

## CALLING FOR INCLUSION OF NATIONAL CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT IN WELFARE REFORM

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

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call for the inclusion of a national child support enforcement program in any welfare reform proposal considered by this body.

Raising a family is no easy task. I don't think anyone here today would say differently. Parenting requires time, patience, sacrifice, love, and of course, money. And according to 1992 statistics, over 8½ million women are raising families alone.

Considering all that being a parent requires, it should come as no surprise that many of these women require assistance—assistance from friends, family, and from the Federal Government. For instance, of those 8½ million women currently raising families alone, over 3 million collect welfare. They collect welfare in order to provide their children with the food, shelter, clothing, and medical care they need to survive.

It's no secret that welfare costs the Federal Government a lot of money. As a matter of fact, it costs nearly \$86 billion every year. It's also no secret that the Federal Government is looking for ways to decrease that amount.

Let's discuss the Personal Responsibility Act, the welfare reform proposal included in the Republican Contract With America. The proposal calls for all Americans to take charge of their lives and assume responsibility for themselves. Specifically, it calls for young mothers to give up their children and go to work. It calls for children to live away from their homes and their families. The bottom line is it calls for both mothers and children to get off welfare.

While this idea seems well and good, a particular and critical segment of the population is consistently absent from the picture and from the Personal Responsibility Act—the fathers. Where is it mentioned in the Personal Responsibility Act that fathers must provide for their children? Where does it say fathers need to go to work and contribute to their children's financial needs? Indeed, I see no reference to fathers in this proposal at all.

Did 8½ million women impregnate themselves? As far as I am aware, the last time a woman found herself with child without any help from the opposite sex was in the year 4 B.C.

So, if we agree that women cannot get pregnant alone, why should we insist that they alone take responsibility for the children that result. Why should the fathers be let off scot-free? The truth of the matter is, they shouldn't. And for several decades the Federal Government has helped ensure that fathers take responsibility for their children.

The child support enforcement program, established in 1975, helps millions of mothers every year identify, and collect child support from the fathers of their children. In 1993, the child support enforcement program collected \$8.9 billion in child support from delinquent fathers through income withholding, income tax refund interception, property liens, and security bonds. That's \$8.9 billion that didn't come from the Federal budget. And that's only the beginning.

Because tracking and collection across State lines is so difficult, \$34 billion in potential child support is not collected each year. If we could establish a national program to work with State and local agencies to track and collect child support from delinquent fathers we could further take the responsibility off the Federal Government and put it where it belongs—on the parents—both parents.

Look, no government or government agency, be it Federal, State, or local can ensure that both parents provide their children with love and emotional support. No government can insist that both parents spend time with their children. However, the government, Federal, State, and local, can, by working together, ensure that both parents at the very least, fulfill their financial obligations to their children.

If we really want all Americans to take responsibility for themselves let's make sure we are talking about all Americans. Make fathers accountable. Make child support enforcement part of welfare reform.

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

[Mrs. THURMAN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

## CONCERNS REGARDING THE MEXICAN BAILOUT

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I got elected for the 13th district of New Jersey to voice on behalf of my citizens their concerns, and certainly it is on their behalf that I have taken to the well today to speak on them.

I want to state very clearly and very loudly for the record that I stand staunchly opposed to the unilateral action by the executive, in collaboration with the leadership of the House, to grant the Mexican Government an unprecedented bailout package worth billions of dollars. Not a single congressional voice nor a single American voter will be heard by virtue of the process that has taken place on this banker and speculator bailout bill.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a travesty for justice. I know that some in the House were involved in negotiations, but overwhelmingly many were not, many who also represent hundreds of thousands of taxpayers in their congressional districts.

For those of us who did not support NAFTA, we spoke up about our concerns at that time, that Mexico was a developing economy, not a developed economy. We spoke up about our concerns about the value of the peso, and that in fact it was way beyond where it should be in terms of its exchange rate.

Sure enough, Mr. Speaker, after NAFTA and after the presidential elections in Mexico, we find that many of these things are coming true. So without creating the appropriate safeguards

during the NAFTA debate and subsequently in its enactment, it is my belief that we created a speculative environment in which middle class investors, the mom-and-pop investors so vital to Wall Street brokers, were led to believe that investing some of their hard-earned life savings in mutual funds, in pension funds, investing in emerging Mexico was a safe bet, but billions of dollars later, we know it is not. In one week alone U.S. investors took over \$12 billion out of the Mexican market.

I question, one of the things I would have liked to have seen is how much money the middle class families across the country lose in the context of the investments in a speculative market that we helped create by virtue of how we portrayed the Mexican market.

Today, Mr. Speaker, in the Committee on International Relations testimony was heard on this issue. I would like to read from one of the witnesses, John Sweeney of the Heritage Foundation, not an institution that I normally quote, but which is of great interest to me, particularly in the context that they were supporters of NAFTA and free market ideas.

He said: "This new plan is an improvised hodgepodge that will not solve the structural causes of the Mexican crisis. This new bailout plan is bad policy, and it is bad politics."

We were told, Mr. Speaker, that in fact the original \$40 billion loan guaranty was meant to overwhelm Mexico's problem.

□ 1830

Yet we see that this new package has now risen to between \$47 billion and \$50 billion. So I am concerned if \$40 billion was meant to overwhelm Mexico's problem, why did we have to go to \$47 billion or nearly \$50 billion?

This witness went on to say, "The Mexican crisis needs a stronger free market cure than Mexico's ruling political, corporate and labor elites are willing to accept." He went on to criticize this action.

I think his last comment that I would like to make, he said, "Bailing out Mexico will tell governments in emerging markets that bad policies based on short-term political imperatives would be forgiven, and it would send private investors the message that bad investment decisions will be bailed out at U.S. taxpayer expense."

I think that that is the wrong message to send.

It is interesting to see in today's New York Times in the business section how now investors are looking at all emerging markets and their investments in those emerging markets and beginning to question those investments. Maybe they will come back to good old T-bills and blue chip stocks here in the United States.

I think it is important in this debate to continue to raise the questions of what type of speculative environments