

Speaker, the United States is going to get credit for expenses which the military incurs supporting U.N. peacekeeping operations. Right now these costs are being double accounted for by the United Nations so that we are paying more than we ought to be paying.

It also requires that there be a genuine analysis, there be a genuine complete analysis and review of our Armed Forces situation, and not that we are going to rule the Armed Forces by committee, but that we're going to actually do the kind of analysis that President Clinton wanted to have but did not get.

Mr. Speaker, I had to address that because of the gentlewoman from Colorado's distortion of what is going on with this bill.

The other thing that I wanted to point out is that we are going to be dealing with block grants on the floor today in the crime bill, and I wanted to bring to the Speaker's attention the fact that the Washington Post this morning, in a rare moment of clarity, wisdom, and intelligence, has editorialized on the fact that this program ought to be supported, that the 100,000 cops program of the President's was a fraud. They said, quote, almost immediately that program was challenged by law enforcement experts and some local officials. In fact, the law created a 5-year matching program during which the Federal Government's share diminished and disappeared, leaving localities with the full cost of maintaining the new officers, close quote.

□ 1010

I know that absolutely to be a fact, because I, like most Members in this body, were very much aware that they had mayors telling them, and police chiefs telling them, that they would not even apply for cops grants because they simply could not afford to pay for them.

We will be voting on that today. I appreciate the Washington Post's support.

#### SUPPORT THE JACKSON-LEE AMENDMENT TO THE LAW ENFORCEMENT BLOCK GRANTS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, last September the President signed the most comprehensive, toughest, smartest crime bill in the history of this institution. It is a crime bill that put better than \$10 billion to build new prisons and combined community policing, 100,000 new police officers with prevention programs that work. It has bipartisan support at that time, Republicans and Democrats signing on, Members of the other body, prominent Republicans signing on. It was a bipartisan bill.

But, unfortunately for some people in this institution, the President apparently got too much credit for that bill.

So now we have a new bill. This bill has a Republican label on it. It attempts to throw all the money from community policing into block grants and hope that county commissioners and school committee members and hope that city councils and local officials somehow become law enforcement professionals and spend the money the right way.

Even though we have a history from 1968 where 33 percent of that money went to administrative costs, we are going to tinker and change this crime bill to take away the label of a Democratic bill or a President Clinton bill.

Before I got to Congress, I was the first assistant district attorney in Middlesex County. Our office managed 13,000 criminal cases a year. I want to tell my colleagues, fighting crime is serious business. You do not fight crime by taking a political poll. You do not fight crime by listening to a focus group. And you do not fight crime by signing on to a document that is put together by political strategists. It is very serious business.

The 100,000 new police officers on the streets, and the previous speaker talker about local governments having to match the money. Ladies and gentlemen, 95 percent of the crimes in this country are prosecuted and enforced by local government. In spite of any rhetoric or any spin you want to put on it, the Congress does not fight the majority of crimes in this country. Ninety-five percent of them are local district attorneys, local States attorneys offices and local police departments. They have that responsibility.

This bill seeks to take some funds and get them focused on community policing, because, guess what? Community policing works. There have been studies over a period of 6 years, and I know from my own experiences as a former prosecutor, community policing works. Community policing is the most effective cutting edge law enforcement tool that we have. Yet because of politics, partisan politics, it appears we want to tinker with that process.

It is working in my home city of Lowell, MA, where we have seen in 1 year 13 additional community police officers opening up a precinct station in the city which has resulted in reducing crime dramatically, 20 to 40 percent.

Now, the new Republican majority has ignored facts about prevention programs, because they have found political profit in labeling them "pork." Apparently if you have the right sound bite, you can label prevention programs pork and it works politically. And after considering all of the information available, like studies, for example, law enforcement studies, I have a hard time figuring out why the new majority is so insistent on pushing this bill. It is bad for efforts to fight crime, it is a bad bill.

I suspect the Republicans are feeling boxed in by the promises they made in the Contract With America. Their crime bill, like much of the contract's

agenda, was drafted based on polls and focus groups. But, friends, what sounds good during a campaign and what makes sense in fighting crime for America, are two very different things.

I know from experience. Republicans, like Gov. Bill Weld from Massachusetts, a former prosecutor, strongly supported this crime bill. The Republican DA in Suffolk County, Ralph Martin, strongly supports the Democratic crime bill, the Clinton crime bill. And I believe that a majority of Republican Members know it as well.

A major test of the Republican Party's ability to govern will be their willingness to admit that many of their campaign promises are unworkable. And to forge a consensus on what to do about it, judging from their work on crime offer the last couple of days, reality has yet to sink in.

I urge my colleagues to take the data that is available from law enforcement professionals all across the country and not to tinker with this crime bill, to put in the prevention programs that work.

What we face this week is serious business. Let us not tinker with this bill and hope the President is going to veto it. Let us take care of the business right here.

#### CLINTON ADMINISTRATION/MEXICAN PESO CRISIS: THEY SHOULD HAVE KNOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most amazing aspect of the Clinton administration's \$53 billion loan bailout of Mexico—\$20 billion of which comes straight out of the pockets of the U.S. taxpayers—is that it's a bailout that should not have happened.

As the Washington Post recently reported, there were signs as early as February of last year that Mexico's economy was in serious trouble. At that time the International Monetary Fund issued a report stating that Mexico's consumption of foreign goods and services was outpacing the ability of its economy to pay for them. In other words, it was living on borrowed time—and money.

Clinton administration officials expressed no alarm, not even when foreign investors began shifting money to dollar-denominated investments that would make it easier to pull funds out of Mexico. As a former analyst for Mexico's Banca Serfin Banking group said, "That's a clear sign something was wrong \* \* \* if the American Government didn't see that, they're blind."

But that did not stop then-Treasury Secretary Lloyd Bentsen from claiming in mid-February that Mexico "has become an example for all of Latin America." He said this one year ago.