

Notwithstanding that, we will not object.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

Mr. CONYERS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, could we get a recapitulation of that? I am sorry to say that we were in a discussion over here, and I did not hear the thrust of the gentleman's request.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman seeking to understand which committees are included in the request? Is that correct?

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman have a copy of the document?

Mr. KOLBE. Yes, we can provide that to the gentleman, or I can read it to the gentleman again if he prefers.

Mr. CONYERS. Is the gentleman seeking permission for the committees to sit while we are in session on the floor?

Mr. KOLBE. Tomorrow under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. CONYERS. Further reserving the right to object, is the gentleman talking about Friday?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will inquire, is the gentleman from Michigan reserving the right to object?

Mr. CONYERS. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am continuing to reserve the right to object.

Could I ask the gentleman if he is talking about eight committees?

Mr. KOLBE. That is correct.

Mr. CONYERS. To sit during the consideration of the crime bill?

Mr. KOLBE. Tomorrow, Friday, that is correct.

Mr. CONYERS. Could I ask the gentleman where he got the impression that the minority had agreed to this previously?

Mr. KOLBE. I have been advised that staff did consult with the staff of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] on this.

Mr. CONYERS. Reserving my right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the gentleman that as to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Resources Subcommittee; we would ask that they both be removed from the list.

Mr. KOLBE. I am sorry; the Committee on the Judiciary, and which other committee?

Mr. CONYERS. Committee on Resources is out already?

Mr. KOLBE. The Committee on Natural Resources is not on the list that I read.

Mr. CONYERS. Then I ask that we add the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, all Judiciary subcommittees, because we are all due here on the floor tomorrow.

So, with that exception I would be willing to withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comment.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I will revise my unanimous consent request.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit tomorrow while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: Committee on Agriculture, Committee on Banking and Financial Services, Committee on Commerce, Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, Committee on Science, Committee on Small Business, and Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

---

#### REREFERRAL OF TITLES V, VI AND SECTION 4003 OF H.R. 9, JOB CREATION AND WAGE ENHANCEMENT ACT TO COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that titles V, VI and section 4003 of H.R. 9, the Job Creation and Wage Enhancement Act, be rereferred to the Committee on Small Business as an additional committee of jurisdiction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

---

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 668, CRIMINAL ALIEN DEPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 1995

Mr. MCINNIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-26) on the resolution (H. Res. 69) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 668) to control crime by further streamlining deportation of criminal aliens, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

---

#### ANNOUNCEMENT ON AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR NATIONAL SECURITY REVITALIZATION ACT

(Mr. MCINNIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute for the purpose of making an announcement.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce to Members that the Rules Committee will meet next Monday, February 13, at 2 p.m. to consider a rule for H.R. 7, the National Security Revitalization Act.

The Rules Committee anticipates reporting an open or modified open rule with a possible time limit on the amendment process.

The rule will likely accord priority in recognition to Members who have pre-printed their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, though this would be optional and not mandatory.

The Rules Committee intends to make in order as base text for amendment purposes the text of H.R. 872 which was introduced today. The new bill reflects a consensus product of the various committees of jurisdiction.

Members should draft their amendments to this new base text and are urged to use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted to the new base text.

If Members wish to avail themselves of this pre-printing option, amendments should be titled, "Submitted for printing under clause 6 of rule XXIII," signed by the Member, and submitted at the Speaker's table.

Amendments must still be consistent with House Rules since neither the rule nor printing in the RECORD will afford any special protection against points of order for such amendments.

It will not be necessary for Members to submit their amendments to the Committee on Rules or to testify on them.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCINNIS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. speaker, I may have misunderstood. Would the gentleman please state the date and day of that committee meeting?

Mr. MCINNIS. We have just been advised that the time has just now been changed, so the date is February 10 at 3 p.m.

Mr. DURBIN. That is tomorrow, Friday, February 10?

Monday is February 13.

Mr. MCINNIS. All right; I have got a typographical error. It is Monday, February 13, at 3 p.m.

---

□ 1840

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUNNINGHAM). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

---

#### LAW ENFORCEMENT BLOCK GRANTS

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the streets of my district are safer today because of the 1994 crime bill. Streets are becoming safer across this country

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