

Mr. Chairman, the amendment of Mr. Ackerman is a rational approach, a thoughtful recommendation in dealing with a process of consolidation that should be given serious and careful consideration before it is implemented. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the Ackerman amendment.

LAW ENFORCEMENT LEGISLATION

HON. JIM LIGHTFOOT

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1995

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge my colleagues to support legislation I have recently offered. Regardless of what we in Congress believe is the best way to approach crime control, we can all agree there is no more important resource in that effort than the men and women who serve our Nation's communities as law enforcement officers.

The legislation I am referring to is H.R. 1805. This legislation would allow off-duty and retired law enforcement officers to carry concealed weapons. As a former law enforcement officer, I can tell you that the daily duties of police officers are regularly fraught with danger. And just by virtue of doing their jobs, police officers make many enemies within the criminal community. Those who have served in law enforcement have many legitimate concerns about their safety and the safety of their loved ones. Allowing those officers who are off-duty or retired to carry concealed weapons can help allay those fears.

In addition, regardless of whether they are on or off duty or retired, police officers know what to do in the event of a crime, how to minimize threats to the public safety and how best to apprehend a criminal. Providing those who are the most knowledgeable about how to catch and restrain criminals with the ability to carry weapons makes such action easier. This legislation gives us an additional tool with which to fight violent crime. I would also tell my colleagues who have legitimate concerns about the availability of firearms that this measure was crafted to ensure that it pertains only to those who are either retired or current full time police officers charged with the authority to make arrests, and those who are required to regularly qualify in the use of a firearm. Furthermore, the legislation also requires that officers covered under this bill must be able to present a badge and photographic identification.

This legislation has the strong support of the 270,000 members of the National Fraternal Order of Police and I ask unanimous consent that a letter to that effect from FOP President Dewey Stokes be inserted in the *The RECORD* at this point.

I hope my colleagues will agree with me that we owe it to our Nation's law enforcement officers not to stand in the way of their efforts to protect themselves and others. I believe this legislation meets that goal. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1805.

FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE,

Washington, DC, June 13, 1995.

Hon. JIM ROSS LIGHTFOOT,

U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LIGHTFOOT: On behalf of the 270,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, I thank you for the introduction of HR1805, which will allow off duty and retired

state, local and federal officers to carry concealed weapons in all United States jurisdictions.

This legislation is critically important to public safety on two levels:

First, it provides state local and federal officers, who are increasingly targeted by the criminal element, with a legal means to defend themselves and their loved ones in off-duty situations or in their retirement years.

Secondly, this legislation will have the immediate effect of putting trained, qualified, dedicated officers in a position to assist their brother and sister officers and citizens no matter where or when the need occurs.

The careful drafting of your bill, paying special attention to the qualification and identification of officers permitted to carry concealed weapons, makes HR1805 preferable to other similar legislation, because HR1805 provides better safeguards against officers endangering one another through mistaken identity.

Again, the rank and file law officers of this country thank you and we look forward to working with you on this and the many other police issues in which you have taken a leadership role, most notably the HR878, the Police Officers' Bill of Rights.

Sincerely,

DEWEY R. STOKES,
National President.

A SENSIBLE ROLE FOR OF GOVERNMENT

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, June 14, 1995, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

A SENSIBLE ROLE FOR GOVERNMENT

The heart of the political debate today is over what is the core responsibility of government. Some insist that fairness requires federal standards for assistance and help to all who qualify. Others say those federal standards have created a mess and want to shift various social programs to the states. Some see a government responsibility to help rebuild neighborhoods and communities and to promote common moral and social principles. Others see an activist government as the problem, not the solution, and insist that government has destroyed peoples' sense of responsibility.

Most Americans would agree that government cannot solve all our problems but does have a role to play. Government is, after all, nothing more than people coming together to accomplish what they could not do on their own. It's about cooperation and helping each other for our mutual benefit. What Americans want is a government that works better and costs less; that is more responsive to the needs of the average American.

To develop a sensible role of government, I think we need to keep a few basic points in mind:

GOVERNMENT SUCCESS

First, there have been major government successes. In public meetings in Indiana I will often ask whether anyone can name a federal program that works well. Usually not a single hand goes up, even when the audience is filled with people who are getting social security checks every month, who drove to the meeting on the interstate highway system, or received a first-rate education because of the GI Bill.

There have, of course, been failings of government programs, but we should not let the shortcomings blind us to the very real successes of government programs. Social Security, for example, is the biggest federal program and is also one of the most successful. It has had an enormous impact on the lives of seniors. Without it, the poverty rate of seniors would jump from 14% to 50%. And Social Security's administrative costs are less than 1% of benefit payments.

Many other examples could be given. Programs to feed infants and pregnant women, to teach preschool children in Head Start classes, student loans, safe drinking water, medical research are all valuable programs. Our agricultural research and extension service has helped make U.S. farmers the world's best. The aerospace and computer industries owe their origins to federal programs. Even the enormously popular Internet was set up by the federal government. The FBI is the most respected law enforcement organization in the world. And our armed forces are preeminent in the world.

It may be unpopular to point out some good things about government, but it really ought to be done. We simply will never get a sensible role for government if people think of government as the enemy.

GOVERNMENT FAILURES

Second, there have been government failures. The "Star Wars" antimissile defense system, burdensome regulations on business, tax, subsidies that lead U.S. companies to move jobs overseas, all are wasteful. There is no reason to have 689 federal programs for rural development or more than 150 job training programs.

Every problem does not have a legislative solution, and legislators, who are used to solving problems, must remember that. One particularly bad procedure, often used in recent years, is to try to solve a national mega-problem with one huge mega-bill, consisting of thousands of pages. Congress must narrow its agenda.

Various federal programs—no matter how well intentioned and no matter how impressive the title—simply don't work. And we will never be able to develop a sensible role of government if we think otherwise.

SENSIBLE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

Third, our goal should not be big government, or small government, but effective government. The American public is very skeptical of government, and is demanding a less government-centered approach to national problems. Government still has many valuable roles to play, but only if it can do things more efficiently and more effectively. To get there we must be willing to think about the role of government less ideologically and more pragmatically—what, after all, works. Those government programs that work well should be kept or expanded; those that don't should be reformed, terminated, or turned over to someone else.

The private sector has taken this approach in recent years. Government should follow suit. Those companies which have been most successful in reforming themselves did not try simply to downsize—to cut costs or personnel by a certain amount—but to rethink what they have been doing—looking at their various missions and expanding on what they are doing well and abolishing what doesn't work.

The same should be true for government. From the President on down to the local level, public officials and citizens need to get engaged. We need to address several questions:

What should be the appropriate role of the federal government as we approach the 21st Century?

If the federal government weren't already carrying out a certain program, would it be created today?

Can we pay for whatever we decide the government ought to do?

Do states have sufficient resources and capability to resume the full role under the Constitution?

What should be the balance between the private sector and the public sector?

If we undertake this effort, I think we will be getting at the core of what bothers American about government and its performance. And we would be undertaking a comprehensive, objective review of the federal government that is clearly long overdue. We might not only get better government, but also government that is more broadly supported by the American people.

FEARLESS JACK'S WAR ON "NON-CRIMES"

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1995

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the following Mike Royko column appeared in the Indianapolis News on June 8, 1995.

Apparently we should still seek the distinction between headlines and substance.

[From the Indianapolis News, June 8, 1995]

FEARLESS JACK'S WAR ON "NON-CRIMES"

(By Mike Royko)

If any criminal mastermind in Chicago has been planning a big-time caper, this might be an excellent time to get it going.

I've never given advice to a criminal before, but why shouldn't a newspaper try to be of service to all of its readers?

There is good reason to believe that the time is right. It can be found in a list of cops, prosecutors and investigators who are said to be working on the case of U.S. Rep. Mel Reynolds, D-Ill.

This list was provided to defense lawyers, as the law requires, by the office of Cook County State's Attorney Jack "Fearless Jack" O'Malley.

It is an impressive list. It appears to be almost as long as a college football roster.

On it are 10 Chicago police detectives and their supervisors.

There are 24 detectives from the state's attorney's investigative office.

And 10 assistant state's attorneys are listed as helping the two lead prosecutors assigned to the case.

We shouldn't forget the O'Malley publicity specialists, who show up in court for every Reynolds hearing and whisper advice to TV reporters on how to best extract a thrilling sound bite from that day's proceedings.

All of this manpower is devoted to proving beyond a reasonable doubt that U.S. Rep. Reynolds did indeed have a go at a woman, now 19, who says that she willingly hopped in the sack with him when she was 16.

The woman since has recanted her charge, but that hasn't discouraged Fearless Jack O'Malley. He's determined to prove that Reynolds did the dirty deed and persuaded the woman to change her story.

And that's why this army of investigators and prosecutors is scrambling for any information that could be used to nail Reynolds—or at least generate TV footage that makes him appear to be the most dangerous fiend since Vlad the Impaler, which he very well might be.

Only last week, O'Malley's office trotted out Reynolds' disgruntled former secretary,

who screamed at the TV cameras that Reynolds beat his wife.

The wife since has indignantly denied being beaten and says the ex-secretary is a nasty, politically motivated liar. But what does a mere wife know about such matters?

Of course, this is a noble pursuit of justice. I can't think of anything that could make the streets of Chicago and its suburbs safer than a successful proof that Reynolds frolicked with a consenting young bimbo. We finally could return to the good old days, when we didn't have to lock our doors at night.

It is comforting to know that investigators are out there knocking on doors and asking every female to whom Reynolds ever has said "howdy-do" if he ever leered, pinched, oggled, drolled or breathed heavily in her presence.

And Fearless Jack is to be commended for his devotion to duty. Not only commended, but touted for higher office, which is the highest praise a Republican prosecutor can get for skinning a Democratic congressman.

But it is obvious that if you have limited manpower and payroll and you assign a dozen fulltime prosecutors, two dozen investigators, your publicity experts and political sex scandal—as earth-shaking as it might be—they can't find time to be gathering clues in Chicago's many cases of murder and mayhem.

Not that I believe for one minute that murder and mayhem and heavy dope dealing are as terrible a threat to the delicate fabric of our society as Reynolds allegedly having a tryst with a consenting tart who now says she doesn't give a hoot.

But as humdrum as murder, mayhem and other crimes can be, they still have to be dealt with. Even if the killers, maulers and dope profiteers beat the raps, as many of them seem to do, O'Malley still has to go through the motions. We can't have judges sitting around in empty courtrooms telling each other doctor jokes.

And who knows, some of the accused killers, maulers, dope profiteers and other lesser-known felons might have even more serious skeletons rattling around in their closets.

It's very possible that when you investigate a gangbanger for blowing away a rival, you also might discover that the nasty fellow has been doing you-know-what with a 16-year-old gun moll.

Ah, then you are really on to something. So the Reynolds case might only be the beginning of something really big.

Today Reynolds.

Tomorrow jaywalkers.

Go get them, Fearless Jack.

MEMORIAL DAY

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1995

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of the House to speeches written by some young students at Alpine Elementary School in my district. Jessica Herold, Kimberly Shoemaker, Tasha Voeltzel, and Travis McGrath have written what Memorial Day means to them and their words are something we can all be proud of. I ask that their speeches be submitted into the RECORD.

(By Jessica Herold and Kimberly Shoemaker)

Good morning Congressman Hunter, Mr. Miller, Teachers, Guests, and students.

We were asked to write about our flag or Memorial Day. We found it difficult to separate the two because both of these represent our nation and its beliefs.

We are a country because we wanted our rights and freedom. Many wars have been fought to keep us a free nation.

Students in the past have said the Pledge of Allegiance to our flag, today we continue to say the pledge. When we make this pledge, we are saying we believe in our country.

On Memorial Day, we salute the men and women who have fought for our freedom. It is our hope that each time you say the Pledge of Allegiance, you remember its meaning and that you take the time to think about the men and women that have fought to keep us one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WHY MEMORIAL DAY IS IMPORTANT

(By Tasha Voeltzel)

Good morning Congressman Duncan Hunter, Mr. Miller, staff, and students.

I think Memorial Day is important because it is a day that we need to salute to the people who have died, trying to save our country so we could be free. My dad fought in the Vietnam War while he was in a wheelchair, even though he didn't get hurt, I still salute him being that brave, and having the courage to fight for our country. I will always remember Memorial Day and look back to the wars and giving everyone who is dead or alive, the salute for freedom.

MEMORIAL DAY; A DAY TO REMEMBER THOSE WHO PAID THE ULTIMATE PRICE TO KEEP AMERICA FREE

(By Travis McGrath)

To us kids, Memorial Day weekend has come to mean several things. Sure it's a three day weekend. One more day added to the weekend that gives us the extra freedom to go on a picnic, to visit a special friend or relative, to go to the beach, the river, or the mountains. Freedom to relax, freedom to play.

Many Americans take to the road on Memorial Day. They sometimes drive hundreds of miles to visit a theme park, a national monument, another country or special place. Memorial Day has also come to signify the time of a special once a year event, like the Indianapolis 500.

For whatever reason Memorial Day may be significant to us all, let us not forget the real reason that this day is celebrated. Memorial Day is the day we honor and remember the men and women of the armed forces who have given their lives in the defense of liberty and freedom, home and abroad. From the battlefields of Bull Run to the sands of Iraq and Kuwait, brave Americans have fought for this Monday in May and all the days of the week to keep us safe and America free. So today, let us not forget that the freedoms we enjoy on this holiday and all year long have been paid for by Americans who have made the ultimate sacrifice.

HAPPY ANNIVERSARY,
SEBEWAING VFW POST 4115

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1995

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, there are debts that our country owes, and chief among them is the debt owed to our veterans. If it were not for the sacrifice made by many in the name of freedom and democracy, we would not be able to stand here and enjoy the wonders provided by our great Nation. I want to call special attention to the fact that Saturday, June