

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 gentleman 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

I think free speech is becoming more important every day.

Thank goodness that we were able to read about women and men and their biological views, as viewed by the Speaker, but it does scare me to death.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5, UNFUNDED MANDATE REFORM ACT OF 1995

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-2) on the resolution (H. Res. 38) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to curb the practice of imposing unfunded Federal mandates on States and local governments, to ensure that the Federal Government pays the costs incurred by those governments in complying with certain requirements under Federal statutes and regulations, and to provide information on the cost of Federal mandates on the private sector, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### HAITI: BELOW THE SURFACE

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, today is day 122 of the American occupation of Haiti, a friendly country just south of our borders. The United States command in Haiti has determined that a secure environment has been established. The United Nations is expected to rule on this question in the coming weeks and the process of transition to a United Nations mission will be online, hopefully for an end of March completion. What will this transition mean? Today, our forces in Haiti have the authority to arrest and detain troublemakers and to respond with force. And in fact they have been doing that.

The U.N. mission in Haiti, which will include approximately 2,500 United States troops, will be a chapter 6 mission—strictly one of providing presence and monitoring. Under current mission parameters, American soldiers provide the security in Haiti, to the degree that that security is real. They are the folks who are enforcing the security there, to the degree that there is any real security.

Today, our soldiers are involved at the local level in the day-to-day running of villages throughout the Haitian countryside. Our soldiers are serving as mayors and judges; they are serving as the electric company and waste disposal management company. In any given day, they might be called upon to deal with a charge that perhaps the local magistrate is engaged in extortion; they will probably buy the food for the prisoners in the local jail and make certain it is delivered; they will probably give out a few speeding tickets and might even confiscate a few

guns. As we always expect of them, our troops are doing an outstanding job. Whether or not it is an appropriate or safe job for them to be doing and what sort of track record they are building in the eyes of the Haitian people are questions still open for debate. We have lost one soldier tragically in action in Haiti—he was trying to force someone to pay a toll to an individual who apparently had no official authority to collect it. We are deeply troubled by this death and renew our call for a thorough review of United States policy in Haiti.

Knowing the degree of American financial and personnel involvement in Haiti, Americans were no doubt surprised to read in the national press yesterday that their men and women in uniform are not accepted with open arms by all Haitians. Despite the fact all we are doing for Haitians, apparently there are some problems. This is in sharp contrast to the pictures they remember of jubilant Haitians in Port-Au-Prince welcoming Americans to their shores. But there is more to Haiti than Port-Au-Prince.

It is true that in many Haitian villages, American soldiers are cheered as they drive through the streets, and that gladdens the heart of all Americans. But the feeling that American troops do not belong in Haiti also is real in many areas of the country.

It is a little bit of going back to the old days of the occupation that some remember, the gringoism that we have suffered for so many years in our hemisphere and tried to get away from through the good works we have done in so many countries in our hemisphere.

Haitians from the provinces will tell us that the soldiers have made little difference in their lives. They are disappointed. The farmers will tell us that they still have no one to go to when someone steals their crops or their livestock, or that if they do complain, nothing happens. People will tell us that the American soldiers have let themselves be used in some instances by thugs and vagabonds. Some will also tell us that they would prefer that no foreign soldiers be in their country. I guess we can understand that.

In other places, like Jeremie, they are crying foul because they believe the U.S. troops are too close to the military leaders who once terrorized that population. It is a very thin, delicate line our troops have to walk.

As we make the transition to a U.N. mission, any feelings of insecurity and resentment will continue to grow. We know that. That is not uncommon in a transition. But we have to add into the equation the fact that the Haitian Government is not up to the administrative and financial challenge of providing for its own security right now or for getting government up and running, even with the present monitoring of our United Nations mission. They are not going to be able to do that.

Haitian police forces do not have the respect of the public, and they do not

have the weapons or the vehicles to provide for law and order.

The conclusion I reach is that below the surface of the so-called secure environment there remain very serious problems that could become deadly in an instant once the transition is made.

Mr. Speaker, the U.N. mission in Haiti is not the end of the risk for our troops. In fact, it may even up the stakes. I hope the Clinton White House is looking below the surface to ensure the safety of our men and women in uniform.

And while they are thinking about Haiti, the Clinton administration might start thinking about the American taxpayers who are footing the bill for the hundreds of millions committed to bail out the Aristide ship of state, which many observers feel is a boat that will not float no matter how hard you bail.

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

[Ms. JACKSON-LEE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

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

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

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

#### A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, kind of a disturbing thing happened this week in so many ways that makes me wonder if the folks at the White House get it yet.

The President appointed a very liberal member of the Washington political establishment to run the National Democrat Party, and in his first press conference he personally told the Washington press corps elitists that he was against the balanced-budget amendment because he did not want to wait 7 years to balance the budget.

Well, neither does the American middle-class public. They are tired of it. The middle class in America are in a situation where they may need a new carpet, they may need a new washing