

Then in March, the Mexican financial markets suffered another shock when the ruling political party's Presidential candidate was assassinated. This prompted the Clinton administration to extend a \$6 billion credit line to Mexico, even as Mexico was using up its reserve of U.S. dollars to prop up the peso. This occurred less than 1 year ago.

Last summer, the Mexican economy had deteriorated to the point that Clinton administration officials finally recommended economic reforms. But as the Washington Post put it, "those efforts lacked urgency and never went beyond exhortations." And the administration never made a big push for Mexico to devalue its overinflated currency.

And although administration officials deny it, one has to wonder what role their desire to see Ernesto Zedillo win the upcoming Presidential election played in the decision to abandon calls for real reform. As the Washington Post quoted one official, the CIA accurately predicted Zedillo's victory, but "it didn't tell you that if he kept driving straight he would fall off a cliff."

With Zedillo safely elected, Mexico's then-President Salinas finally admitted on October 1 that his country's central bank reserves had fallen to \$17 billion from \$28 billion at the end of 1993. It became clear a devaluation was coming.

But Mexico tried to hide its financial predicament from the world. Not until mid-December did we find out Mexico's reserves had sunk to \$7 billion. Even then, Mexico's finance minister said his country would "absolutely not" devalue its currency.

We all know what happened next. On December 20 the Mexican Government reversed its policy and devalued the peso by 13 percent.

There is no good reason the Clinton administration should not have seen this coming. The signs were there a year ago. Now the U.S. taxpayers are the line for \$20 billion to rescue the economy of a country that bungled its own economy and hid the facts from us. Congress should not let his bailout deal go through unquestioned.

CRIME BILL SHOULD PREVENT CRIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FLAKE] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

(Mr. FLAKE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, last year we in this Congress, working with a wide array of groups, joined together and drafted a realistic and humanitarian approach to the problem of solving crime in America. In the past, crime bills have simply increased various ways by which we execute people.

They have limited the constitutional rights of individuals and they have established mandatory minimum sentences which allowed us to build more prisons, which merely supports an ever growing penal institutional industrial complex.

As we move forward in this crime bill, most of us are already aware that the bills of the past have not in any way decreased significantly enough the results of crime in this Nation. I doubt, moreover, that crime can ever be totally eradicated in America as a result of this or any other legislation.

I am, however, resolute in my belief that the radically different approaches that are being taken this year in this year's crime bill will not in any way solve our crime problem. Furthermore, in some ways they abridge the ability to protect the rights of our citizens by virtue of our constitutional rights.

We must do all in our power to protect those constitutional rights that are guaranteed automatically to those who are citizens of this Nation, and that means all of our citizens. I am not certain, nor do I see any way that this bill guards against the continued repeat offenders, the recidivists that go back to prison time and time again. They do not assure safe neighborhoods. They do not save this generation of mostly minorities who drown in oceans of despair, of hopelessness, and of pessimism.

Beyond creating new crimes and harsher crimes, last year's crime bill gave us true preventative measures. The \$7 billion crime preventative package represented a groundbreaking attempt to create new measures by which we would create opportunities and alternatives which invested in our cities and our youth.

This money was intended for 15 model programs, for intensive community services in high crime areas and grants to local governments for speedy access to flexible funds for anticrime activities.

Money had been allocated for drug courts and drug testing for first-time offenders. This is important. This package represented an important shift in resources and attention to front-end solving of the problem, the neglect of our cities and children that produced the apparent conditions in which crime and violence is allowed to thrive.

Yet today, Mr. Speaker, this Congress will begin abandonment of preventative measures to prevent crime. Instead of guaranteeing preventative measures, we are telling our citizens that we want to return to the good old days of wasteful spending by fiscally irresponsible governments and politicians who do not have the best interests of the people at heart.

In essence, we are sending them a blank check. We are failing to live up to our responsibility, and we are offering no innovative crime measures.

SUPPORT CRIME BILL

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

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time this morning to focus attention on the issue which will be debated later this morning when we actually convene, and that is the crime bill. We have spent time talking about five different crime measures which have been designed to redress the problems of the 1994 crime bill. Yesterday and today we were working on the sixth measure.

When I was working on the rule down here yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I was talking about the fact that I am hard-pressed to understand why this sixth measure is the most controversial of all. This morning on NPR they talked about the fact that it was controversial. I know Chairman HYDE said it was controversial based on the fact that in the Committee on the Judiciary a wide range of members of the minority raised serious questions about it.

The reason I say it is difficult to understand why it is controversial is very simply that we in making that statement are questioning the ability of State and local elected officials, people who are elected by the same constituents who elect us, were questioning their ability to make the very tough decisions that each community faces as it relates to crime.

I have the privilege of representing a portion of Los Angeles County, and we have very serious crime problems in Southern California stemming from illegal immigration and a wide range of other problems that frankly are unique to southern California.

In the 1994 crime bill, Mr. Speaker, we were promised 100,000 new police officers, and virtually everyone has said that we would be very fortunate if we were in that period of time to possibly get 20,000 police officers. Yet the President continues to refer to 100,000 police officers.

It seems to me that we need to allow State and local officials the opportunity to make the tough decisions as to how they can best deal with the crime problems in their communities, and it is my hope that we will listen to those State and local elected officials, just as we listened to them when we dealt with the unfunded mandates legislation.

Yesterday I quoted one of my city managers, a Democrat who strongly supported the 1994 crime bill. He urged me to vote for it back last fall, and I did not. Now he has come forward and said I was correct in not supporting that, and he hoped very much that we will be able to pass this measure which will provide the block grants allowing

State and local officials the opportunity to make the tough decisions that are before them.

I hope we can pass this bill out today, Mr. Speaker, and finally begin to turn the corner on this very serious public policy problem.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no further requests for morning business, pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the House will stand in recess until 11 a.m.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 27 minutes a.m.) the House stood in recess until 11 a.m.

□ 1100

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 11 a.m.

PRAYER

The Reverend Ruth Ward Heflin, Mount Zion Fellowship, Jerusalem, Israel, offered the following prayer:

Holy are You, O Lord; just and righteous in all Your ways. You are awakening and healing our Nation by Your Presence in this crucial hour, in this strategic day, for Your Presence heals, creates and effects change, not only in our Nation but in all the nations of the world.

We declare the hastening and fulfillment of Your plans and purposes for our great Nation through these yielded men and women who have been given authority by You and the people of this country. Be unto us wisdom, knowledge and understanding, and establish peace, justice and righteousness in all our dealings. Let Your love be shared among us. Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory. May Your glory fill these chambers. Hallelujah! In Your name I pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty an justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize Members this morning for 10 1-minute speeches per side.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON].

REPUBLICAN CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, our Contract With America states the following:

On the first day of Congress, a Republican House will require Congress to live under the same laws as everyone else; cut committee staffs by one-third; and cut the congressional budget. We have done this.

It goes on to state that in the first 100 days, we will vote on the following items: A balanced budget amendment—we have done this; unfunded mandates legislation—we have done this; line-item veto—we have done this; a new crime package to stop violent criminals—we are doing this now; welfare reform to encourage work, not dependence; family reinforcement to crack down on deadbeat dads and protect our children; tax cuts for families to lift Government's burden from middle-income Americans; national security restoration to protect our freedoms; senior citizens' equity act to allow our seniors to work without Government penalty; government regulatory reform; commonsense legal reform to end frivolous—lawsuits; and congressional term limits to make Congress a citizen legislature.

This is our Contract With America.

SUPPORT OUR NATION'S LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

(Mr. MANTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, New York City Police Officer Anthony R. Ottoman, captain of the 100th Precinct in Queens, recently wrote an article for New York Newsday about his upcoming visit to the National Law Enforcement Officers' Memorial in Washington. In his moving and reflective article about police officers who have been killed in the line of duty, Captain Ottoman says, "There is no adequate compensation for their sacrifice * * *. The living can do no less than pay them homage and ensure that their memories are etched forever * * * in our hearts."

As we continue to consider legislation to amend last year's crime bill, we can pay homage to those fallen heroes by heeding the calls of their families and their brave colleagues who remain on the front line in the war on crime.

Mr. Speaker, our law enforcement officers support tough and enforceable penalties for convicted criminals, they

strongly support funding to put 100,000 more cops on the street, and they overwhelmingly favor a ban on the sale and production of semiautomatic assault weapons.

Mr. Speaker, as a former New York City Police Officer, when I vote on crime legislation, I will be guided by the wisdom, experience and knowledge of these police officers.

THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

Mrs. MORELLA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, today we mark the 75th anniversary of the League of Women Voters. Each of us has undoubtedly had some personal connection with the league, whether it is taking part in a candidates forum, or interacting with local League members who have reached consensus in a study group.

Historically the league grew out of the women's suffrage movement. In 1920 the founding of the League of Women Voters coincided with the ratification of the 19th amendment which gave women the right to vote.

Although only 26 percent of the women voted in that first election, the league immediately tackled this problem with measures such as initiating "Know Your Government Studies," and with an active role on issues that are important to women and all people. In those early years this meant issues such as the welfare of mothers and children, equal compensation for women which culminated in the Civil Service Reclassification Act of 1923, as well as child labor law. The passage of the motor-voter bill last year is a tribute to their historical position of increasing voting participation.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of my membership in the League, and I hope others will join in celebrating the 75th anniversary of the League of Women Voters.

MORE POLICE FOR WEST VIRGINIA UNDER LAST YEAR'S CRIME BILL

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the bill that is on the floor that calls itself a crime bill because it undoes the real crime bill that was passed last year.

One of the good parts of that crime bill came true last week in West Virginia which we saved 118 new police officers for communities across our State, bringing to a total of 170 police officers that have already come to our State and with hundreds more scheduled to come. Our own State police received 13 police officers. Yet under this bill they would not be eligible for additional officers.