

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I just would like to add to the gentlewoman from Oregon's concern before I go into what I wanted to talk about. I think her concern is a legitimate one, that for over 200 years of this Republic we have done without term limits, and we have now driven the American people to really want term limits, and yet we seem to be able to get everything else up on time. But we tend to want to play with the term limits legislation so that it won't really apply to us, so that everybody will get at least 20 more years in before they kick in. There are some games being played and I think she had a legitimate point.

But, Mr. Speaker, the reason I really come to the floor is to talk about women's history week because—actually it is a month, we get a whole month this year, and it should be a month because actually this is a year where we are celebrating the 75th anniversary of women having gotten the right to vote federally, so in this diamond jubilee, I think it is only right that we look back at some of the history that so many Americans really don't know.

I want to just quickly talk about three women this morning that I think all played very important roles that a lot of people don't know about.

First is Anne Hutchinson. Ann Hutchinson was born in 1591 in England. She was born during the reign of Elizabeth I. Her father was an Episcopalian minister and she migrated with her husband to the Massachusetts Bay Colony. She was very steeped in theology because she had grown up with it, and obviously it was not long before she came to loggerheads with the different leaders in the Massachusetts Bay Colony who really were not under free speech. They were only into free speech for themselves.

We as Americans talk about, first, free speech, and, second, freedom of religion, but let me tell you, the first guys that got off the boat were not for that. And it was this very courageous woman, with her husband standing beside her, and she had over 12 children to join her, that took up this cudgel, and she and their followers ended up moving outside of the Massachusetts Bay Colony after several very prolonged trials where they tried to try her for witchcraft and everything else.

They moved and they started the first colony in America that had freedom of religion and freedom of speech in it. So I think as we talk about that, we should remember where some of those ideas came from and came from early on.

Another woman that I would like to talk about that we don't mention, she was one of the very early women in America to become a doctor, Mary Edwards Walker. She was not the first, but one of the first, and she became a great friend of Ms. Bloomer of the Bloomer girls. People forget where the word "bloomer" came from; it came from the woman who came up with the idea that it was very difficult to wear

hoop skirts all the time and came up with these billowing bloomers.

Well, Dr. Edwards, or Dr. Walker became very, very involved in serving the Union Army in the fields, and when she used to come into Washington, DC; to get you in someplace, they would arrest her because she was not wearing proper attire. If you can remember the attire of the Civil War, you can certainly understand why if you were a woman doctor and you were out on the field treating patients, you were not running around in one of those big hoop skirts. And finally, the Congress gave her a special exemption so she could come into town and resupply and not be arrested because of the terrific, meritorious job that she was doing for Union soldiers.

I think that is another very interesting and heroic woman that we know very little about. Another woman that I think is very interesting is Bertha Palmer. How many people who grew up in Chicago know about Palmer House, and she was the spouse of the Palmer of Palmer House. She also, when she inherited his wealth, proceeded to double it before she died, which is no shabby task, but she was a very, very strong person for women's rights. And some of the very interesting things that she did was during the Columbus exhibition, when they were celebrating the 400th anniversary of Columbus finding America, she was on the board and she said, "Well, aren't we going to do anything about Queen Isabella who at least put up the money."

I mean, this woman had some respect for that and of course you could imagine what the old boys said. They said, "See, that is what happened, put a woman on the board, the next thing you know they are trying to take over everything," so she ended up having to form a woman's exhibition right alongside of it. It became very successful and actually it ended up in the black even though the other one ended up in the red.

So these are three mothers that I think we should think more about in this month and I hope we get to think about many more.

ON MEXICO BAILOUT

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

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, my friends, in politics as in humor, timing is everything, and the timing of President Clinton's \$20 billion bailout of Mexico could not be worse. At the very moment, the American dollar is taking a beating in world currency markets. The Clinton administration is sparing no expense to shore up the Mexican peso.

In looking through some of the clips over the weekend, it seemed to me the

timing of what President Clinton is doing is everything. For on this House floor this week we will be voting on a rescission package that cuts benefits for veterans.

Now, how do the veterans feel about a rescission package that cuts the veterans at the same time we are shoring up the peso by giving \$20 billion to the exchange stabilization fund?

Let me also talk to you about what the chief economist at Lehman Brothers, Allen Sinai said: "The dollars' new all-time lows are being generated by the United States ties to Mexico and the panic flight right now of funds away from weak currency countries, Mexico, Canada, and the United States."

Need I remind the Members of this body that the exchange stabilization fund that is being tapped by the Clinton administration was set up explicitly to protect the value of the United States dollar, not the Mexican peso. Yet the administration has already disbursed \$3 billion from this fund to Mexico whose current political corruption saga contains more characters than a Tolstoy novel and is expecting to ship down the next \$7 billion by the end of June. And for those of my colleagues who didn't read the paper this morning, Mr. Salinas, the former President of Mexico, has left Mexico, and now intends to reside in Boston, MA, and be a consultant.

Mr. Speaker, James Madison wrote, "The House of Representatives alone can propose the supplies requisite for the support of the Government. They, in a word, hold the purse."

My colleagues, what that means basically is Congress has to approve money that you spend. The administration can't take this kind of money from the American people without Congress approving.

So that is why I call on the rest of the Members of this House to allow a vote on congressional approval for any additional funds to Mexico and suspend further payment until all the questions are answered from the Leach letter that we approved in a House resolution here on the House floor.

I would like to conclude by reading a quote from a leading columnist in Mexico talking about the recent disruption in Mexico and the peso, and she said, "Two things happened to Mexico under Mr. Salinas. He made us believe in the Government of Mexico and he anesthetized us from the corruption. Now the new President has made us see the corruption, and the result is we don't believe in Government anymore."

Mr. Speaker, now is the time to allow us to vote on this matter and suspend all further payments, particularly in light of the fact that we have a rescission package coming on this House floor that is going to be \$17 billion, almost as much as the President intends to give to Mexico without congressional approval.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, we will be voting on Wednesday on a major rescission. We will be voting to cut the spending for many programs that many of our people have learned to depend upon. Whether or not they should be depending on these programs, whether or not the Federal Government should be in those areas or not is a matter of debate, but if we cut these programs and then we spend the money, not on their benefit by bringing down the Federal deficit, which is the purpose behind cutting spending supposedly, but instead allow that money to be taken from the United States Treasury and sent to Wall Street speculators who went to Mexico to receive high returns on their investment or the Mexican elite, which is a corrupt elite that have betrayed their country time and again, we ourselves will be betraying our people in the same way that Mexican elite has been betraying their own people.

This bailout is a crime against our own people, and on top of that, it will not work. One can see the nature of this crime by the fact that here we are talking about the transferring of billions of dollars, American taxpayers' dollars, without so much as a vote of Congress.

The last time I heard, money was not supposed to be spent in this country unless the elected Representatives of the people voted for it. This is a travesty. It should and it will be stopped.

MORE ON THE MEXICAN BAILOUT

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, in terms of the bailout, the Mexican bailout, there was no vote in this body on the transfer of those funds. In fact, when the President of the United States turned to Congress and saw that there was no support in Congress for this \$40 billion, potentially \$40 billion expenditure, he proceeded in what I consider an antidemocratic fashion to scheme and to plot in what could be a legal way of taking billions of our dollars and sending it to Mexico and spending it on the purposes he intended, meaning the bailing out of Wall Street speculators and basically lining the pockets of a corrupt Mexican elite so that the system will not break down in Mexico.

Well, perhaps it would be good if the current Mexican elite, which is corrupt, which has been antidemocratic, perhaps it would be good if that power structure did break down and that the people of Mexico at long last would be given a chance for true democracy and honest government, because the grip of their oppressor would have been broken.

We have a chance to try to put an end to this. Already \$3 billion has been spent. It is up to Congress now to do

everything that we possibly can to stop the spending of that money, mainly because—OK, it is wrong but also it will not work. It is not going to save Mexico.

Sending—you know, pouring money—it is the old adage, sending good money after bad is not a way to make things right. It will just make things worse. In Mexico, it will not work.

What is needed down there is a change. It needs change, basic change, and by us subsidizing the status quo by spending billions of dollars, we will not see that change come.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. STEARNS. The gentleman, perhaps like myself, has heard the arguments if we do not give this money to Mexico, there will be a financial catastrophe in Mexico and we hear that oftentimes here in the halls of Congress and we have heard the administration—in fact, recently Mr. Greenspan, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank and the Secretary of Treasury, Mr. Rubin, used this. And frankly I think it is sort of a scare tactic because a recent Wall Street Journal properly debunks that whole idea that there would be a financial catastrophe.

From early December through mid-February, stock markets in emerging countries that undertook significant pro-markets reforms, the ones you are talking about, and sound money reforms survived quite nicely during the so-called global crisis that the currency has just been through. Stock markets in Singapore, Chile, and the Czech Republic were essentially flat during that period. Emerging nations with partial or faltering reforms, including Brazil and Hungary, however, did indeed suffer mightily during the Mexican breakdown.

So, in other words, private global investment capital is discerning and mobile. It knows where it is investing its money. It knows a good deal from a bad deal and it will not be intimidated by disaster scenarios conjured up by financial officials like Chairman Greenspan and Secretary Rubin.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Reclaiming my time, every time we try to cut the budget around here, every time we say, Let us not spend Federal money in this area, let us cut the deficit, we are always told, My goodness, there is going to be a catastrophe, people are going to starve, there are going to be babies in the street, it is going to be horrible.

But you know what, most of these scare tactics that are being thrown out are just absolutely wrong and the people who are talking that way know they are wrong but they are using a tactic to get us to spend the taxpayer's dollar to line their own pockets. This is not contrary to what we have experienced here at home. But let us take a look at that.

If we are going to spend money to stabilize the currencies, what about Russia? Isn't that also an important country? We could be spending hun-

dreds of billions of dollars to stabilize their currency. After all, they have got nuclear weapons. What if chaos erupts in Russia?

This is a formula for the United States to be spending hundreds of billions of dollars to protect other people's currencies, and do you know what that means? That means our currency will come under attack. That means our currency will come under attack. That means people will sense that our currency no longer is strong because we are spending money from a stabilization fund meant to protect our currency that now is protecting these foreign interests who basically are big money guys and rich elitists in other countries, and what happens?

We have found that since the Mexican bailout and the defeat of the balanced budget amendment, that our own dollar is now under attack. This is unconscionable. It has already cost American people too much. It is a disgrace. We have got to act to stop this.

ON THE REPUBLICAN AGENDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I probably will not take the whole 60 minutes, much to your relief and others, but I would like to take some time here to discuss some matters that concern me, some of which will be addressed in the rescission this week and later those that will come before us in the welfare reform bill proposed by the Republican Members of this Congress.

First of all, let me just say that it is pretty well documented now and I think people have come to understand that the welfare reform bill holds major, major cuts to populations that are very vulnerable in this American society and especially with those cuts with respect to nutrition programs for school children and for newborn infants and for children in child care settings. Specifically, some \$7 billion are cut out of nutrition programs that serve the women's, infants' and children's program and the school lunch programs.

Now, many of my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle have come to the floor and suggested from time to time that they are not cutting anything, that they are simply slowing the growth, but the fact of the matter is that they are removing a little over \$7 billion from these programs over the next 5 years, and that means that the people who are administering these programs at the local level, because that is where these programs are run, will have to decide whether fewer children receive a school lunch or whether they will receive a smaller school lunch or whether they will receive it fewer days a week than they would