

That is the power to determine whether those moneys, not in the view of some bureaucrat in Washington but in the view of the elected officials and law enforcement officers in their community, should be spend on one program or another, prevention, law enforcement.

That, Mr. Speaker, is precisely, is precisely, Mr. Speaker, why the results of the election on November 8 were so profound. The will of the people has been heard. It was heard in the halls of the Committee on the Judiciary this week, and will indeed result, I hope, Mr. Speaker, in passage of these important crime measures in just a few days ahead.

SUPPORT THE CHILD RESPONSIBILITY ACT, MAKING BOTH PARENTS RESPONSIBLE FOR CHILD SUPPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHood). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise tonight to speak about that critical aspect of the welfare reform that is overlooked by the Contract With America. I'm talking about child support.

The contract spells out the exact punishments for women on AFDC. Women under 18 will be ineligible for assistance if they have a child out of wedlock. Women will not receive additional benefits if they have another child while on welfare. Women will be forced off welfare after 2 years, whether or not they have found employment or completed a training program.

Is this a personal responsibility act, or a female punishment act? Not once is the responsibility of the father mentioned in the contract. In fact, the only mention of fathers denies public assistance to the child if paternity is not established. That is an astonishing oversight.

Today, as the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], has already pointed out, 63 percent of absent parents contribute no child support. Out of the \$48 billion which should be paid annually only \$14 billion is actually collected. Millions of families could escape welfare if only they received the owed child support.

The child support enforcement system in my State of Massachusetts is a model for successful collection. In the 1980's, then Governor Dukakis made child support payments a top priority. Governor Weld built on that foundation the toughest, most streamlined child support collection system in the country.

Massachusetts has been able to effectively garnish the wages, bank accounts, unemployment claims, and the lottery winnings of child support avoiders. In the last 6 months, these new laws have helped 4,000 families escape AFDC and saved Massachusetts \$38.5 million.

The Massachusetts system is effective because it is centralized and unempllicated. Only one office deals with child support payments, and there are no forms to fill out. But this system works best if the noncustodial parent lives and works within the Massachusetts border. If the parent has crossed State lines, the support order is unlikely to be paid.

We need a national system of child support. We need more cooperation and coordination between States. We need to create a national registry of child support orders.

Tougher child support enforcement is a concrete way to achieve personal responsibility of fathers for the children they conceive. Under the contract, fathers remain totally unaccountable, while mothers must sacrifice and are subjected to sometimes harsh reforms.

This is a clear double standard that I urge my colleagues in this Congress to rectify. Our support of the Child Responsibility Act would show that we believe both mothers and fathers should be held responsible for the economic well-being of their children.

OPPOSITION TO THE MEXICAN BAILOUT

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to once again voice my opposition to the Mexican bailout, and especially to the way in which it is being done.

I have frequently said that today we have a Federal Government that is of, by, and for the bureaucrats, instead of one that is of, by, and for the people. But even I did not realize how little control the people of this Nation now have over their own National Government.

Once again we see the arrogance, the elitism, the public be damned, Big Brother knows best attitude of the powerful people who run this Government.

Because of the overwhelming opposition of the American people to this Mexican bailout, the President did what has been described as an end run around Congress.

Apparently, he found that the votes were not there, even though the politically correct vote, the "anything to gain the approval of the national media vote" would have been to be for this bailout.

So the President and the big financial powers decided to come up with a plan that did not require congressional approval. This means that our Government is sending billions to Mexico even though everyone knows the vast majority of our people are opposed to it.

This is the most undemocratic—with a small "d"—thing I have seen during my slightly over 6 years in Congress. It flies in the face of the will of the American people.

Big Government liberals have long had the belief or philosophy that Gov-

ernment knows best—that the people really don't know how to run their own lives or spend their own money.

This latest action—sending this money to Mexico—is just another example of big government spending the people's money in a way that most Americans do not want. And boy are we talking money here—billions, with a "b."

A few weeks ago, through the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve, we provided \$9 billion of an \$18 billion package to prop up the peso. That wasn't enough.

Now, the President has announced he is taking \$20 billion from the Exchange Stabilization Fund, even though this money was designed to stabilize our own currency and even though it has never before been used to prop up the money of a foreign country.

Also, we are using \$20 billion of the \$25 billion in this fund, thus placing our own money in a less secure status.

In addition, Mexico will receive \$17.8 billion from the International Monetary Fund, the largest loan in the Fund's 50-year history. Who is the largest contributor to the IMF? The U.S. taxpayer of course.

Then we are sending \$10 billion more from the Bank for International Settlements.

Billions and billions and billions—and all this at a time when the Heritage Foundation says Mexico already owes us over \$70 billion that they cannot now and probably never will repay.

The big Wall Street and International investors bought Mexican bonds paying 25 and 30 percent interest rates. They certainly did not share their profits with U.S. taxpayers, but now they want us to protect them from losses for their foolish risks.

Even a liberal like A.M. Rosenthal, the New York Times columnist, has come out strongly against this deal.

Last Friday, he wrote:

Could it be that the administration had so enthusiastically promoted Mexico that it would have been terribly embarrassing—an election coming up and all—to disclose that Mexico "suddenly" could not go on backing up its pesos and bonds unless the United States offered heavy loans to bail out investors?

And then he wrote, while we were still talking about just \$40 billion in loan guarantees—instead of the more lavish deal we now have:

Economic aid is often justified, but not 40 billion dollars to a country whose mess was created by the cowardice of bureaucrats and the mistakes of investors, theirs and ours. Americans would be foolish—I am being exquisitely polite today—if they agreed to any loan before they found out which American and Mexican investors would be the big beneficiaries.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, our Federal Government has shown that only the rich, the powerful, the wealthy, and those who work for the Government truly benefit from Big Government.

In the meantime, our taxpayers get the shaft—they are left holding the bag—this time for a wasteful Government in Mexico, whose economy has been ruined by years of socialism.

We probably cannot stop this now, but we would if we were truly listening to the citizens we are supposed to be representing.

□ 2050

PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT THREATENS SENIOR NUTRITION PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise again tonight to discuss some of the effects of the Personal Responsibility Act on the nutrition programs, specifically the senior citizens nutrition programs.

Yesterday, during a hearing on the Personal Responsibility Act in the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, of which I am a member, there were six witnesses, five representing local community groups, and all were against title V of the bill which deals with all our Federal nutrition programs. Title V repeals every Federal nutrition program and then block-grants the funds after severe cuts. Under this repeal of our nutrition programs, the State of Texas would lose over \$1 billion in 1996 alone.

One member of the committee questioned the constitutional basis for providing nutrition and actually said it is not a Federal responsibility, and he quoted the Constitution.

Well, we all may need to reread our Constitution because where I see it in the Preamble, it says to provide for the common defense and promote the general welfare, and that is included in nutrition.

If the Republicans are holding the defense budget sacred and even increasing it because it is protected under the Constitution, at the very minimum nutrition programs should also be protected from these draconian budget cuts.

After November 8 of last year, many people called for Congress to become result-oriented. The PRA, or the Personal Responsibility Act, will result in 800 seniors going hungry every day in the city of Houston.

I hope and I pray that the PRA, the Personal Responsibility Act, was not designed to deny senior citizens their Meals on Wheels but that will surely be the result.

Let me repeat. If the PRA is passed in its current form, there will be over 800 hungry seniors in or around the district that I represent in Houston, TX. Not only will seniors go hungry, but on page 74 of the PRA, it requires seniors under the age of 63 and not disabled to work for their food.

The Older Americans Act allows any senior over 60 years of age and their spouse, regardless of age, to receive one meal a day. Would this Personal Responsibility Act repeal that law? I believe so.

What we will see, and I will show this sign, is that we will have seniors saying I will work for food, and that sign will be traded in every day with an affidavit from that senior to the State swearing that they will work at least 32 hours a week for that one hot meal. This is ludicrous.

I would hope that the committees, and I serve on one of the committees, will have better judgment than to pass this bill, particularly title V.

Stalin may have done this to the Soviet seniors, but not us. This would mean at least 35 people would be barred from a hot meal at the Magnolia Multi-Purpose Center in Houston, Texas. And simply on the work requirement alone. So between 60 and 63, they have 35 people who today enjoy a hot meal that would have to either carry this sign or turn it in with an affidavit saying they will work.

Should there be budget responsibilities? Of course, yes. Should there be administrative reduction? Yes. Should there be lonely, hungry seniors in the breadbasket of the world? No.

We must take a look at this title V in the Personal Responsibility Act contained in this Contract With America to see that it is a contract on our seniors to remove the nutrition programs.

WOMEN AND GIRLS IN SPORTS DAY

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

PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am glad listening to the Democrats that they are finally getting off NEWT GINGRICH and talking substance on the Contract but as usual it is mostly specious emotional arguments hardly based in reality and it would seem incredible to me for somebody to say that the Contract With America is going to mean that 800 senior citizens in his own district would be going hungry.

I find it incredible that the gentleman who is an elected Member of Congress would take such a tactic and one of such stature at that. I hope that in the future we can have a more honest dialog.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. I would be glad to yield time, but I have to make a statement on something else. Then if we run out of time, if perhaps someone on your side would yield time, I would like to engage you, because what I would like to talk about is entirely off the subject. But I did feel it was appropriate to react to that which of course is why we are here, to have good substantive debate on subjects.

Mr. Speaker, what I want to talk about, something that happened on the mall outside of the Capitol this morning, and that was a celebration of National Day of Women and Girls in Sports. This was an important event for many reasons. There are so many different activities that go on in Washington that often we say, oh, that's just one more demonstration, so to speak.

Today in high schools, 38 percent of the girls are participating in athletic programs. That is up from 24 percent 10 years ago. But I think the real story is actually in the elementary schools. The young girls are participating in sports. They are flooding the soccer fields. They are on the tee ball and baseball diamond. They are running out on the basketball courts, and all the other traditional boys arenas now have young ladies playing.

Indeed, those of us who are fathers look forward to watching our girls just as much as fathers with sons look forward to watching their boys. I want to emphasize also that this is a national trend. This is not going to be stopped or end at the county recreation level. These young ladies will grow to be women who are athletic and they are going to take the sports with them throughout junior high, high school and college, and hopefully professional.

We will, I believe, 20 years from now go to see women's soccer games and women's basketball games with the same alacrity and the same enthusiasm and the same vigor that we are now seeing men's sports. I think it is important for us as a country to realize that.

I say that one of the best benefits of this is that for those of us who are maybe a little shell-shocked after the Super Bowl wondering who is going to go on strike next, that we are tired of the overgrown, pampered, greedy, self-indulgent millionaire prima donna players and owners who dominate our national pastime. We are sick of it. These striking athletes have built an empire which is collapsing under the weight of their own grandeur.

I think it is time to open up the system, end their monopoly and let the girls on in. I am glad to see it.

PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas so we can get back to our dialog.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I agree this is why we are here and to talk about the issues. I had not had an opportunity to read the Personal Responsibility Act or deal with it until we had the hearings yesterday.

We had 6 witnesses, 5 of them called by the majority side and 1 of them called by the minority side. Of those 5, and that is what I said, that of those 6 witnesses, 5 of them asked that that be changed, that that PRA or the Personal Responsibility Act that deals with senior citizens nutrition.