

payment, and that is it. There is no requirement that you even have to get treatment. There is no requirement that you try to turn the young person's situation around so they no longer suffer from that illness.

Should there be a requirement for job responsibility on SSI? I submit there is just as much requirement to be required of those individuals as AFDC. But somehow we want to step back from it. We want to say, no, we want welfare reform but we just want this little green portion, not the whole portion. I also suggest that we should change the cash payment to a voucher which says, particularly in the situation where you might have some treatment available to you, says, here is a voucher. Here is the situation. You go get the treatment, here, because we want to see you get better.

In Kentucky, \$45 million was spent on 153,000 beneficiaries for SSI. The Federal Government alone spend \$24.5 billion; \$10 billion—\$10 billion more than we spent on AFDC. Yet we are saying, welfare reform is just AFDC and not SSI, \$10 billion. And keep in mind, AFDC is the lowest among program which we spend, the lowest amount of any of these except the housing benefits.

Let us talk about the food programs. The Republican contract has suggested that we are going to block grant the food programs, which are the nutrition programs for, like I said earlier, the WIC Program, programs in the schools and food stamps. Let me tell you what happens in Kentucky under that scenario. We will lose 33 percent of the money we are presently getting, not new money but we are presently getting. Basically we are going to tell the State of Kentucky and also other States which also likewise will lose; fine, you have an option to make, after we block grant it, you can tell folks, you are out, even though you might qualify, you are out, that is tough. And even future ones come on, you cannot even come on, even though they were deserving and not folks who abuse the system.

In food stamps alone, in Kentucky we spent, as I said, \$41 million for 524,000 people. The Federal Government spends \$24.5 billion this year on food stamps. Without question, the fraud and abuse sometimes runs rampant in the Food Stamp Program. In 1994, food stamps were issued to purchase food to over 207,000 retail stores. I do believe that the inspector general and others of oversight are making some good recommendations on how we should treat the retailers. Congress should authorize the forfeiture of proceeds for materials that facilitate the violation of food stamps. Those retailers who traffic in food stamps should be permanently disqualified from the program. Stores that are disqualified from participation in the WIC Program should also be disqualified from other programs. But that is just the people. What about the people that use them?

Obviously, we have got to have tougher sanctions. We have to stop the trafficking. All of you have seen television shows about the traffic in food stamps. But, again, I come back to my central theme. We have a lot of discussion on welfare reform up here. But the proposals that have been produced to date do not include food stamp reform. Why not? It constitutes a larger portion of the welfare budget than AFDC does, in fact, everything except Medicaid.

Let us talk about related issues. I am going to come back to AFDC one more time. It is easy to pick on the single Mommas and the children. It is easy. People know examples all over the country. Where are the Daddies? Where are the Daddies? Thirty-four billion dollars of uncollected child support today throughout this country—\$34 billion. Should not the child support issues be a factor in welfare reform? Should not the missing and absent parent have some responsibility to help us curb the cost of raising their children? Obviously, the answer is yes.

Again, when we talk about welfare, I suggest to you that child support issues need to be made an integral part of the whole package.

□ 1620

We will not just try to get past AFDC and say, "We are there." We are not there. It is my suggestion that all these issues have to be put together in one package to address, if we are going to have true welfare reform, because it is going to be too easy to say after one passes, "We have done our job; we have met our responsibility; we have hit our contract; let's go home." We should not do that.

Mr. Speaker, whatever reform we make—whatever reform we make, it will not work unless we curb the abuse that people experience every day. How do we do that? I suggest that we need to involve the local communities more and more in reporting the abuse and in prosecuting the cases. Some States do this already.

We have to involve the locals. The people next door know who is cheating. The people next door know who is trying to beat the system. We need to bring them into the discussion. We have to give incentives back to the State to help us collect the money.

For instance, on Medicaid, in the State of Kentucky, the Federal pays 70 percent, the State pays 30 percent of Medicaid. I think it would be pursuant to law if the State of Kentucky increased their enforcement provisions on Medicaid fraud, and give them a larger portion back, so they could do other things with other programs.

We have to have tougher sanctions for the violators. It is not enough to get your hands slapped and say you cannot participate in a program for 6 months. It is not enough to say, "We caught you now. That is tough. We are going to let you go; don't do it anymore." People who violate the system,

who do not cooperate with what we are trying to do with our work programs and everything else should be dealt with swiftly and, I think, firmly.

Last, we have to make sure that folks who are enforcing have the tools for enforcement. We talk about welfare and we talk about AFDC. What we really want to accomplish is self-sufficiency.

I submit to you that in every community we have what it takes to make self-sufficiency. We have United Ways, we have the community activities, whether it is tenant services or whatever. We have the housing corporation. We have section 8 certificates. We have hospitals. We have the local governments, State governments. We have colleges of dentistry, home economics, whatever.

The Federal Government, I submit, Mr. Speaker, when we are talking about money, when we decide we are going to spend some money on welfare reform, we need to provide the incentive to suggest to the communities, if you will work with these folks and try to get them toward self-sufficiency, and if you will integrate all the resources available to you in your community, and if you will have housing, child care, transitional help, and you will help provide it, we will help you do that, and it will work.

Our ultimate goal is to take people off of welfare to self-sufficiency. But I submit that ultimate goal has to apply not only to AFDC, it has to apply to SSI, it has to apply to food benefits, food stamps, housing benefits, and I think we have to have some responsibility tied to Medicaid.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot that has been discussed up here on welfare about the Contract With America, and I understand it and appreciate it. But I would like to submit to you, there is another contract we have to be concerned with.

It is easy to talk about welfare reform, because we are going to have very few people up here talking on the other side. Most of us agree what has to be done. However, we are going to do this and do that with contracts, let us not forget one of the contracts I think we have which is most important of all. That is a contract with our conscience.

THE MEXICAN BAILOUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZELIFF). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] for 60 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], my distinguished colleague.

REMEMBERING CONGRESSMAN CHET HOLIFIELD

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the Congress and the Nation for a few moments to the memory of former Congressman Chet Holifield of California, who passed away on February 6 from pneumonia at the age of 91.

Mr. Speaker, Chet Holifield devoted 32 years of his working life to this institution and to serving the American people. To review his accomplishments in Congress is to review some of the key developments in American Government and public policy in the years after World War II.

Chet Holifield was deeply involved in congressional policymaking about the peaceful and military applications of atomic power after the Second World War. He was a vigorous advocate for the peaceful use of atomic power and pushed hard to have the U.S. atomic energy program placed under civilian, rather than military, control.

In 1957, he headed the first full-scale congressional hearings on the implication of radioactive fallout from nuclear testing. At the same time, Chet believed strongly in—and was a strong advocate for—the development of the hydrogen bomb and he was a strong supporter of Adm. Hyman Rickover in his program to build a nuclear navy and submarine fleet. Congressman Holifield's decades of experience and detailed involvement in nuclear policymaking gained him the respect of colleagues in both political parties, the scientific and professional communities, and environmental groups.

During the last 4 years of his congressional service, from 1967 to 1971, Chet Holifield was the chairman of the House Government Operations Committee, the House committee primarily involved in promoting the efficient operation of Federal Government agencies. Chet authored the legislation establishing the General Services Administration, which does most of the purchasing for the civil departments of the Government and manages most Federal buildings. And, during the growth of the Federal Government in the 1960's, Chet Holifield was personally involved in managing legislation that created two Cabinet-level departments: The Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Transportation.

Chet was born in Mayfield, KY, grew up in Arkansas, and spent some of his teen years working in the wheat fields of Kansas and the oil fields of Oklahoma. He later hitchhiked to California where he found a job in a Pasadena cleaning and dyeing shop.

Ultimately, he worked his way up to his own small business: A men's clothing store. Chet was first elected to Congress in 1942 and was reelected 15 times by the people of eastern Los Angeles County, CA, finally becoming the dean of the California congressional delegation.

He voluntarily retired in 1971, and returned to California to run his clothing store in Montebello. After finally retir-

ing from his business work, Chet moved to the beachside community of Balboa, CA.

Through his efforts in Congress and his involvement in the public affairs of our Nation, Chet Holifield's work helped shape modern America, and his life's accomplishments will live on for a long time.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by apologizing to the approximately 80 House employees who will be kept a little bit late this afternoon as a result of this. What the people in the gallery and many of the folks back home do not realize is that under present system these employees have to stick around as long as we have special orders. There is a room right up there that has a television camera.

I have asked the previous Speaker, and I'm going to ask that the Speaker try to change that policy. There is really no reason to keep these people around late, but I would not keep them here if it was not worthwhile.

What we have to talk about today is of the utmost importance to our Nation. We are talking about \$20 billion for the single largest expenditure on the part of this country that has ever been made without the consent of Congress, and the potential for an additional \$15 billion to be spent at any moment by the President of the United States, again without the consent of Congress.

It is particularly frustrating as a Member of Congress that earlier in this week, when the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], seven Republicans, an equal number of Democrats, and the body's only Independent Member offered a resolution to demand of the Comptroller General the information as to whether or not what President Clinton did last week, when he guaranteed the loan to bail out Wall Street, to bail out the Mexican peso, whether or not that was even legal.

Second, we wanted to know how often this fund has been used, and what amounts of money have been appropriated over the past. We also wanted to know who knew that the bailout was going to take place. We know that Speaker GINGRICH knew; we know that President of the Senate, Senator DOLE, knew. We know that the President knew. Who else knew that this was going to take place?

The reason that this is so important is, they knew before the announcement that the value of the peso was going to jump dramatically. It has now been shown that it jumped 20 percent in less than 48 hours. For those who have a small savings account, for those who might own a stock, can they imagine having a guaranteed 20-percent return on their investment in only 48 hours?

That is why it is important, and that is why it was so wrong, that this deal was cut with the Speaker, with the President, with the President of the Senate, in secret, without the approval of Congress to bail out the peso, but

most importantly, to bail out Wall Street, the same people who just 15 months ago said "We have to have NAFTA, even if it means that the garment workers down in rural communities like south Mississippi will be thrown out of work, even if it means that the fishermen and the shrimpers down in the Gulf Coast States will be put at a severe disadvantage," because they have to live by all of our laws, our minimum wage laws, our OSHA laws, the pollution laws. They have to pay our taxes.

□ 1630

And they will be competing with shrimp brought in from Communist China, for which there is no import fee at all. They said it was economic Darwinism and that we had to have NAFTA because the chips are just going to fall where they are.

It is kind of strange, then, that 15 months later when Wall Street is hurting, when Wall Street is losing a few bucks on their investments down in Mexico that they run to this body, that they run to the President and demand to be bailed out. It is not right. It is not fair. And it is your money.

I think the people of America need to realize that these are unsecured loans. Now, the President will tell you and Speaker GINGRICH will tell you that the Mexicans have pledged the oil revenues to pay these loans back. Who's kidding whom? If those oil revenues had not already been pledged in a dozen different places, do you think they would be having to borrow \$20 billion? That oil revenue has been pledged long ago and will not be available to repay those loans and \$20 billion of your tax dollars have already gone down the rathole.

Some of the older Members of this body tell me that this is much like the S&L crisis where they came to Congress and said, "You know, for \$5 billion we can solve the problem," only a few months later to come back and say, "Well, you've now invested \$5 billion, you have to invest some more to get your money back." There is not a doubt in my mind that within a certain period of time, the President of the United States will be asking for the remaining \$15 billion. And it is your money. And it is the only money spent without the approval of Congress. It is the only money spent without the approval of the Senate. And if you take the time to read our Nation's Constitution, it is very clear in article I, section 9 which says the Congress shall have the power to coin money. No money shall be spent from the Treasury without an appropriation by the Congress. And yet what the President did was completely contrary to that.

He will point to an old law from 1934 that was meant to get us out of the depression, that was meant to prop up our currency, that has never been used for more than \$1 billion at a time and say that that \$20 billion somehow benefits us. Who's kidding whom?

Who is to bail out Wall Street? And again no one will ever really know if some phone calls were made to some people who happen to be Wall Street buddies and said, "Go out and buy a bunch of pesos because the value's going to go up very quickly and very soon," and your money was used to guarantee that.

It is wrong, and that is why what the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], a number of Republicans including the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER], the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING], that is why we are trying to find out what happened and that is why equally importantly we have a bill in the Banking Committee to say that this cannot happen again, that from now on these moneys have to be appropriated by Congress.

At this time I would like to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], who has been most instrumental in doing the research on this matter.

Ms. KAPTUR. I want to thank Congressman TAYLOR for his extraordinary leadership on this effort and for gaining the special order time this evening. It is my privilege to join him and to thank him so very much for cosponsoring the special resolution of inquiry that was filed today here in the House of Representatives asking the President of the United States to submit information to this House within the next 2 weeks answering questions that we cannot answer for the American people simply because the executive branch chose to take a unilateral action without a vote of the Congress of the United States. Congressman TAYLOR has outlined the amount of money that is on the line initially, money that is flowing out of our Treasury, not just in the form of loan guarantees, although we cannot get specifics on this, but we understand direct loans as well. We do not know for what duration, we do not know what the terms are. We do not know exactly what the purpose is. But we know that part of the money is being used to help Mexico refinance what are called pesobonos, the bonds that she holds, that creditors hold against her that she has to refinance. Approximately 10 billion to 16 billion dollars' worth of those are owed to U.S. investors.

I would just ask our colleagues and people around the country to be aware that this resolution of inquiry asks very specific questions of the administration asking them to give us the assured source of repayment to our country for any of the short, intermediate or long-term credit facilities that were designed by the administration and made available to Mexico, to give us any documents—we are just asking for facts here—concerning the net worth of Pemex, the state-owned oil company, the historical annual revenues of Pemex and as Congressman TAYLOR

mentioned, to what other purposes those revenues have already been dedicated, which means that the collateral really is not worth anything.

As one of our colleagues over in the other body said, we may have to send in the 82d Airborne to collect on the oil collateral because it has been so overpledged.

We are asking for other information concerning what criteria the administration used in deciding to make loans from this fund to Mexico when in fact it has refused so many other countries around the world access to funds through that particular credit facility. So why should this situation be different and why should the Executive go around the Congress of the United States?

We are also very interested in knowing what additional replenishment of funds will be required in the International Monetary Fund and Bank of International Settlements, because they have now been drawn into this agreement and the United States does provide some of their working capital. What are the nature of those arrangements and what additional amounts of taxpayer dollars will be required to replenish those funds?

In any case, there are over seven pages of questions here, and this particular resolution was today referred to the Banking Committee. The Banking Committee under the rules of the House has 14 days in which to respond.

If I just might take 2 extra minutes here, I want to say something very important tonight that we did not talk about during the day today. That is, as a result of press clips today in the Washington Post, the New York Times, and other newspapers, the President of Mexico evidently yesterday effectively declared an end to that Government's peace efforts in that country to try to keep the lid on the uprisings that are occurring, particularly in the southern part of Mexico, and I want to say something about this, because it cuts to the quick of what is happening in relations between our two nations.

It is not enough for just the President of the United States to be friends with the President of Mexico or the biggest banks in America to be friends with the biggest banks in Mexico. Good relations between our countries depend on the people of the United States being friends with the people of Mexico. As we watch the people of Mexico stream across our borders, stream across our borders because they are hungry, our response as a nation is, well, we have to close the borders, because the exodus is so huge.

But let me say this: That all the interests on Wall Street that are watching what we do here, and I will call some of them by name, Citibank, Chase Manhattan Bank, the Fidelity mutual funds. Over there in Illinois, Archer-Daniel-Midland, you sell a lot of grain down in Mexico, but I will say this tonight: There is not one share of your stock that is worth the life of one

Mexican peasant fighting for enough to eat off their land that they are being divested of. And we have to speak out for those people here in the Congress of the United States. It is not reported in the press, it is not reported on television, it is hardly reported in the newspapers. In fact one of the newspapers says today, many investors in America here have said that continuing political instability in Mexico is the main reason that they are withdrawing their money from Mexico. They have been withdrawing their money from Mexico in recent months.

It is very interesting that they are worried about the political instability. Yet you do not hear one call for democracy building in Mexico.

□ 1640

We do not hear one call out of Wall Street for human rights. We do not hear one call of sympathy for the farmers in Chiapas who literally plant coffee with their hands on the hillsides, and as a result of this NAFTA agreement are being thrown off of their land, and they call it in the paper, they call them rebels, and call them insurrectionists, and make them seem like they are traitors. Well, they are not traitors to the ordinary people of that land, and frankly, I think they had the real true belief in democracy in their hearts.

I would hope that our country would listen to the Catholic prelates who spoke out this morning in the New York Times, Bishop Samuel Ruiz Garcia, who said that this is a very, very serious situation. It is pointing to a solution of war, and it breaks the process of dialog.

This is not a situation that will be solved with guns or with the President of Mexico sending in the federal police. We can take a lot more lives, and I would hate to see the biggest financial interests in this country part and party to killing the common people of Mexico. That will not build friendships over the years.

But the biggest interests in this country, political and economic, ought to be for democracy-building south of our border, because only when the people there have a right to have a decent wage and to own a piece of property and have enough to eat will there be political stability and economic stability in that country and four our own country.

I felt compelled to speak out. I am very worried about what could happen over this weekend when Congress goes home with that cease-fire having been lifted, and at least I wanted to put something on record about my deep concerns, and also that those who have their monied interests at heart would also put to heart the interests of the people of Mexico and be a voice for them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZELIFF). The Chair would remind Members to address the Chair and not those outside the Chamber.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] for her remarks. It is strange that she used the word "rebel." It reminded me of some other people who really need to be commended for what happened earlier here in the week. There was a vote on Tuesday, or at least we had hoped to get a vote on whether or not we could investigate this. If you happen to have been following the House proceedings you would know the majority leader, Mr. ARMEY, stood up and called for tabling of that motion, and what that means is that it cannot even be debated, that the American people would not even have 1 hour to hear what was the information we were looking for, why we were looking for it, and what we hope to do with it and how we hoped to change things. It is interesting that there were 14 Republicans who went out on a limb and opposed their leadership because they knew that what was going on was so wrong that they would not give their blessing to it. I really think those Members, there were about 150 Democrats, and I thank all of them for their help, but in particular I want to thank Congressman BILBRAY, Congressman COBLE, Congressman DUNCAN, Congressman ENGLISH, Congressman HUNTER, Congressman ISTOOK, Congressman KLUG, Congressman LARGENT, Congressman MYERS, Congressman ROHRBACHER, Congressman STEARNS, and my friend but not relative, CHARLIE TAYLOR from North Carolina, Congressman WELDON, and Congressman WHITFIELD.

It was my understanding, as reported today in the Washington Times, that rather than being applauded by their colleagues in the Republican Conference for their brave stand in putting the American people before party politics, and I quote, "they were castigated by House Majority Whip TOM DELAY for opposing Mr. GINGRICH on the vote to bring this before the public."

I want to make it very clear to the Speaker, I want to make it very clear to the American public, this issue will not go away. They hope it will be forgotten. How can you forget \$20 billion and how can you forget the potential for this Nation to lose another \$15 billion? That is \$35 billion, and for those who want to know what that is the equivalent of, that is the equivalent of what this Nation spends on the entire budget for the Veterans' Administration for a whole year, and it is gone, and it is wrong.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Vermont, the only independent Member of this body, and the gentleman who has introduced legislation to make this fund subject to an annual appropriation process like every other dollar that is in the Treasury.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding

and congratulate him on his leadership, as well as that of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR]. It is nice to be here this evening with them. I share the concerns they have articulated.

It seems to me to be rather incredible that at a time when we spend huge amounts of time right here on the floor of the House debating the appropriation for the National Council for the Humanities and the National Council for the Arts, and \$100 million here and \$100 million there, that this institution presumably which represents the American people has not been able to debate and vote on a \$20 billion-plus package which puts taxpayers' money at risk. Maybe people agree with what the President and Mr. GINGRICH are doing, maybe they do not. But I cannot believe that many Americans think it proper that the U.S. Congress does not debate that issue and vote it up or vote it down right here on the floor of the House.

As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] indicated, I have introduced H.R. 867. What H.R. 867 does is it says that the world has changed markedly since 1934 when the legislation that the President authorized was first enacted. A lot has changed. Under H.R. 867 loans from the Exchange Stabilization Fund would only be allowed, as the gentleman from Mississippi indicated, to the extent that Congress has previously authorized it in an annual appropriation bill. In other words, like all of the other appropriations in this Congress that come through this Congress, this fund also would have to be appropriated by Congress.

I would point out to my colleagues that this would mean that the fund would be treated in the exact same manner that we treat the funds held by the Export-Import Bank. Both funds are self-sufficient and do not require annual contributions in appropriation bills. However, loans made by the Export-Import Bank are subject to congressional approval given under authorization and appropriation bills. This bill would simply subject the Exchange Stabilization Fund to congressional approval.

We have just introduced this bill on Wednesday, and I am delighted that we have already received significant support for it of both the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR], but also on board are the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO], the gentlewoman from Missouri [Ms. DANNER], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCOSKY], the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIPINSKI], and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF]. Included in those Members are some who consider themselves pret-

ty conservative and some who consider themselves pretty progressive. But I think the bottom line for all of us and for the American people is that at a time when this country has a \$200 billion deficit, at a time in which Members of this Congress are talking about cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, veterans' programs, nutrition programs for hungry children, that before \$20 billion-plus of taxpayers' money is put at risk, that issue must be discussed and must be debated and must be voted upon on the floor of the House, or else we as Members of Congress are not doing our job.

I thank the gentleman for inviting me. I have to run, but I thank him.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for being here today, and I want to again remind everyone that this was never brought before Congress. The reason it was not brought before Congress is because both sides, the Democrats and the Republicans, knew that had it been brought before Congress, Congress would have voted it down, and that is the greatest outrage of all, that the will of the majority as expressed through their elected representatives was never heard. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] is trying to correct that. It is a shame that a little-known provision of a law had to be used to thwart the will of the majority.

But I really do want to thank the gentleman for trying to correct that.

Mr. SANDERS. If the gentleman will yield, and not only are a majority of Republicans against this bailout and a majority of Democrats, polls indicate that the vast majority of the American people are in opposition, and as the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] has pointed out on many occasions, a majority of the people in Mexico are in opposition to this bailout.

So who is for it? I think we know who is for it, and that is the people who have the money, and that is the people who have the power in this country, our friends in the large commercial banks and in the investment houses on Wall Street. But we all and many of our colleagues are going to demand that this issue be debated and voted upon here on the floor of the House. We do not intend to abdicate our responsibility.

Again I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Ms. KAPTUR. If the gentleman will yield, I just wanted to say it is rather interesting when you look at who will get the \$20 billion as it is drawn down from the Treasury, it will not be the people in the United States who have lost their jobs to Mexico. We have had over 18,000 Americans since January 1, 1994, lose their jobs to Mexico already because the wages down there are so cheap. Our plants, several thousand of them, have been relocating down there over the years, and after NAFTA that exodus accelerated. So our people will not be getting the money. In fact the

money is being taken from our taxpayers to bail out the big financial institutions.

□ 1650

We know the money will not go to feed the people of Mexico. The people of Mexico understand that their government will not help them, because it is in fact a one-party government and an authoritarian state that has been in power since before my grandmother was born. So they know that they will not get assistance from there. So it is interesting to think about who the money is really going to and at the same time as those dollars flow between the central bank of Mexico and its public treasury and Wall Street here in the United States and the central bank of Germany and Japan, when you think about that movement of money, and then you think about the fact that some of those very same institutions, especially the private creditors, have said very quietly to our government it is all right, let Mexico clean up its problems in Chiapas, clean up its problems in Tabasco state, in other words, kill the people of Mexico who are fighting because they basically do not have enough money to survive for life, enough to eat.

I remember one woman said to me when I visited down there, "Well, Ms. KAPTUR, you do not understand. We work for hunger wages." I said, "I beg your pardon? I never heard that term." She said, "People get about 80 percent of the calories that it takes to keep a person's weight in balance," so in the part of the countryside that we were in, the people were very thin, and they were very hungry, and it was very hard to even get tortillas. The children were eating tortillas. They did not have fresh water. It is hard for Americans to imagine if they have not visited the inland area how people are actually living in that nation of nearly 100 million people, yet the dollars will not go to help those people. In fact, the people that are suffering most, the ones who are crying out for their own government, for their own government to help them, are being felled by the federal police.

And so we ask ourselves, what are we doing as a country; what are the major institutions of this country doing, political and economic? Are we standing up for the best ideals that are in the Constitution?

I think not.

And so it is my pleasure to join with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] this evening and to be a voice for people on both sides of the border who feel that this money is being incorrectly used to support a government that does not represent the majority of people in that nation.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. I say to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], it has really become apparent to me in phone calls I have had, letters, faxes from around the country that the American people feel powerless against Wall Street. They feel powerless

against the people who benefited from this.

You pointed out very well that is not the Mexican people. It is Wall Street. It is the people who reaped tremendous profits down there last year, because they took risky investments. When those risky investments went sour, then they called upon the taxpayers to bail them out, and that is wrong, that is not free enterprise.

Ms. KAPTUR. USA Today last week had a big page in the business section that showed all the different funds, the stock and bond funds, the mutual funds in the United States and what their earnings had been since 1991, and the emerging market fund under which this would fall, investments in Mexico had yielded a 66 percent return over the last four years.

So the companies that we are talking about are not poor little lambs. These institutions have made incredible profits, and as they made those profits, why should they not eat their losses? And for the big banks, this has been a great time to be in banking in America. They put a fee on everything, right, if we go down here to the little checking machine and I try to get some money from my bank in Ohio, they charge \$2.50 or \$3.50 for the transfer. You pay for your checks. You pay for everything. You practically pay to go into the bank. They are making lots of money off of customers.

So this is true. Banking has been very profitable over the last 5 years. Why should they not eat their losses? Why have they come to the taxpayers?

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Reclaiming my time, I want to thank the gentlewoman for her help.

I would like to encourage those who are listening to get in touch with their elected Representatives. I think a few questions are fair to ask: Who agreed to the bailout? What were the names of the congressional leaders who met with the President and agreed to the bailout? When did they know? Who did they tell prior to the bailout so that people could call and buy millions of pesos and get a 20-percent return on their investment with your money that they get the profits? And above all, what can we do as a Nation to keep this from happening again?

And I hope that the American people will not let this slide. There are still \$15 billion in that account that could be spent, and we have already seen the President use it once. It should not be used again.

But until we can pass legislation which is going to take awhile and will only take place if the people of America demand it, then they have to be held accountable by the voice of the American people.

I again want to thank the approximately 80 House employees that we have kept late. It is almost 5 o'clock, Friday afternoon. I would like to let them go home. I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] very much.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] for this special order.

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS FOR THE 104TH CONGRESS

(Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule XI, clause 2(a) of the House rules, I am submitting a copy of the rules of the Committee on Small Business to be printed in the RECORD.

Rules and Procedures of the Committee on Small Business, U.S. House of Representatives, 104TH CONGRESS

1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Rules of the House of Representatives, and in particular the committee rules enumerated in Rule XI, are the rules of the Committee on Small Business to the extent applicable and by this reference are incorporated. Each subcommittee of the Committee on Small Business (hereinafter referred to as the "Committee") is a part of the Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee, and to its rules to the extent applicable.

2. REFERRAL OF BILLS BY CHAIR

Unless retained for consideration by the full Committee, all legislation and other matters referred to the Committee shall be referred by the Chair to the subcommittee of appropriate jurisdiction within two weeks. Where the subject matter of the referral involves the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee or does not fall within any previously assigned jurisdictions, the Chair shall refer the matter as she may deem advisable. Bills, resolutions and other matters referred to subcommittees may be reassigned by the Chair when, in her judgment, the subcommittee is not able to complete its work or cannot reach agreement thereon.

3. DATE OF MEETING

The regular meeting date of the Committee shall be the second Wednesday of every month when the House is in session. Additional meetings may be called by the Chair as she may deem necessary or at the request of a majority of the members of the Committee in accordance with clause 2(c) of Rule XI of the House.

At least three days' notice of such additional meeting shall be given unless the Chair determines that there is good cause to call the meeting on less notice.

The determination of the business to be considered at each meeting shall be made by the Chair subject to clause 2(c) of Rule XI of the House.

A regularly scheduled meeting need not be held if there is no business to be considered or, upon at least three days' notice, it may be set for a different date.

4. ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS

Unless the Chair, or the Committee by majority vote, determines that there is good cause to begin a hearing at an earlier date, public announcement shall be made of the date, place and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted by the Committee at least one week before the commencement of that hearing.