

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?