

aside, the facts are that the Clinton administration's taxpayer funded bailout of Mexico is a colossal failure.

In early 1994, Mexico was hailed by the administration as a hallmark of success and was embraced as a partner in the North American Free-Trade Agreement. The subsequent 2 years have revealed that this image was a costly mirage forced upon the American and Mexican citizens. Mexico has become a dependent of the United States, looking north for more money to bail out its failed economic and social policies. But the answer to Mexico's problems is, and always has been, in Mexico City, not Washington, DC.

I have been saying for almost 1 year that the Clinton administration's bailout was an ill-conceived disaster. It is not just my opinion, it is the cold hard facts—evidenced by the Mexican economic figures. The last few months have demonstrated that the Mexican financial sector can no longer disguise what is happening in Mexico. Mexico's economic crisis is now 1 year old and there is no indication of any meaningful improvement in Mexico's real economy: Record numbers of Mexicans are out of work, interest rates are soaring, the people are starving, and the country is reeling under increasing social and political unrest.

Mr. President, we must look at the objective facts, and the performance of the Mexican peso is an excellent starting point. On December 20, 1994, the peso was trading at 3.97. Yesterday the peso closed at 7.54 against the dollar—that is a 50-percent drop in 1 year.

Mr. President, no one wants to hold pesos because they are considered worthless. As reported by the New York Times on November 11, 1995, "In the land of the peso, the dollar is common coin." But the Mexican Government continues to spend United States taxpayer dollars in their frantic and futile attempt to support the peso. Money from our Exchange Stabilization Fund—the ESF—that was supposed to be used to support the dollar. The Clinton administration's use of the ESF was unprecedented, and legally tenuous. In August of this year, I sponsored the Senate passed an amendment to the ESF statute which will prevent this administration from using the ESF as the President's personal piggybank again.

The currency speculators will continue to reap huge profits from the fluctuating peso. On December 22, 1994, Mexico adopted a floating rate regime, which can only be successful if people have confidence in the Mexican Central Bank. The Central Bank's performance so far has failed to inspire such confidence. These problems are exacerbated by the continuing dismal condition of the Mexican banking system. I have been saying all year that the Mexican banking system is the weak link in any financial recovery. In May of this year, the Banking Committee held a hearing to review the condition of the banks and their apparent inac-

curate reports. The end result in that the Mexican Government is bailing out Mexican banks. On December 15, 1995, the Mexican Government announced that it was buying \$2 billion of bad loans from Banamex, Mexico's largest financial groups. Where is the Mexican Government getting this money? From the U.S. taxpayers?

In the year since the peso's collapse, Mexico has received over \$23 billion from the United States and the IMF and it has not solved anything.

American taxpayer dollars have been spent paying off private investors and not one dime of it is staying in Mexico or helping the Mexican people. Over 1 million jobs have been lost and annual inflation has exceeded 50 percent. It is clear the bailout is a failure, so I hope that this administration will not consider throwing more good money after bad.

Mr. President, I want to address a related matter concerning the IMF. On October 18, I sent a letter to the Managing Director of the IMF, Mr. Camdessus, requesting the public release of the so-called "Whittome Report". Two months later, the Congress and the American public still have not seen the Report. The Whittome Report is the result of an internal study by the IMF of its surveillance and response to the Mexican crisis. According to news articles, the Whittome Report concluded that the IMF distorted its own reporting on Mexico in response to political pressure from the Mexican Government. The Report apparently provides a comprehensive analysis of the IMF's monitoring and response to the Mexican Economic Crisis. The Congress and the American people need all the information we can get on this multi-billion dollar bailout.

The United States is the single largest financial contributor to the IMF, almost ¼ of their funds, and we deserve some answers. The IMF has sent \$11.4 billion to Mexico this year and they will disburse \$1.6 billion more every 3 months until August of next year. So when you add the indirect contributions the United States has made from the IMF to the \$12.5 billion the United States has given directly to Mexico, it is obvious that we all have a very large stake in this game. When we have questions—we deserve answers.

It is unconscionable that full disclosure has not been given the Congress—or the American taxpayer—about what happened in this Mexican bailout. The Treasury Department has classified the Whittome Report so the American people cannot read it and make their own judgment about how this crisis was handled. That's wrong.

In October I introduced a resolution calling for the IMF to release the Whittome Report and requesting that the Treasury Department declassify it so that the American public can judge it for themselves. If this report is not declassified and made available to the public and the Congress by the start of the next session, I will ask my col-

leagues to vote for this resolution and take further steps to obtain the information we deserve.

Mr. President, the Mexican peso crisis is now 1 year old. It is time to reassess the situation and learn all we can from the mistakes that were made. At a time when we are struggling to balance our own budget, and make necessary cuts in social programs, we must think long and hard about spending United States tax dollars to bail out Mexico's financial problems.●

RETIREMENT OF DAVID COLE

● Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, David Cole, the officer in charge of the Memphis office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service is soon to retire. Today I wish to pay tribute to this dedicated civil servant.

For 34 years David Cole has labored in the vineyards at INS, and, along the way, he earned a law degree from Memphis State University. All who have come in contact with Dave have been impressed with his knowledge, his dedication, and his integrity.

David Aaron Cole joined the agency as an immigration patrol inspector on August 15, 1961, at Laredo, TX, following his graduation from Mississippi State University in Starkville. Dave answered the call during the Berlin crisis and entered the military, assuming active duty status on December 23, 1961, where he served until August 27, 1962. He then returned to the U.S. Border Patrol in Laredo.

On January 6, 1966, Dave was promoted and transferred from the Border Patrol to Boston as a records and information specialist. In August 1967, he was promoted and transferred to records and information specialist in New York City and became chief of records in 1970.

On November 19, 1970, Dave was selected as officer in charge, Memphis, TN, where he has faithfully served since then.

Mr. President, Federal employees are often the brunt of jokes, cartoons, and talk shows. There are thousands like David Cole who faithfully do their job without recognition or fanfare.

I salute David Cole for his commitment to public service and for his dedication to the people he served. I wish him the very best as he retires from public service and begins a new career in the private sector.●

GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

● Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, renewal of the Generalized System of Preferences ["GSP"] duty-free import program is currently up for consideration as part of the budget reconciliation package. The GSP program allows duty-free imports of certain products into the U.S. from well over 100 GSP eligible nations as a way to help less developed nations export into the U.S. market. While I support this program,

it is essential to remember that from its inception in the Trade Act of 1974, the GSP program has provided for the exemption of "articles which the President determines to be import-sensitive." This is a critical provision to many of our industries.

Mr. President, a clear example of an import sensitive article which should not be subject to GSP is ceramic tile. The U.S. ceramic tile market has been repeatedly recognized as extremely import-sensitive. During the past thirty-years, this U.S. industry has had to defend itself against a variety of unfair and illegal import practices carried out by some of our closest trade partners. Imports already dominate the U.S. ceramic tile market and have done so for the last decade. They currently provide nearly 60 percent of the largest and most important glazed tile sector according to the 1994 year-end government figures.

Moreover, a major guiding principle of the GSP program has been reciprocal market access. Currently, GSP eligible beneficiary countries supply almost one-fourth of the U.S. ceramic tile imports, and they are rapidly increasing their sales and market shares. U.S. ceramic tile manufacturers, however, are still denied access to many of these foreign markets.

Also, previous abuses of the GSP eligible status with regard to some ceramic tile product lines has been well documented. In 1979, the USTR rejected various petitions for duty-free treatment of ceramic tile from certain GSP beneficiary countries. With the acquiescence of the U.S. industry, however, the USTR at that time created a duty-free exception for the then minuscule category of irregular edged "specialty" mosaic tile. Immediately thereafter, foreign manufacturers from major GSP beneficiary countries either shifted their production to "specialty" mosaic tile or simply identified their existing products as "specialty" mosaic tile on customs invoices and stopped paying duties on these products. These actions flooded the U.S. market with superficially restyled or mislabeled duty-free ceramic tile.

Mr. President, in light of the increasing foreign dominance of the U.S. ceramic tile market, for whatever reason, the U.S. industry has been recognized by successive Congresses and Administrations as "import-sensitive" dating back to the Dillon and Kennedy Rounds of the General Agreement of Tariffs and Trade (GATT). Yet during this same period, the American ceramic tile industry has been forced to defend itself from over a dozen petitions filed by various designated GSP eligible countries seeking duty-free GSP treatment for their ceramic tile sent into this market.

The domestic ceramic tile industry has been fortunate, to date, in the fact that both the USTR and the International Trade Commission thus far have recognized the "import-sensitivity" of the U.S. market and have de-

nied these repeated GSP petitions that would result in further import penetration. If, however, just one petitioning nation ever succeeds in gaining GSP benefits for ceramic tile, then all GSP beneficiary countries also are entitled to GSP duty-free benefits for ceramic tile. If any of these petitions were granted, it would eliminate American tile jobs and could devastate this domestic industry.

Mr. President, I believe an import sensitive and already import-dominated product such as ceramic tile should not have to continually defend itself against repeated duty-free petitions but should be exempted from this program in some manner. While I understand USTR has serious reservations about granting exemptions without periodic review, I am hopeful we can find some common ground so that the ceramic tile industry does not have to defend itself each and every year.

While I support reauthorization of the GSP program, I trust and expect that import-sensitive products such as ceramic tile will not be subject to GSP.●

HOWARD H. BAKER, JR., UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. SANTORUM. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be immediately discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2547, and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:..

A bill (H.R. 2547) to designate the United States courthouse located at 800 Market Street in Knoxville, Tennessee, as the "Howard H. Baker, Jr., United States Courthouse."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. THOMPSON. Madam President, I am pleased to support this bill which will designate the new United States Federal Courthouse in Knoxville, TN as the Howard H. Baker, Jr. United States Courthouse. I think it is fitting that this newly purchased courthouse be named for one of the most distinguished members ever to grace this body, a true gentleman who served his Nation for nearly 20 years as Senator from Tennessee, Senate Majority Leader, and, finally, White House Chief of Staff.

Senator Howard Baker begin his career as an attorney in Huntsville and nearby Knoxville, TN, after his graduation from the University of Tennessee School of Law. In 1966, he was elected to the United States Senate. Here, he established a lasting reputation as an outstanding lawmaker. Because of his broad appeal in our home state, the people of Tennessee chose to reelect him in 1972 and again in 1978.

In 1973, I had the opportunity to work under Senator Baker as he served as Vice Chairman of the Senate Watergate Committee. His leadership on this investigatory committee proved to be an asset as he helped this investigation during one of the most difficult time in our Nation's history.

From 1977 to 1981, Senator Baker served as Republican Leader of the Senate. In 1981, he became first Republican in more than 25 years to be elected Senate Majority Leader, a post he held until his retirement in January of 1985. During all of his Senate service, Senator Baker was known for his fair and impartial treatment of members from both sides of the aisle. He was also known in the Senate as someone who could bring both sides of an issue together, especially when political partisanship was intense.

In 1987, Senator Baker again answered his country's call, returning to public service as Chief of Staff to President Reagan. His tenure came at a difficult time for the Reagan Administration, during the Iran-Contra controversy. Senator Baker helped to steer the Administration through this trying situation, uncovering the relevant details of the controversy and helping to convey them to the public.

My friend, Howard Baker, who recently celebrated his 70th birthday, has retired from public service but continues to work on the behalf of many worthwhile causes. Over the years, he has received a number of awards and honors including The Presidential Medal of Freedom and the Jefferson Award for Greatest Public Service Performed by an Elected or Appointed Official. In addition, he has been presented a number of honorary degrees from several institutions of higher education, including: Bradley, Centre College, Dartmouth, Georgetown, Pepperdine, and Yale.

As Senator Baker has served his country and Tennessee admirably and well for nearly two decades, and it is my hope that the U.S. Senate will see fit to observe this service by naming the U.S. Courthouse in Knoxville in his honor.

Mr. FRIST. Madam President, I rise today in support of the bill offered by Senator THOMPSON and myself, which would designate the U.S. Courthouse located at 800 Market Street in Knoxville, Tennessee, as the "Howard H. Baker, Jr. United States Courthouse."

In 1966, Senator Baker became the first Republican ever popularly elected to the U.S. Senate from Tennessee, and he won reelection by wide margins in 1972 and 1978. Senator Baker first won national recognition in 1973 as the Vice Chairman of the Senate Watergate Committee. He was the keynote speaker at the Republican National Convention in 1976, and a candidate for the Republican Presidential nomination in 1980.

He served in the Senate from 1967 until January 1985, and concluded his Senate career by serving two terms as