

The most well-known Byrne-funded scandal occurred in Tulia, Texas where dozens of African-American residents, representing 16 percent of the town's black population, were arrested, prosecuted and sentenced to decades in prison, even though the only evidence against them was the uncorroborated testimony of one white undercover officer with a history of lying and racism. The undercover officer worked alone, and had no audiotapes, video surveillance, or eyewitnesses to collaborate his allegations. Suspicions eventually arose after two of the accused defendants were able to produce firm evidence showing they were out-of-State or at work at the time of the alleged drug buys. Texas Governor Rick Perry eventually pardoned the Tulia defendants, after four years of imprisonment, but these kinds of scandals continue to plague the Byrne grant program.

These scandals are not the result of a few "bad apples" in law enforcement; they are the result of a fundamentally flawed bureaucracy that is prone to corruption by its very structure. Byrne-funded regional anti-drug task forces are Federally funded, State managed, and locally staffed, which means they do not really have to answer to anyone. In fact, their ability to perpetuate themselves through asset forfeiture and Federal funding makes them unaccountable to local taxpayers and governing bodies.

The scandals are more widespread than just a few instances. A 2002 report by the ACLU of Texas identified 17 scandals involving Byrne-funded anti-drug task forces in Texas, including cases of falsifying government records, witness tampering, fabricating evidence, stealing drugs from evidence lockers, selling drugs to children, large-scale racial profiling, sexual harassment, and other abuses of official capacity.

Texas is not the only State that has suffered from Byrne-funded law enforcement scandals. Scandals in other States have included the misuse of millions of dollars in Federal grant money in Kentucky and Massachusetts, false convictions based upon police perjury in Missouri, and making deals with drug offenders to drop or lower their charges in exchange for money or vehicles in Alabama, Arkansas, Massachusetts, New York, Ohio, and Wisconsin. A 2001 study by the Government Accountability Office found that the Federal Government fails to adequately monitor the grant program and hold grantees accountable.

#### AMENDMENT CONSIDERED BUT NOT OFFERED

Because of these abuses, I would have offered an amendment when this bill was considered at the Full Judiciary Committee markup. My amendment would have addressed the responsible use of Byrne-JAG monies. Specifically, my amendment would have required that a State that receives Byrne-JAG money should collect data for the most recent year for which such funds were allocated to such State, with respect to:

- (1) The racial distribution of criminal charges made during that year;
- (2) the nature of the criminal law specified in the charges made; and
- (3) the city of law enforcement jurisdiction in which the charges were made.

My amendment would have required a condition of receiving funds that the State should submit to the Attorney General the data collected by not later than one year after the date the State received funds. Lastly, the report

should be posted on the Bureau of Justice Statistics website and submitted to the Attorney General.

My amendment is good because arrests will be transparent and the light of day and public airing of any problems will be the greatest disinfectant. My amendment is an attempt to make law enforcement more responsible, more accountable, and more just in their dealings with persons of all races and backgrounds. My amendment is but a small price to pay to rid the Nation of scandals and disasters that occurred in Tulia, Texas and elsewhere.

My amendment, which I would have offered, would provide oversight and accountability. It is not burdensome. It will not prevent the States from collecting and funding programs under the Byrne Grant program. My amendment does, however, shed light on any maladies that might exist in the system. Once we see the problems, we can fix them. My amendment is responsible and aims to make the Byrne-Grant program a better program by ensuring that the funding is used appropriately and is used with oversight.

#### NO MORE TULIAS

While I support the Byrne-JAG reauthorization, I would also urge my colleagues to also support my bill, H.R. 253, No More Tulias: Drug Law Enforcement Evidentiary Standards Improvement Act of 2007. This bill also enhances accountability with respect to the use of Byrne-JAG monies.

First, it prohibits a State from receiving for a fiscal year any drug control and system improvement (Byrne) grant funds, or any other amount from any other law enforcement assistance program of the Department of Justice, unless the State does not fund any anti-drug task forces for that fiscal year or the State has in effect laws that ensure that: (1) a person is not convicted of a drug offense unless the facts that a drug offense was committed and that the person committed that offense are supported by evidence other than the eyewitness testimony of a law enforcement officer or individuals acting on an officer's behalf; and (2) an officer does not participate in an antidrug task force unless that officer's honesty and integrity is evaluated and found to be at an appropriately high level.

Second, H.R. 253, No More Tulias, requires that states receiving Federal funds under the No More Tulias Act to collect data on the racial distribution of drug charges, the nature of the criminal law specified in the charges, and the jurisdictions in which such charges are made. I urge my colleagues to support my No More Tulias Act so that we can quickly bring the bill to markup.

I also urge my colleagues to support Byrne-JAG.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague in urging passage of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 231.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the

rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1831

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania) at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 415, TAUNTON RIVER WILD AND SCENIC DESIGNATION

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-758) on the resolution (H. Res. 1339) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 415) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Taunton River in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

- H. Res. 1067, by the yeas and nays;
- H. Res. 1080, by the yeas and nays;
- H. Con. Res. 297, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

#### RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CROSSING OF THE NORTH POLE BY THE USS "NAUTILUS"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1067, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) that the House suspend the