: BACKGROUND -- AMERICA'S CRIME PROBLEM

The overall Statistical Picture. Crime is one of the most pervasive problems in American society. As President Clinton stated in the State of the Union Address on January 25, 1994, "Violent crime and the fear it provokes are crippling our society, limiting personal freedom and fraying the ties that bind us."

Since 1960, the number of violent crimes in the United States has been increasing relatively steadily. Only 161 violent crimes per 100,000 people were reported in 1960. In 1992, that rate was 758 per 100,000 -- a 371 percent increase.

Surprisingly, crime actually appears to have dropped about one percent last year, according to the Federal Bureau of Investigation's 1993 Uniform Crime Reports. This slight improvement has not seemed to affect public opinion, however. Polls consistently show crime to be one of American's top concerns. People are no longer willing to tolerate the levels of crime and violence our nation has been experiencing. A rate which is relatively lower, but too high nonetheless, is just not good enough -- especially considering the fact that, although the overall rate declined a bit in 1993, the murder rate did not. It rose by 3 percent.

The Toll It Takes. As rehabilitation professionals, we know of violent crime's terrible ramifications. We work with the victims every day -- helping them to recover from their crime-related injuries. We can provide endless anecdotal evidence of crime's deleterious effect upon the lives of too many individuals in this country.

The empirical data certainly bear our observations out. The National Pediatric Trauma Registry has compiled information on youth patients (ages birth to 19) of participating trauma centers nationwide between 1988 and 1992. The following are among the regions of youths' bodies which were affected by gunshot wounds, according to the Registry: superficial (35%), multiple regions (28%), extremities (12%), head and neck (11%), abdomen (8%), thorax (5%), and face (1%).

Injury Severity Scores recorded by the Registry reveal that 23% of these gunshot injuries were of moderate to high severity. The Registry also reports that, because gunshot injuries are often so severe, 39% of youth were left with between one and three functional limitations upon discharge from the hospital. Three percent had four or more such limitations. Among the functions that were affected are walking (27%), bathing (26%), dressing (22%), feeding (8%), vision (4%), speech (4%) and cognition (2%).

In addition, the registry reports that 11% of youth gunshot victims died as a result of their injuries -- the highest death rate for any mechanism of injury.

The Costs. In addition to the cost in human suffering and human life, crime and violence have a cost to the American economy. Compiling information from economists and criminal justice experts, *U.S. News and World Report* estimates that the medical and mental health costs resulting from violent crimes such as murder, rape, assault, and robbery total about \$11 billion annually. In addition, the lost wages, pain and suffering by victims prices out at \$191 billion each year. All told, the yearly cost of crime in the United States -- including the above mentioned figures and other items like criminal justice expenditures -- is a shocking \$674 billion a year.

We in the rehabilitation field have worked for years to help individuals overcome their often crippling disabilities. Now we are joining with other medical and social service professionals to turn some of our energy and experience towards the societal disabilities of crime and violence. However, federal and state government need to recognize and support these initiatives. An infrastructure currently exists which is far less costly than building prisons and maintaining prisoners.

Section III: SPECIFIC POTENTIAL REHABILITATIVE SOLUTIONS

There are two main ways in which rehabilitation facilities and other rehabilitation service providers are addressing the problems of crime and violence. First, we are working to **prevent crime by providing youths -- especially those with disabilities -- with alternatives to the streets.** Specifically, we have developed, and can develop, programs which offer comprehensive, high quality, integrated, and accessible vocational rehabilitative services, and other such services.

One example of this type of program is Project Second Chance, a collaborative youth drop-out transition effort of the American Rehabilitation Association, The Kennedy Institute, the District of Columbia Public Schools, and the District of Columbia Rehabilitation Services Administration. Project Second Chance operates in Washington D.C. to provide youth with disabilities who have dropped out of school with an alternative approach to gaining the academic credits and skills necessary to live and work successfully in their community.

The Second Chance model includes the following elements:

- (1) vocational education and mentoring which teach the skills necessary for success in the job market;
- (2) supported employment, apprenticeship, and on-the-job work experience;
- (3) a range of counseling and support services aimed at enhancing self-confidence and independence.

Project Second Chance therefore seeks to decrease the incidence of substance abuse, criminal activities and violence in the Washington, D.C. community by improving youths' job-related skills and employment opportunities. Rehabilitation providers which take similar courses of action by replicating this model will be ensuring that youths who might otherwise become criminal offenders find productive alternatives to lives of crime. More information on Project Second Chance is available through the American Rehabilitation Association, 1350 I Street, NW Washington, D.C. 20041-0675, 1-800-368-3513.

The second way in which rehabilitation providers can help to decrease crime and violence is to **prevent the occurrence of crimes committed by repeat offenders**. If not given the skills and training they need to find their place in society, ex-offenders are at risk of committing crimes again. Just as vocational rehabilitation providers can help youths avoid crime in the first place, these providers can help give ex-offenders a second chance by offering them comprehensive employment and training programs which will help them re-enter the mainstream.

One example of such a program is the Neighborhood Work Project run by the Vera Institute of Justice, a member of the American Rehabilitation Association. For the past 12 years, this Project has provided ex-offenders in New York City with on-the-job and job placement services. In addition, the Vera Institute offers a Vocational Development Program which teaches ex-offenders a work ethic, instructs them in the preparation of a resume, and gives them other skills necessary for transition to the world of employment. There are still other ways in which the rehabilitation industry can contribute to the effort to decrease crime in America. Various states throughout the country have begun to address the concern that prison conditions such as overcrowding are impeding the rehabilitation of offenders. They have started to advocate the use of alternative sanctions such as alternative incarceration centers which provide a range of offerings to nonviolent offenders.

Among the offerings of such centers are:

- (1) drug treatment programs
- (2) holistic, integrated models of counseling and other support services
- (3) adult education and job training.

The trend toward such alternatives to incarceration presents a significant opportunity to the rehabilitation industry. We have the chance to work with corrections officials, job training and other social service providers to improve the corrections system so that it is both less expensive and more successful in re-integrating ex-offenders into post-prison life. Vocational rehabilitation can be a core component of such alternative sanction efforts.

For more information on alternative incarceration programs, contact the Council of State Governments, 3560 Iron Works Pike, P.O. Box 11910, Lexington, KY 40578-1910, 1-800-800-1910. The Council's entire February 1994 issue of *Innovations* focuses on one such effort.

Section IV: Conclusion

With decades of experience in rehabilitating individuals facing difficult challenges and severe disabilities, we in the rehabilitation industry are uniquely and ideally positioned to develop policies and programs that both help prevent crime and rehabilitate criminals. The American Rehabilitation Association is committed to helping our members find ways to contribute so that we as an industry can contribute more fully to the national anti-crime effort.

AJ Congress

American Jewish Congress
Stephen Wise Congress House
15 East 84th Street
New York, NY 10028-0456
212 879 4500 • Fax 212 249 3672

August 16, 1994

Dear Representative:

On behalf of the American Jewish Congress and its nationwide membership, I am writing to express our deep concern regarding the evolving tenor of the crime bill debate. Over the years and in a series of congressional contacts during the consideration of this crime bill, AJCongress has staunchly supported an assault weapons ban, the Racial Justice Act and crime prevention funds, and we have consistently opposed expansions of the death penalty. We were saddened to see the Racial Justice Act removed in conference, and deeply disturbed at the vast expansions of the federal death penalty in this bill. Now that there is some discussion of reducing the crime prevention funding and separating out the assault weapons ban, Congress is approaching a threshold at which we will have no choice but to oppose this bill.

The American Jewish Congress has long felt that the easy availability of assault weapons poses a great threat to the health and well-being of our entire nation. Every day, America's law enforcement officers have to face-off against the most well-armed criminals our country has ever seen. And it is increasingly the case that our police find themselves outgunned. These assault weapons are an important tool for America's drug dealers and traffickers. It is for these reasons that we must strongly urge you to keep the assault weapons ban in this bill, as it was reported out of conference. Combined with the other problematic developments mentioned above, the removal of the assault weapons ban from this crime bill would push our organization towards working to block this legislation.

Equally troubling to us are the recent comments made by many House and Senate critics ridiculing vital crime prevention programs such as "Midnight Basketball." The importance of these critical initiatives is unmistakable to the single mother trying to work at night while being assured that her children are engaged in safe and enjoyable activities that foster responsibility and a sense of pride. Such constructive programs play an immeasurably positive role by providing these young men with a creative outlet to say "yes" to, instead of just another dangerous influence to say "no" to.

Prevention programs also make good economic sense. These programs do require funding now, but such expenditures will be dwarfed by the gargantuan outlays that will be necessary if we do not embark on this path towards true crime prevention now, to augment our otherwise punitive approach to crime policy.

Like so many "omnibus" bills, the current crime bill is a mixed bag. Without the assault weapons ban, it would, on balance, no longer merit support. We urge you to support retaining the assault weapons provision. Please feel free to contact our offices if we can be of any help in this matter.

Sincerely,



Phil Baum
Executive Director

August 25, 1994

TALKING POINTS ON THE CRIME BILL (INTERNAL)

The crime bill has not passed yet...

We should let groups know that the Senate will vote on a point of order this afternoon. We should ask groups to urge the Senators to vote against the point of order.

- o The budget point of order is a procedural trick and it is the NRA's next attempt to block the most comprehensive anti-crime legislation ever considered by Congress.
- o The Senate voted 94 to 4 to demand that its conferees put the Trust Fund in the bill.
- o If the budget point of order succeeds, it will again delay the vote on the crime bill. Each additional "procedural" delay is a blow to every major law enforcement organization in the United States. NOTE: every major law enforcement organization has endorsed this legislation.
- o America demands a bipartisan effort to defeat this procedural delay so that we can pass this historic crime bill. The time has come to put politics and special interest aside and enact this critical legislation.