Caucus, laughably tried to tell us that it was middle-income people's money at risk. Their pension funds are invested in Mexico, he said.

Pension funds? Any pension administrator who is investing in junk bonds in Mexico—and that is what these things are, junk bonds that pay 20 to 40 percent interest, from a country that defaulted on all of its loans just 12 years ago, no one thinks they are a good risk. Any pension administrator who has any substantial amount of money down there, there is a cause of action against him by the holders of that pension fund. I don't believe that is true.

If it is true, let's disclose it. We have sent a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury asking ''Whose money is at risk here? Who are we bailing out?'' There has been no response.

I don't know that we will ever know who we are bailing out, because apparently no hearings will ever be held on this bailout legislation. The largest bailout since the savings and loan crisis, and no hearings are to be allowed.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard my Republican colleagues around here chortling a little bit because Bill Clinton is so closely identified with this issue. At least, although I disagree with him, President Clinton has the guts to go out and say he thinks this needs to be done.

However, remember, the Republicans have an absolute stranglehold on both the House and Senate. Any bill that moves through here has to have their permission, has to have their votes. It is not a Democratic Congress or a Democratic Senate, so they do not want to hold hearings.

No, they do not want to hold hearings. They do not want to be identified with it. They do not want people to really know what is going on. They do not want possibly to upset some of those people on Wall Street who so handsomely provided for their elections.

It is business as usual here in Washington, DC, folks, despite all the hoopla about the contract, despite all the hoopla about the new majority, business as usual, back room deals, $40 billion, U.S. taxpayers on the line, and no hearings. That is even worse than the worst abuse I can think of of my own party in the last Congress.

Now we have even drug in the book deal. Today or yesterday the chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Financial Services, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH], sent a note to White House Chief of Staff Leon Panetta tying Republican support of the Mexican $40 billion bailout to the need to get guarantees, guarantees, of kinder treatment by Democrats of House Speaker NEWT GINGRICH of Georgia, so there you have it, folks. If you think this isn't business as usual, in fact it is even worse than business as usual, a $40 billion bailout, for whom, putting the American taxpayers on the line, and the Republican-controlled Congress is going to refuse to hold a single hearing on this, and will try and jam this thing through in the dark of the night some night next week or the week after.

THE SECOND REVOLUTION RETURNS AMERICA TO ITS BASIC VALUES

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

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I am excited to be a part of what I believe is the second American Revolution, because this year I truly believe that the American hour is upon us. It is time for this country and this Congress to decide once and for all which direction we are going to turn.

Are we going to continue down the same failed path of LBJ and FDR, where we turn to bigger and bigger government to answer every question? Or are we instead going to turn back to those simple, basic values that our Founding Fathers laid at the foundation of this great country, values like family and faith and hard work and personal responsibility?

Thomas Jefferson wrote that the government that governs least governs best. James Madison said:

> ''We have staked the entire future of the American civilization not upon the power of government, but upon the capacity of each of us to govern ourselves, control ourselves, and sustain ourselves according to the Ten Commandments of God.''

But Washington has ignored these values for too long. Because of it, we find ourselves $4 trillion in debt in a country were we have, as the Speaker has pointed out, 12-year-olds that are having babies and 15-year-olds that are shooting each other and 18-year-olds that are graduating from high schools with diplomas they cannot even read.

So what is the answer? The answer, Mr. Speaker, lies in many of the proposals that the Republican Party has set forth in the Contract With America, but beyond that, we have to go back to the original Contract With America, the Constitution of the United States, and read the amendments, read the 10th amendment in particular, which states that all powers not specifically given to the Federal Government are reserved to the States and to the individuals.

If we start doing that, then we can return back to what our Founding Fathers intended this country to be, and that is a nation of communities, a nation of communities where families and individuals decide what is best for them, instead of turning to Washington for every single answer, and instead of having Washington dictate what doctor they are going to choose and how they are going to teach their children and how they are going to protect their family.

That is what this unfunded mandate debate is all about. It is about restoring power to States and families and individuals to once again take control of their lives and take control of their families and take control of their business and take control of their communities, without interference from Washington.

□ 1550

We are not trying to jam anything through that every single State and family and individual has not begged for for years, and, that is, to once and for all take the chains off of them and get the Federal Government out of the way.

But when we talk about unfunded mandates, and the fantastic bill that has been put forward that is going to be voted on next week, and when we talk about balancing the budget and finally making the Federal Government do what middle-class families have had to do forever, we are told that we are going to somehow going to make my 91-year-old grandmother go without, or somehow we are going to harm my 7-year-old boy and his education.

We do not need a Department of Education bureaucracy in Washington, DC to teach my child how to read and write and get along in this world. And yet we continue turning back to Washington for bigger and bigger government. That is why I am excited to be part of a reform movement, excited to have signed the Contract With America, excited to be on board with the unfunded mandate bill that should pass, and excited to be supporting the balanced budget amendment with a three-fifths tax limitation.

Let me tell you something. You are going to be hearing a lot of talk about this next week. You can call it what you want, but in the end, that three-fifths requirement is the taxpayers' protection plan, and that is why I am excited about supporting it. That is why I am excited about supporting this unfunded mandate bill. That is why I have not wasted time listening to these charges about GOPAC or hearing these claims about Nazi historians, or hearing this talk about the book deal.

Let me tell you something. It is a sad day when the party of F.D.R. and Harry Truman can bring forth no other proposals other than attacking Members personally.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that we all get together as a country and support the unfunded mandate bill and support the taxpayer protection plan.

ELECTION OF REPUBLICAN MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 41) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 41

Resolved, That the following named Members, be, and they are hereby, elected to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct of the House of Representatives:

Mrs. Johnson of Connecticut, Chairman; Mr. Bunning; Mr. Goss; Mr. Hobson; and Mr. Schiff.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF DEMOCRATIC MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 42) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 42

Resolved, That the following named Members, be, and they are hereby elected to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct of the House of Representatives:

Mr. McDermott; Mr. Cardin; Ms. Pelosi; Mr. Borski; and Mr. Sawyer.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

LET US STRESS CRIME PREVENTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, the one thing that the Thirteen Colonies knew was that we were all in this together. One of the things that my constituents in the 18th Congressional District of Texas have asked is that I would come to this office and deliberate, cooperate, and consider the concerns of the Nation, but most of all represent them.

I hope that we will have an opportunity to deliberate and consider as we look toward H.R. 3, the take-back-your-streets bill that offers to the American people the suggestion of going forward, but actually it takes us back.

The 1994 bipartisan crime bill spoke to all of the people of America. It provided dollars for law enforcement, some $13 billion, it answered the questions for overcrowded prisons by providing for $9.8 billion and, yes, for the first time historically we committed to prevention. We recognized that we are in this together—hamlets and towns and cities and counties and States.

Rennie Click, the chief of police of Dallas, TX, recognized it when he testified how extensively he supports law enforcement, support of police but he realizes how important it is to address the social needs of those who perpetrate crime. And at the same time the chief of police from the city of Houston, Chief Nuchia, indicated that he is a strong advocate of law and order, like all of us, like I am, and he believed that we must protect ourselves like I had to do as a council member working with local law enforcement, as a former judge. But he was convinced that we could not arrest ourselves out of this situation. It was his belief that adequately funded community-based programs are an important component of the American goal of achieving a healthier, safer society.

What is wrong with prevention? What is wrong with supporting boys clubs and girls clubs? What is wrong with acknowledging the importance of in-school and after-school programs, acknowledging that there are latch-key children who are subject to abuse and or subject to inspiration by others that would not follow the way of law-abiding citizens?

One of our witnesses indicated that most people living in our communities are law-abiding and work every day to help assist the community to stay on a straight-and-narrow track. But yet, now we have a bill that wants to take away the prevention dollars, when a bipartisan Congress put together a package that talks about cops on the streets. No more in this new bill. It talked about prisons, it talked about prevention. No more in this new crime bill.

It is interesting that we would all support prenatal care, immunization, which has helped our children and helped this Nation be a healthier nation. We even joined Nancy Reagan and said, ''Just say no to drugs'' and there are so many youngsters who can talk about that, but live it every day because the message was pounded in. And how many of us grew up with Smoky Bear? ''Only you can prevent forest fires,'' so we know what not to do in our Nation's precious forests.

But yet do we treat crime differently? We do not want to prevent? We throw the baby out with the bathwater.

I simply ask the Nation to deliberate and consider that we are all in this together, that we are all crimefighters. But if we are going to go into the 21st century, we must focus on the prevention to be able to make this community, for police officers and sheriffs and constables and citizens and children and the elderly and all the towns and hamlets and counties and States and yes, our cities, to make them a safer place, we must have prevention. We must continue to go forward.

Let us go forward and enhance what we are doing. Reaffirm the omnibus crime bill of 1994. Let us have prevention.

COMMENTARY ON HOUSE PROCEEDINGS OF THIS WEEK

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of this week, the gentlewoman from Florida attempted to give a 1-minute speech in regard to the book deal of the Speaker of the House. During that speech, the gentlewoman was interrupted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania who asked that her words be taken down, the last two paragraphs of that 1-minute speech.

Following that taking down, the Chair at the time, the gentleman in the chair from Florida, ruled that the words were out of order and that they should be stricken.

Following that discourse, the following day in regard to that ruling, the Chair in its ruling on Thursday morning, the gentleman from California who was in the chair at the time, acting as Speaker pro tem, said:

> The Chair must reiterate that the principles of decorum in debate relied on by the Chair yesterday with respect to words taken down are not new to the 104th Congress.

Then it goes on, during that, which we can all find in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where the Chair says:

> On occasion, however, the Chair has announced general standards of proper reference to Members, as was the case on June 15, 1988.

□ 1600

There, in response to a series of 1-minute speeches and special order debates focusing on the conduct of the Speaker as the subject of an ethical complaint and on the motives of the Member who filed the complaint, the Chair states as follows:

> Thus, the Chair would caution all Members not to use the 1-minute period or special orders, as has already happened, to discuss the conduct of Members of the House in a way that inevitably engages in personalities.

But the Chair did not rule in that ruling on that date that such language was not in order but cautioned the Members.

Then the Chair continuing on Thursday, the gentleman from California, stated that:

> Third, longstanding precedents of the House provide that the stricture against personalities has been enforced collaterally with respect to criticism of the Speaker even when intervening debate has occurred. This separate treatment is recorded in volume II of Hinds' Precedents, at section 1248.

I have reviewed that, Mr. Speaker. At a later time I will ask that that be part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my comments.

Then the acting Speaker pro tempore continued on Thursday:

> Finally, a complaint against the conduct of the Speaker is presented directly for the action of the House and not by way of debate on other matters. As Speaker Thomas B. Reed of Maine explained in 1897, criticism of