

because we are putting more police officers on the beat.

Sadly, in the name of politics, the Republican majority wants to undo our progress. The 1994 crime bill struck the right balance between prisons, police, and prevention. This bill was tough on criminals, as it should be. It also recognized that the best way to deal with crime was to prevent it from happening in the first place. And this means more community policing, more cops on the beat. The 1994 crime bill does it right, with the Public Safety Partnership and Community Policing Act, better known as COPS.

Next week we will consider a bill that would destroy this effective program and replace it with an approach that does not guarantee a single new cop on the beat. This new bill is absolutely unnecessary. Why would we ever want to destroy a program that is working? I can only conclude that it is because of politics, and that is sad, because politics should not be allowed to threaten programs that save lives and improve safety.

Mr. Speaker, when I voted for the 1994 crime bill, I made a promise to the people of the Third District of Connecticut. I promised them that I would help put 1,500 more cops on the streets of our cities, and 100,000 on the streets of this Nation by the year 2000.

The President is doing his part to keep the promise he made when he signed the 1994 crime bill into law. His budget for 1996 includes \$1.9 billion to hire 20,000 more police officers and to support community policing programs across this country. When combined with last year's appropriations, there will be 40,000 more police officers hired and trained this year. In my district alone, funding has already been awarded to hire 32 police officers in 10 municipalities.

Like the President, I believe we have an obligation to our communities to continue the Community Policing Program. I know how this program works, because I have seen it firsthand. I have seen the difference that it has made in my district, in cities like New Haven and Stratford, CT.

In 1990, my hometown of New Haven had the unfortunate distinction of having the highest crime rate of any city in Connecticut. Then police and community leaders came together and implemented a Community Policing Program. Three years later, New Haven has a much prouder distinction. Crime was reduced by 7 percent in the first year of the program, and by 10 percent in the second year. In fact, New Haven's Community Policing Program has become a model for this Nation.

But under the Republican bill, other municipalities may never have a chance to replicate this model. The Republican bill destroys the COPS Program. The Republican block bill grant does not guarantee that States and municipalities will ever spend one penny on this kind of crime prevention, and the track record of existing block

grant programs is not encouraging. According to the National Association of Child Advocates, the states spend only 7 percent of the money that they receive through the Byrne Law Enforcement Block Grant Program on prevention activities, including community policing expenditures.

I support giving flexibility to local officials and using the resources that we provide. The last year's crime bill did provide flexibility. It struck the right balance between flexibility, accountability, and security. I urge my colleagues to support our police and our communities by keeping our commitment to the COPS Program. Let us put COPS on the beat.

I have walked in my neighborhoods with the police. I have driven around with them. I have seen how its program is working. I want to the businesses with the cop on the beat and have felt their sense of security with the police officers being there.

This is a program that keeps our cities safe, our streets safe, and our businesses more in tune with what they want to do, which is keep their business without being concerned about what crime is going to do.

Let us maintain the Cops on the Beat Program. It is in fact making our streets safer.

U.S. MEXICAN AID SENSIBLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take this time today to address the House on a recent crisis that occurred in Mexico. I have not had an opportunity to do it before now, and there has been an awful lot of information and misinformation that has been stated in news media, the floor of this House, by a lot of speakers all over the country, and for that matter, the world.

Let me begin with this observation: What we saw in Mexico I think was a great liquidity crisis, and it was the first one to result from mutual fund redemptions, as opposed to the operation of central banks.

Mutual funds determine their values minute by minute with each and every transaction, so they are vulnerable to very small market ticks which can result in very large scale losses and redemptions.

Banks, on the other hand, report their earnings quarterly. They have wide latitude to hold on to nonperforming loans in their portfolios. This is an important distinction and one which will affect us in the future, because today mutual funds have 90 percent, as much on deposit, as banks do, while only 12 or 14 years ago it was 10 percent of what banks had on deposit.

The bottom line is this: Mutual and pension funds drive the financial markets today. Because of this distinction,

the crisis was fundamentally different from the ones we have witnessed before in developing countries, including Mexico.

What would have happened if we had taken no action to meet this stated \$40 billion loan commitment that the President and the leadership in this House and Senate gave a few weeks ago? We do not know for sure what might have happened, but there are some facts we do know.

First of all, Mexican reserves were at a perilously low level, and they simply would not have been sufficient to cover the redemption of the treasury bonds called tesobonos. Since loss of confidence had eroded any chance to roll these notes over at virtually any price, the government was resorting to printing pesos to redeem the bonds as they came due. The holders of those bonds were converting them very quickly to dollars, so that resulted in further loss as the peso deteriorated. Unless checked, this combination of events was certain to lead to high inflation and very, very deep recession.

As if these problems were not enough, Mexican private banks were seriously at risk as well. With interest rates soaring to offer 50 percent levels, debtors were simply unable to repay in the short-term. Nonperforming bank loans would have skyrocketed within the Mexican financial system. Widespread bank failures would have been almost inevitable.

The social and political consequences for the United States resulting from such a collapse in the Mexican economy are not too difficult to imagine. Certainly we would have seen the loss of U.S. jobs stemming from the inability of our second largest market to buy our exports, and we would have seen a significant increase in illegal immigration.

□ 1850

Indeed, some of that is likely to happen because of the contraction that we have seen in the Mexican economy. That has already occurred. But the results of a total collapse could have been catastrophic and impossible to reverse in the short term. It is clear to me that it is in our national interest, our national security and our national economic interest to have a prosperous and stable neighbor on our 2,000-mile common border.

By the end of this year Mexico will have a population of at least 90 million people with a growth of 2 percent a year. With 50 percent of the population under the age of 20 and 25 percent over the age of 56, the Mexican job market over the short and medium term must continue to expand to provide jobs to a very competitive Mexican youth who are coming of age. In addition, 700,000 jobs here in the United States are directly tied to the exports we have to Mexico.

If only Mexico had been at risk in this, it is possible we could have ridden out the crisis, although even then with

some considerable difficulty. However, when it became apparent that this crisis was spreading like a huge ink blot across world financial markets and in particular among the emerging markets, it became clear that the economic and national security costs of U.S. inaction were going to be much higher than the risks associated with action.

The collapse in Mexico would have adversely affected our ability to continue steering developing countries on a path to free markets and democratization. Mexico has been viewed as a litmus test for the success or failure in our model of development. It is the largest of the emerging markets, the only one to have joined the 15-member OECD. That this should happen to an OECD country would have been unthinkable just a few months ago.

Second, Mexico has been held up as a model for other developing countries with its privatization, democratization, deregulation, and free-trade orientation. The United States, the OECD, and the IMF have been very public in urging other countries to follow this model. So Mexico's problems become the problems for everyone else.

Finally, let me just speak about the legality of the action. There is no doubt in my mind that the President's actions were within his authority under the law governing the use of the economic stabilization fund.

Mr. Speaker, the President acted when he had to act. The leadership of this body was correct in supporting that action.

It is important, not only the legal correctness of the President's action, but its policy sensibility.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 76

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 76.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUNNINGHAM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

SHOULD CONGRESS INTERVENE IN BASEBALL STRIKE?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, tonight I would like to visit with you a little about the baseball strike and the very

issue that is addressed or has been brought to us in the last week, should the U.S. Congress deal with the baseball strike? I think in order for us to assess an answer to that question, we need to look at what the historical standards have been in the U.S. Congress or in the White House before we intervene in a labor dispute between two private parties.

First of all, how about Presidential involvement? You should know that in the past, it is very rare for a President to intervene in a labor dispute. It has occurred, but the standard that seems to have been set in the past is that it was necessary for a precedent to occur, and the President was brought in when the strike or the labor dispute would have had a crippling impact on the entire Nation.

I will give you some examples. For example, in 1945, at a time of war, President Truman intervened and ordered the coal miners back to work. In 1946, he did so with the railroads. In 1952, again during a time of major conflict, he ordered the steel workers back to work. President Nixon in 1972 ordered the dock workers back to work, obviously a crippling impact because we were not able to bring imports into the country. President Carter, 1978, with coal, and in 1979 with rail. President Reagan in 1981 intervened with the air traffic controllers. But even that intervention was somewhat unique because it dealt with Federal employees. And President Clinton last August intervened in a labor dispute that involved rails.

But nowhere in our history can we find, especially in a sport or a pastime, that a President has intervened.

I do commend the President the other day for asking the two parties to come to the White House, although I think the President was overly optimistic on his chances of succeeding in bringing about a solution to this dispute. As a result of that, I think the President made a mistake when he offered to both of those parties congressional assistance.

Should Congress intervene? The answer is clearly no. Baseball, the lack of professional baseball, is not a national emergency. I would like to see baseball. I am a baseball fan; my son is a baseball fan. But it is not going to have a crippling impact on this country if we do not have professional baseball for a few weeks or even this summer. It is not going to cripple the Nation. It is not like our coal or our steel or our dock workers. We should not intervene in a private dispute.

As you can see, where does this lead? Where does it lead if Congress does intervene? We had a bill introduced, a bill in this Congress, this is a bill to establish a new Federal agency, the National Commission on Baseball. Federal employees, seven full-time Federal employees will determine such things as what the price of tickets should be, what the contract should be, individual

negotiations of contracts in the minor leagues and the major leagues, and where this baseball stadium should be built. The Federal Government will be negotiating TV rights for the baseball teams. The Federal Government will have the right under its Baseball Commission to subpoena people, as if it is a criminal action. You do not want the Federal Government intervening in the private marketplace. And baseball does not, by the very merits of its sport, does not demand that the U.S. Federal Government intervene in the strike.

I think that it is absolutely necessary, especially when you are talking about two very wealthy parties, nobody is going to go hungry between the owners and the players. Granted, there is a ripple effect for people that work for baseball, but does that upon itself mandate that they come in? It sure does not for Bridgestone Tire Co. down in Oklahoma or Caterpillar. The President has not asked Congress to intervene in those because they do not meet that standard of having a crippling impact.

In conclusion, I urge all of you not to allow Congress to intervene in the baseball strike. Let the titans of money resolve it amongst themselves. And for gosh sakes, do not create a new Federal agency called the Commission on Baseball with full-time employees, another building in Washington, DC, another bureaucracy, the right of subpoena, the right to determine private contracts. We do not need it. Baseball players, baseball owners, go out there and settle it yourselves. It is your fight, not the fight of the U.S. Congress.

We should not give you 1 minute of time by taking it away from the debate on crime, which is a national crisis, on the Federal deficit, which is a national crisis.

Go settle your fight amongst yourselves.

NOMINATIONS OF DR. HENRY FOSTER FOR SURGEON GENERAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is very important that we come here tonight to talk about the President's nominee for Surgeon General, Dr. Henry Foster. Now, a lot has been said about Dr. Foster, but I don't think people truly understand Dr. Foster. Dr. Foster has spent a lifetime making our country a better place.

First, let me say that I think Dr. Foster is a fine choice for Surgeon General. Apparently, many other individuals and organizations do too, including the American Medical Association, which has praised him as "a dedicated teacher, a dependable leader, and a concerned advocate for improving access to quality health care." I would like to include as part of the RECORD