

Mr. TATE. Mr. Speaker, why are the Democrats scared of discussing the real issues of the day? Why are the Democrats scared to engaged in a real discussion about the issues of importance to the American people—like the balanced budget amendment and unfunded mandate legislation.

The American people sent a clear message to us in November to clean up Congress. We are working hard to do just that. Republicans will keep their promise to the American people to change the culture of Washington.

I'd say to my Democrat colleagues, start working to change Congress, and stop working so hard to change the subject.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

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

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, while there is no scheduled business on the floor of this House today, I can think of fewer issues more important to discuss here than freedom of speech. I believe debate on this floor should be conducted with respect and dignity. Yet if this House were to impose a gag rule on free and open debate, it would be a genuine tragedy for our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, this is the people's House and the people have the right to have their voice heard through their elected Representatives.

If Members of this House were to fear that honest expressions of fact and philosophy might be denied on this floor, then we will have done our democracy and the freedom of speech so deeply embedded in our Constitution a great disservice.

ARGUE SUBSTANCE, NOT SMOKESCREEN

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

Mr. KINGSTON. You know, if you cannot argue substance, attack the person; if you cannot argue substance, you make outrageous and frivolous claims; and if you cannot argue substance, you throw out smokescreens and red herrings. That is what seems to be the tack of the Democrat Party today.

You know, we need your help, we need it on the balanced budget amendment. You cannot balance the budget by frequent flyer points. We need your help on unfunded mandates. Granted, most of them came from your party. The mayors and the county commissioners across America want relief. We need your help on ethics. Maybe you can find time to talk to Mr. GEPHARDT to get your side of the aisle moving on ethics. We need your help on welfare reform. Maybe you have some ideas, you have great rhetoric. We are now interested in your ideas. I hope you will put your ideas in front of your party

interests and work for the betterment of America.

WE COULD HAVE VOTED TODAY ON SUBSTANTIVE LEGISLATION

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, referring to a couple of speakers before us, they somehow claim that we are delaying the activities of the House. The House is in pro forma session today. That means those of us who flew across the United States to attend this session, there will be no recorded votes or there should be only procedural matters. There is no substantive legislation before us. The unfunded mandates bill is not before us, because it has been delayed by the majority. The majority told us all bills will come before the House with open rules. Well, if you want to bring your unfunded mandate bill up with an open rule, what is the problem? We could be in session right now doing unfunded mandates, but you have us waiting for the Rules Committee because they want to restrict debate on unfunded mandates.

Where is the balanced budget amendment, the balanced budget amendment we were promised you would come forward with?

I am a cosponsor of a bipartisan version. Where is it? It is hung up by the majority because they want to insist on a super majority for taxes in that proposal. It is your holdup, not ours.

WHERE IS THE BEEF?

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I have come late to this debacle on the floor today, but I cannot resist commenting on the irony of the concern about the much-vaunted Speaker's nonbook deal.

Now, find me one American citizen who has turned down \$4.5 or \$3 million, perhaps, or even \$1 million when they might have gotten such a good deal. The fact is Speaker GINGRICH turned it down, and yet to avoid confronting the issues important to the American people that they voted for in the last election, the minority party—excuse me, the minority party—has now said that this is the most important thing that must be discussed. No comment about Speaker Wright's problems with his sales of his book to lobbyists; no comment about the Vice President's very lucrative book deal, but let us concentrate on this that is a nonbook deal. There has been no money here.

Where is the beef, folks? Get real.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH IN CONGRESS

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure under your ruling that I can even refer to the Speaker in any respect, but as someone who came to the floor today to vote when the vote was called, I did not expect to speak. But as someone whose family has fled from oppression in search of freedom and democracy, I am appalled at what could happen in the greatest hall of democracy in the world. But I have seen it today.

You can question the motives of a whole group of people, put their motives in question, but you cannot question the motive of an individual who is in a leadership position and determines the agenda of this House.

You can pass a Congressional Accountability Act, yet you cannot call for the accountability of an individual who leads the House and seek its disclosure. This is not about an individual's book deal who may be paid by royalties and the \$4 million is coming. But it is about public licenses, public airwaves. It is about our national treasures, and you are denying one of the greatest national treasures, the ability of Members to speak in this House freely.

WE HAVE BEEN GAGGED

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, today, in 14 years of legislative work that I have done in State and Federal out of legislatures, is the saddest day I have ever seen. I feel effectively gagged.

Let me ask a question, Mr. Speaker: If anyone was reported to have signed a \$4.5 million deal to write a book, if any Member was reported to have met with an interested party who possibly had interests affected by the Congress, if any Member had had legitimate questions raised in the public media and in editorials about his or her conduct, should it not be discussed on this floor?

But now we have to tell the American people, "Read your newspapers, watch your television, they can tell you what is happening. They can ask questions about the conduct of any Member of this House, including its Speaker. Follow your media, they can tell you what your elected House Members," myself included, "cannot tell you because the Republican gag rule says that we are out of order."

WE ARE FOLLOWING THE RULES OF THE HOUSE

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, yes, today has been a debacle, and a debacle because I think of people not the reading the rules that we have been living under for as long as I have been

in the Congress of the United States. The rule that has been voted upon today and the Speaker's rulings have been in the precedent book of the House of Representatives for decades. It has never been in order for one Member to impugn the motivation of another Member. Speakers throughout the years, whether they be Democrat or Republican, have always enforced that rule in a uniform manner, and that is what happened today.

I do not see why my friends on the other side of the aisle object to that. They should not, because their Speakers enforced their rules just like our Speaker today has enforced the rules that we adopted in the first day of the session. Let us get down to legislation instead of talking about this.

THIS IS THE CENTER OF FREEDOM

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I believe in his very first speech to this body, in his eloquent words, Speaker GINGRICH talked about bringing a Russian delegation to the floor of the House, and he was very moved by the words of one of those Russians who said, "This is the center of freedom." This body, this seat, this podium, that podium shared by Democrats and Republicans alike, is the center of freedom.

We are free to debate, to dialogue and to discuss and, hopefully, in bipartisan ways, and I would say that all the American people watching today are moved, and not moved in the right direction about what has happened in this body today to limit that dialog and debate and discussion.

□ 1320

Justice Brandeis said, "The best antidote to offensive speech is more speech."

Let us continue to debate more speech in this body.

GUARANTEEING LOANS TO MEXICO IS IN OUR NATIONAL INTERESTS

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, the issue of guaranteeing loans for Mexico is not the S&L bailout. It is not NAFTA once again. It is not bailing out big businesses and corporations. Let us not politicize an issue where we have no choice but to act in a responsible and bipartisan manner.

The issue of guaranteeing loans to Mexico is in our national interests. Surely we are helping a friend, but it also means keeping a hundred one million jobs in exports. It means stopping an influx of additional illegal immigrants. It means stopping an erosion of Third World economies.

Mr. Speaker, let us not impose some conditions that preserve taxpayers exposure. Let us make sure there is an up-front fee and that we are paid in full. But again, Mr. Speaker, let us not politicize an issue that we need to act on in a bipartisan and responsible manner.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOBSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

FACTS AND THE NEW SPEAKER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be able to take the floor and review some of the things that I think have made this day so confusing to a lot of us.

I am a historian, as is the new Speaker, and the new Speaker wears that button with great pride. I always thought that historians were very, very proud about the fact that what we dealt with were facts. We try to deal as much in facts as possible, and I think today we all got a little confused as to what became factual, what became image. Were the image police working on the floor today? Were there new rules? Where were we going with all of this?

I know I was troubled when I read about yesterday's press conference when a reporter had asked the Speaker when he charged taxpayers' money had funded a PBS viewer opinion poll; the reporter asked, "Well, show us proof," and he said, "I don't have a clue, I don't have any proof."

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues, "What does that mean? Shouldn't you have to have facts if you make those kinds of allegations?"

Many of us were troubled when the recommendation had been made by the new Speaker that Government economists who would not change statistics to their way of keeping statistics should be zeroed out. Well, again should we not be dealing in facts? And where do we go?

But then today I picked up the paper, and I am even more troubled. I feel like I am taking the floor to defend men and women. I read in today's paper some new facts that I certainly did not know about, and I would love to have

the basis for these. In today's paper they take direct quotes from the Speaker's text that he is teaching on different campuses, and he is talking about men and women in combat. He says, "If combat means being in a ditch, then females have biological problems being in a ditch for 30 days because they get infections."

Well, I do not know of any medical status for this, and I would be very interested in having those facts because I know this will be a very debated issue as we come forward.

He says further, "When it comes to men, men are like little piggies. You drop them in a ditch, and they will wallow and roll around in it. It doesn't matter, you know."

Well, I am standing here defending my husband, my son, my uncles, my father. I mean I have seen them in ditches, but they do not roll around like little piggies, and I do not know anything in the facts that are based on that. So, that I found very troubling.

I read further in this lecture and found a statement that males do not do as well sitting as women, that women are maybe doing better with, as my colleagues know, laptop computers because supposedly he has some information that males get very, very frustrated sitting in a chair. I say to my colleagues, "That's kind of hard if you're Speaker, because they got to sit in a chair a lot." But they got frustrated sitting in a chair because we all know that males are, quote, biologically driven to go out and hunt giraffes.

Now I have been working in a male culture for a very long time, and I have not met the first one who wants to go out and hunt a giraffe. They can sit in chairs. They do not wiggle and so forth, and so I just must say I am very, very troubled by the new factual data that seems to be coming out of our new leader.

□ 1330

And then I must say I was terribly troubled by the proceedings that went on on the House floor today. I do not know exactly what to make of them. I thought what the gentlewoman from Florida was stating was a very factual statement about what she had read in the press, and she was pointing out that the publisher of the book, if they push the book sales, could make more money, which I think is factual. Royalties are based upon how many books are sold. The more books sold, the more money comes in in royalties.

How that becomes an innuendo or how that becomes some kind of illegal utterance on the floor is way beyond my understanding. I have heard much worse things said on the floor. And I must say I am a little shocked that the rules of this House are being used by the image police to try to clean this up.

Thank goodness for the newspapers, because the image police have not been able to get to the newspapers yet, and