

with, did in fact Mr. Murdoch come to the Capitol and so forth.

In fact by Friday of last week, the Republican chairman of the House Banking Committee sent a letter to the administration and said that he was not prepared to consider the Mexican financial crisis as long as Mr. GRINGRICH's ethical problems were being discussed on the floor. He did not think that was a political environment that he could in good conscience discuss the Mexican financial crisis in.

I think that is unfortunate and it suggests how much business on Capitol Hill is now being subsumed into the Speaker's financial situation.

We have seen reaction across the country. In the Midwest, my hometown of Springfield and in Chicago, major newspapers have editorialized that the Speaker has to get away from this book deal and get back to focusing on issues important to America. Virtually every editorial writer with the politically predictable exception of Rush Limbaugh has said it is time for the Speaker to do something about this and get it behind him. It went to far this morning as to have an article in the Wall Street Journal questioning the members of the House Ethics Committee on the Republican side.

Let me say at the outset that I know all three of the gentlemen referred to in the article and I have absolutely the highest confidence in their honesty and integrity. I would gladly have them sit in judgment of myself should a question ever be presented. But in this situation, where they have been involved with GOPAC, the Speaker's political action committee, there is a legitimate question about conflict of interest.

□ 1310

I think it goes to the point raised by the gentleman from California. It is time for us to take this whole swirl of controversy about GOPAC, the Speaker's foundations, the book deal and such, and take it off of the floor of this House, off of Capitol Hill and put it in the hands of an outside counsel, someone who is chosen on a bipartisan basis to look into the facts and report to this body as well as to the American people.

We can then step aside from this and get down to the real business that is before us. It is certainly important that we be concerned about the ethics and integrity of the House of Representatives. I think the outside counsel is the best way to go. It will not be a Republican or Democratic choice, it will be a bipartisan choice. It has been done before and it should be done in this instance. We can put this behind us. We can stop focusing on it and move forward on important issues which we will continue.

This week we are considering unfunded mandate legislation and tomorrow night, right here at this podium, the President of the United States will have the opportunity, as others have before him, to speak to the American people. Then we will go on to consider a balanced budget amendment. These

are all critically important issues for the Nation.

In order that we give our full attention, as we should, to them, an outside counsel should be called immediately to take this ethics question involving the Speaker off of our agenda and put it in the hands of a nonpartisan source that can make a decision as to whether or not anything has happened.

#### AID TO MEXICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Wall Street, the influential lobbyists in Washington, DC, and Republicans in Congress prattle on about free markets and free trade until it is their speculative investments and profits on the line. If NAFTA were really about free trade, and free markets, then it would mean a free fall for both the Mexican tax market and a free fall for the peso.

Heaven forbid that we should let the free market work when Wall Street's major financiers, Mexico's 24 billionaires, multinational corporations, big brokerage houses, and international investment bankers have gambled and lost.

Fred Bergsten, director, Institute for International Economics, says of Members of Congress such as myself who oppose the bailout Mexico, "They don't realize they could cause what might be like an accidental nuclear war."

Out of such outrageous hyperbole is born the idea that the bailout of Mexico's billionaires and international speculators is an issue of national security which requires the United States to put its full faith and credit, that is read exactly, more specifically, United States taxpayers at risk.

In the spirit of openness and sunshine, demanded by the new Republican majority in Congress and adopted in their rules, let us have some hearings on this issue. Let us have hearings before the Republican leaders jam the Mexican bailout through in the dark of the night, without any deliberation by this House.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

(Whereupon, at 1 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m., the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.)

□ 1400

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We pray, O almighty God, that we will be faithful to that which marks our purpose and reason for living, that we will be steadfast in our allegiances and in our vision, that we will be worthy of the high calling that is ours. Yet, O gracious God, may we not only be devoted to our mission, but may we also listen to others, to hear their voices, to sense their purpose, to discern their motivations so that together we will testify to the good purposes of our Nation and bear witness to our unity as Your people. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LAHOOD] will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LAHOOD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS— STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 16) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 16

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).* That the two Houses of Congress assembled in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, September 24, 1995, at 9 p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### READING THE CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

(Mr. JONES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, our Contract With America states on the first day of Congress, a Republican House will force Congress to live under the same laws as everyone else, cut one-third of committee staffs, cut the congressional budget. Mr. Speaker, we have done that.

In the next 81 days, we will vote on the following 10 items:

No. 1, a balanced-budget amendment and line-item veto;

No. 2, a new crime bill to stop violent criminals;

No. 3, welfare reform to encourage work, not dependency;

No. 4, family reinforcement to crack down on deadbeat dads and protect our children;

No. 5, tax cuts for families to lift Government's burden from middle-class people;

No. 6, national-security restoration to protect our freedoms;

No. 7, Senior Citizens Equity Act to allow our seniors to work without Government penalty; and

No. 8, Government regulations and unfunded mandates;

No. 9, commonsense legal reform to end frivolous lawsuits; and

No. 10, congressional term limits to make Congress a citizen legislature.

This is our Contract With America.

#### CIVILITY DUE TO, AND FROM, THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(Mr. FROST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, as one of the three Members of Congress representing Fort Worth, TX, home of former Speaker Jim Wright, I rise to urge that Speaker GINGRICH take down his own words.

Last Friday, speaking to a Republican audience here in Washington, Speaker GINGRICH referred to former Speaker Wright as a "crook." In my opinion, such a comment does harm to the office of Speaker—both past and present.

The truth of the matter is that former Speaker Wright served this body with dedication during his 34 years as a Member and 2½ years as Speaker.

Contrary to the remarks made last Friday, Speaker Wright was never convicted of a crime nor was he even ever charged with a crime in court. Additionally, though ethics charges were lodged against him with the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, that committee never ruled against him on the merits of those charges.

It is my opinion that the current Speaker, Mr. GINGRICH, would serve both his own party and this House by desisting from making such references as he did when in the minority.

The country expects a degree of civility from the presiding officer of this body.

I, for one, have always respected the leaders of the opposition party even when I disagreed with them on the merits of an issue. It would serve the Nation if our Speaker would do the same.

#### TIME TO DO AWAY WITH BURDENSOME REGULATIONS

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, history was made on the opening day here in Congress.

We passed sweeping reforms to not only change the rules of the House but also to make Congress adhere to laws governing the rest of the country.

But now the question is, Mr. Speaker: Do we really need so many regulations? Compliance under some of these strict rules and regulations which are mandated by OSHA, the Americans With Disabilities Act, and all of this massive legislation we passed in the last 150 years is forcing companies to either downsize their work force or go out of business entirely, as we speak.

Many small business are struggling under the yoke of overburdensome regulations and rules. They make it virtually impossible for them to operate.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the action taken thus far by Congress to bring this body into the mainstream, but I also think the time is now to do away with many of these needless rules and regulations that are already in existence.

#### WATCHING OUT FOR THE SPECIAL INTEREST OF MA AND PA CITIZEN

(Mr. VOLKMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, Will Rogers always had a down home way of making light of politics and particularly Members of Congress. Mr. Rogers held no punches for either party saying of the Democratic party, "you've got to be an optimist to be a Democrat, and you've got to be a humorist to stay one." He also had this to say of the Republican party, "Republicans take care of the big money, and big money takes care of them. It takes nerve to be a Democrat, but it takes money to be a Republican." This quote rings so clearly today.

Mr. Speaker, who was invited to the Republican gala for the Contract With America? Was it ma and pa citizen? No, it was Mr. and Mrs. special interest.

Mr. Speaker, who was invited to the gentleman from Georgia's closed door telecommunications dinner? Was it ma and pa citizen? No, it again was Mr. and Mrs. special interest.

So as we debate legislation here in the people's House, it is time to look who has the special interest of ma and pa citizen at heart and who just has special interests.

#### STAND UP AND BE COUNTED

(Mr. SCARBOROUGH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, with children dying in our Nation's streets, liberal Democratic leaders lament a book deal that even the Washington Post admits is proper, and while working men and women across the land struggle to survive until their next paycheck, liberal Democratic leaders ignore their plight and, instead, chatter incessantly over contrived, imaginary scandals.

And while conservatives on both sides of the aisle boldly forge ahead into a new frontier of federalism, liberal Democratic leaders continue to engage in a desperate, ham-fisted attempt to create a crisis, change the subject, and obstruct the latest great piece of congressional reform.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for all Members of Congress to step forward regardless of what aisle they stand on, stand up, be counted, and debate the issues that will actually affect the lives of those men and women that sent us to Congress to make a difference.

#### PASS THE UNFUNDED MANDATE REFORM BILL

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, a woman was arrested in Sweden for smuggling. She had 65 snakes in her brassiere. She said she was going to start a reptile farm.

Now, imagine if that happened in America: The IRS would declare her brassiere a small business and tax it, the OSHA would fine the bra-holder for an unsafe workplace, EPA would mandate a wastewater treatment plant in her brassiere, and the Interior Department would take the bra-holder to court for an illegal snake sanctuary, violating the Endangered Species Act.

But it is not all bad. The bra-holder may qualify for dairy subsidies under the ag bill.

The bottom line is, Mr. Speaker, let us pass the unfunded mandate bill and give business and Government the support and comfort they deserve before Wonder Bra takes all members of Congress to court.

#### WHAT IS THE GOAL OF THE ADMINISTRATION?

(Mr. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, last week a Member of the President's Cabinet declared that balancing the budget was not the goal of the Clinton administration.

So what is the administration's goal, if it is not a balanced budget? Is it to continue mortgaging our children's future? Is it to continue financing a Government that is too big and too intrusive into our lives?