

ADDRESS BY ROBERT MORGAN  
UNITED STATES SENATOR  
NORTH CAROLINA POLICE EXECUTIVES ASSOCIATION  
FAYETTEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA  
JULY 29, 1976

I want to report today primarily on the mood in Congress toward the LEAA, and the recent reauthorization for it, but I want to talk briefly about the FBI.

The LEAA question, of course, is a bread-and-butter issue.

Those funds, taken as a whole, have been of considerable use to law enforcement agencies. There have been problems. There have been examples of waste. There have been squabbles over the use and allocation of funds.

I don't think there is anyone who can avoid having mixed feelings about LEAA. I can certainly sympathize with the sheriff of police chief who has had his first taste of what it is like to deal with a federal bureaucracy. It has been

frustrating in the extreme.

But local people have found good uses for that money, and in the long run, the program can improve the quality of justice in this country.

I think that anytime you have a crash program, there is going to be waste. But I do not think we should overlook the good things which have come out of local use of LEAA money. The program deserves to continue and it deserves to have the bugs gotten out of it.

But let me tell you what I think the mood in Congress is toward LEAA.

On Monday, the Senate passed a reauthorization bill which

would continue LEAA for five years, with funding at one billion, one hundred million dollars. In the House of Representatives, much less faith was shown in LEAA. The House has extended LEAA for only a year and a half, and has authorized a billion dollars, total. These and other differences will have to be the object of compromise in conference.

But I would not like to convey the impression that support for LEAA in the Senate is unquestioning. A great many of the objections raised in the House also came up in the Senate -- mostly the charge that LEAA has been ineffective in reducing crime. The Senators rejected that appeal, but I read them as doing so with mixed feelings. If LEAA does not improve substantially, I do not feel the support in the

Senate will last.

What is happening, I think, is the inevitable result of unrealistic hopes, and unrealistic faith in the power of federal money to have effect on a problem.

I am sure there are those who thought stopping crime was merely a matter of spending. There is a mentality in Washington which thinks that any problem will go away if the federal appropriation for it is large enough.

This kind of approach is bound to result in disappointment. The truth is, there is no way to bury crime with money. The money is not going to march out there and fight crime.

Instead, local law enforcement and criminal justice

officers spend that money to improve their operations.

And slowly, that should have an effect on crime. I think one of the best examples is police education. A lot of local sheriffs and police chiefs have been able to train their deputies and officers better because of LEAA. In North Carolina, we would not have the Justice Academy without LEAA. That is the sort of thing which will have a good effect over the long haul. But it is not going to immediately get the muggers off the streets.

But there are those who think LEAA is a complete failure because the effect on crime was not immediate, obvious, and statistically measurable. Their reaction, judging from the newspaper editorials, and the speeches in the Senate and the House, comes in about three versions.

There is a hue and cry to abolish LEAA outright. There is a hue and cry, from those who don't trust local government anyway, to create more federal regulation to insure accountability -- and that means having local people accountable to the federal government. And there is a more reasonable demand to cut the fat out of the LEAA program.

As I have said, I don't think we ought to abolish LEAA yet. It ought to have another try. But the other two objections disturb me. LEAA was supposed to leave discretion to state and local jurisdictions, and those who ask the Congress either to cut the fat, or to insure accountability, are asking to lose local control. And let me assure you there are plenty of people in Washington who are ready and willing to take these decisions out of the hands of local officials.

If there is an accountability problem, I say it should be solved at the local level. If a county sheriff in Idaho misuses the funds, let the local voters correct the situation with the ballot box. If a police chief in Florida spends the money on Dick Tracy wristwatches, let the mayor correct the situation. But let's not have the federal government set up still more accounting procedures and more regulation. There is more than enough paperwork involved in this program already. Moreover, I do not think the Congress should be the one to cut the fat out of LEAA. It cannot do it without saying how much money is to be spent, by whom, on what. Its only other alternative is simply to cut back the funds, and hope this will cause the states and localities to tighten up where it is needed. That is just the approach taken in the House.

But anyone can see that this just means less money for all law enforcement purposes. If the states can in fact cut the waste out of their programs, then they can use a full appropriation just as wisely.

I think three things need to happen for LEAA to be a success.

First, the Administration owes it to the people to reform the LEAA bureaucracy. We have got to have a Law Enforcement Assistance Administration which has the respect and confidence of the sheriff and the chief of police. It will have that respect when it proves to be a resource and a help to local law enforcement and criminal justice workers, and not a hindrance.

Second, we need to solve the problem of the distribution of funds. Obviously, there is going to have to be some give and take. But dissention among the local jurisdictions is an open invitation for Washington to take over the decision-making process completely, or to abolish the whole program. Solving this problem must be done at the local level, but it must be done.

And third, I believe LEAA funds must be used in more direct ways to fight crime, as well as for long-range improvements. As I have said, the slow improvement of the law and justice system is a worthwhile object and should be continued. But the people have got to have faith in LEAA for there to be an LEAA, and what the people want is results. Improved lab work may well solve a murder; but I believe the

people want the murder prevented in the first place. For this to happen, I think the sheriff or the chief has got to do some hard thinking about what will actually reduce crime in his community. And if he is able to come up with the answer, he had better make sure the people know about it.

To sum up: I think LEAA is suffering mainly from disappointment on the part of people who had high hopes, probably too high. It is suffering from bureaucratic insensitivity and ineffectiveness in Washington. It is suffering from dissention at the state and local level over funding. And it is suffering from the fact that its mistakes have gotten more play than its successes.

As the House of Representatives made clear in the report

of its reauthorization bill, it was putting LEAA "on notice that it is on a trial basis." These problems deserve to be solved, but solved locally. I believe LEAA is your program, not Washington's. Washington cannot solve the problems without making federal involvement greater than it already is.

Before I close, I want to say something about my criticism of the FBI. It worries me to hear that because I have been critical, some people think I am turning away from my strong law-enforcement stand. I have not. I will always try my best to be a friend to law enforcement. And I assure you it is not true I have been trying to ride the issue for my own political benefit. This is one of the most unpopular things I have ever done. It is just something I had to speak out on,

because it was the right thing to do as I saw it.

I am not afraid of criticism, but I do not want to give the wrong impression to people in law enforcement, whom I have always counted as my special friends.

As I see it, we have an opportunity now to carry on law enforcement without being in the middle of a political argument. The demonstrations of the 1960's and '70's are a memory. And I believe the American people are going to be able to look at policemen in their traditional role of crime-fighters once again. I think we can expect that the demand for law and order will be just that -- a demand for police protection and crime prevention -- and not a political slogan. I think we are in for a period of solid policework,

and that's good.

I might mention a hopeful sign: even the liberal news media we see up in Washington are beginning to take a different approach to crime. There is far less willingness, on the part of those who shape public opinion, to picture some little murderer or rapist as the victim of an unhappy childhood. There is far more willingness to depict the plight of the real victim of crime -- the person who gets raped, or robbed, or assaulted. I think this is one of the most hopeful signs we have seen in a long time. I think we are ready to crack down on criminals.

That is why I believe we need to turn away from political activism on the part of the FBI. That policy of using

slander, tax audits, agent provocateurs, and burglaries to harass or jail political activists of the left -- and the right -- was wrong. It must be stopped and renounced.

The FBI has been on a pedestal. I did not set out to knock it off for my own political benefit, because there is no such benefit in it. And I did not do it with the slightest pleasure. I used to me one of the FBI's greatest admirers, and it was very, very painful to lose faith in an institution I had trusted completely. I believed what the FBI told me; and then I found out I had been lied to.

The point is that we cannot enforce the law by breaking the law. We cannot try to break up someone's marriage, just because we cannot make a case on him. We can't assassinate

character, invade privacy, or encourage lawlessness for the purpose of putting people in jail. And we cannot gather evidence by breaking and entering.

But I want you to know that I am still the supporter of the honest policeman or deputy sheriff or FBI agent whose badge is tarnished by the mistaken policies of a few. They are the rock society is built on, and they have my admiration still. I believe the job of law enforcement in the near future will be fighting hard-core crime. I say, let's leave the troubled political past behind us, and get on with that job.