

Hoyer	Moakley	Serrano
Hunter	Mollohan	Sisisky
Jackson-Lee	Montgomery	Skaggs
Jacobs	Moran	Spence
Jefferson	Murtha	Spratt
Johnson (SD)	Nadler	Stark
Johnson, E.B.	Neal	Stenholm
Johnston	Oberstar	Studds
Kanjorski	Obey	Stump
Kennedy (MA)	Olver	Stupak
Kennedy (RI)	Ortiz	Tanner
Kennelly	Owens	Tauzin
Kildee	Pallone	Taylor (MS)
Klecza	Pastor	Taylor (NC)
Klink	Payne (NJ)	Tejeda
LaFalce	Payne (VA)	Thompson
Lantos	Pelosi	Thurman
Levin	Peterson (FL)	Torres
Lewis (GA)	Peterson (MN)	Torricelli
Lipinski	Pickett	Towns
Lowey	Pombo	Trafficant
Luther	Pomeroy	Tucker
Maloney	Poshard	Velazquez
Manton	Rahall	Vento
Markey	Rangel	Visclosky
Mascara	Reed	Volkmer
Matsui	Richardson	Ward
McCarthy	Rivers	Waters
McDermott	Roemer	Watt (NC)
McHale	Rohrabacher	Waxman
McKinney	Roukema	Williams
McNulty	Roysal-Allard	Wilson
Meek	Rush	Wise
Menendez	Sabo	Wolf
Mfume	Sanders	Woolsey
Miller (CA)	Sawyer	Wyden
Mineta	Schroeder	Wynn
Minge	Schumer	
Mink	Scott	

## NOT VOTING—29

Bono	Gibbons	Reynolds
Brown (FL)	Hayes	Ros-Lehtinen
Chapman	Hayworth	Scarborough
Chrysler	Hefner	Schaefer
Collins (MI)	Kaptur	Slaughter
Conyers	Lincoln	Souder
Creameans	Lofgren	Stokes
Davis	Meehan	Yates
Dornan	Orton	Young (AK)
Flake	Porter	

□ 1018

Messrs. DINGELL, MORAN, McHALE, MONTGOMERY, BALDACCI, and PALLONE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. MYRICK and Messrs. QUINN, McHUGH and SOLOMON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. WILSON changed his vote from "present" to "nay."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). Would the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WHITFIELD] please come forward to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WHITFIELD 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.

## POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this ses-

sion, the House adopted a new rule which says the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be a substantially verbatim account of remarks made during the proceedings of the House, subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections authorized by the Member making the remarks involved.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that we received this morning, reflecting yesterday's proceedings, at page H301 in the transcript of the remarks of the Speaker pro tempore, the gentleman from Florida, there are two changes that were made between what he, in fact, said and what is in the RECORD.

The first change is as follows:

He said yesterday with regard to the statements of the gentlewoman from Florida about the book of the Speaker, "It is the Speaker's opinion that innuendo and personal references to the Speaker's conduct are not in order."

That has been altered and that does not appear verbatim in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Instead, it says, "It is the Speaker's opinion that innuendo and critical references to the Speaker's personal conduct are not in order."

Additionally, later on in response to a parliamentary inquiry from the gentleman from Missouri, the Speaker pro tempore said, as I recollect it, "it has been the Chair's ruling, and the precedents of the House support this, a higher level of respect is due to the Speaker."

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that has been changed to "a proper level of respect."

Now, I do not believe that changing "personal" to "critical" and "proper" to "higher" is either technical, grammatical, or typographical. Both make quite substantive changes. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that by the standard that the Speaker yesterday uttered, the gentlewoman from Florida was judged, but if you take today's standard of revised, illegitimately revised version that is in the RECORD, there would be no objection to what the gentlewoman from Florida said.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair might respond to the gentleman.

The Chair would recite from the manual that in accordance with existing accepted practices, the Speaker may make such technical or parliamentary insertions, or corrections in transcript as may be necessary to conform to rule, custom, or precedent. The Chair does not believe that any revision changed the meaning of the ruling.

The Chair would under the circumstances inform the House on behalf of the Parliamentarian that the new rule is as it might apply to the role of the Chair will be examined.

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am puzzled, and I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. The Speaker cited previous references to the House rules and manual. That predates the rules change adopted this year. This is not simply a case of making a technical change in a ruling. We are talking also about substantive changes in the debate in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has made it very clear, the Chair would say to the gentleman.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. No, the Chair has not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has made it clear that the Parliamentarian plans to examine this issue.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. In the first instance, I thought the Speaker was the responsible ruler in this situation, while the Parliamentarian advised him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Second, I want to know, are you telling me that this new change in which you say that it has to be verbatim, in fact, does not mean that, because two very important changes were made in the transcript from yesterday to today?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has informed the gentleman that this issue is going to be examined in consultation with the Parliamentarian.

Mr. DINGELL. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. DINGELL. Can you inform this Member and the House of what the meaning of the reexamination is?

You are informing the House that the issue is going to be reexamined. Yesterday the Speaker then presiding made a ruling which now appears in the precedents of the House. It interpreted the precedents of the House. It related to the rights, the behaviors, the dignities of the Members, and it dictated the future course of conduct of Members of this body.

Is the Chair informing us that the rulings of the Chair yesterday stand, that the rulings of the Chair yesterday have been changed without approval by the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the Chair might respond to the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to persist in my parliamentary inquiry. Or that the rulings of the Chair of yesterday are going to be reexamined?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

First, clause 1 of rule XIV establishes an absolute rule against engaging in personality in debate where the subject

of a Member's conduct is not the pending question.

Second, it is the long and settled practice of the House over many Congresses to enforce that standard by demands from the floor that words be taken down under rule XIV. Although the rule enables the Chair to take initiative to address breaches of order, the Chair normally defers to demands that words be taken down in the case of references to Members of the House. On occasion, however, the Chair has announced general standards of proper reference to Members, as was the case on June 15, 1988. 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 stated 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.

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 2 of *Hinds' Precedents*, at section 1248.

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 past conduct of the presiding officer is out of order not because he is above criticism but, instead, because of the tendency of piecemeal criticism to impair the good order of the House.

Speaker Reed's rationale is recorded in volume 5 of *Hinds' Precedents* section 5188 from which the Chair now quotes as follows:

The Chair submits to the House that allusions or criticisms of what the Chair did at some past time is certainly not in order not because the Chair is above criticism or above attack but for two reasons; first, because the Speaker is the Speaker of the House, and such attacks are not conducive to the good order of the House; and, second, because the Speaker cannot reply to them except in a very fragmentary fashion, and it is not desirable that he should reply to them. For these reasons, such attacks ought not be made.

Based on these precedents, the Chair was justified in concluding that the words challenged on yesterday were in their full context out of order as engaging in personalities.

The Chair will inform that the Chair is going to proceed with 1-minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the gentleman, the question has not been responded to.

I want to thank the Chair for his comments. I would like to restate my parliamentary inquiry.

The question to which I would appreciate the Chair addressing his attention is: Yesterday the words of the Speaker were definitively put. The

House acted upon the words of the Speaker. The Members on this side of the aisle voted unanimously to take down the words and to take other actions against the gentlewoman who at that time held the well.

The Chair has noted, I believe correctly, as has the gentleman from Massachusetts, that the RECORD was changed overnight to change the words of the then-presiding officer of this body.

The words—

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). If the Chair could respond to the gentleman—

Mr. DINGELL. May I complete my parliamentary inquiry, please, Mr. Speaker?

The Chair made certain rulings; precedents were quoted; new precedents were created. Those new precedents which were created have defined again the rights of all Members of this body.

I am asking whether now the Chair is changing the precedents of the House, whether the change of the words indicates a change of the precedents of the House. What are the rights of the Members of this body with regard to rulings of the Chair?

The Chair made a ruling yesterday. That ruling and matters relative to it including the words of the Speaker in connection with those words have now been changed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Based on the precedents the Chair has just outlined, the Chair does not believe that the intent has in any way been altered.

Mr. DINGELL. I have not completed my parliamentary inquiry. I ask to complete my parliamentary inquiry. Am I going to be permitted to complete this or not?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts; the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DINGELL. I am asking that I be permitted to complete my parliamentary inquiry and get a ruling from the Chair, unless the Chair chooses not to respond.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has ruled.

Mr. DINGELL. No, the Chair has not. Because you have not ruled on my parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The ruling of the Chair is that the RECORD that has been changed does not significantly change the intent that was behind that ruling—

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, well then I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Based on the precedents that the Chair has provided.

Mr. DINGELL. I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is seeking

a parliamentary inquiry. It is the prerogative of the Chair.

The gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DINGELL. Am I going to be permitted to ask a parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be in order.

The gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mine will be quick, and then he can get his in there.

My question is this: It has to do with the rule about changing. It is a two-part question.

Am I correct that the Speaker acknowledges that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was changed in ways that were not either grammatical, typographical or technical, changing from "personal" to "critical" and "higher" to "proper," clearly substantive?

The second question is: Is the remedy for the violation of this rule that the Speaker talks to the Parliamentarian? I am all in favor of conversation, but I am surprised that a new rule as part of the Contract With America is breached and has as its remedy a conversation by the Speaker with the Parliamentarian.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The interpretation of the Chair is that the modifications that were made based on the precedents that the Chair has just outlined have not changed the intent.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Does modification mean change?

Mr. WATT or North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in the Judiciary Committee a couple of weeks ago, we adopted a set of rules which provide that a hearing can be called only by the committee on 7 days' notice. We conducted a hearing that was not so called, and the chairman of that committee advised the committee that the word "committee" does not mean committee, it means chair instead and invited us to seek an opinion from the Parliamentarian which we did, and the Parliamentarian's opinion indicated that the word "committee" means, in fact, "committee."

My parliamentary inquiry is: Should we take this as an indication, in conjunction with yesterday, that we are going to make up the rules as we go along and make technical changes to suit the whims of the chairs of the committees and whoever is presiding over the House, or can we rely now on the rules as they are written?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair can rely on the rules that have been written, and we will proceed under the adopted rules of the House.

The gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I appreciate the Chair recognizing me. I would like to continue with my parliamentary inquiry.

I hope the Chair will have the goodness to let me complete my inquiry before I am ruled out of order and required again to take my seat.

My question is: What is now the status of the original ruling by the previous occupant of the chair in connection with the matter of the 1-minute yesterday and the remarks of the gentlewoman from Florida?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is not changed at all.

Mr. DINGELL. Have they been changed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the Chair might respond to the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry—

Mr. DINGELL. May I complete my parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has asked a question, the Chair wishes to respond to the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DINGELL. May I complete my parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In response to the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry, the Chair has interpreted there will not be a change based on the precedents that have been established. The statement that appeared in the RECORD was not different than that that had been provided.

Mr. DINGELL. If there is no change, Mr. Speaker, then why were the words changed, and what is the impact of the change of the words?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the Chair might respond to the parliamentary inquiry, the revisions that were made were technical and not substantive. That is the ruling of the Chair.

The gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am very puzzled when you tell me they are technical and not substantive.

Would you instruct your Members that you would recognize me and I am proceeding in regular order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

The House will be in order.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. The question is this, and it is a very serious one: When you say that "personal" and "critical" are the same thing, we were talking about references to the Speaker. Is it the Chair's ruling that given the circumstances any personal reference to the Speaker will inevitably be critical?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Based on the precedents that have been provided especially during the 1-minute session, which is what came up under Speaker Reed, it is very clear that these kinds of references are not in order.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am talking now that there are two separate questions here, the ruling which my friend from Michigan was pursuing, and the new rule which the Republicans brought to this House as part of the Contract that said you do not change the Congressional Record; that is subsequent to all of the precedents you are talking about. There are two questions: One, your right to

change the ruling; but, two, separate, the one I am focusing on, your right to change words in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in ways that are neither typographical, grammatical or technical, and I submit that changing "personal" to "critical," one more sentence, "personal" to "critical," and "higher" to "proper" are none of those. My question is: Why are you ignoring your new rule and changing the words in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because they look better?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will announce that it is obvious that these kinds of modifications have been raised as a question, and in the future the Chair will continue to be extraordinarily sensitive in dealing with these matters.

At this point we will proceed with 1-minute speeches.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, before we start the 1-minute speeches, I think it is important that we clarify this issue so that Members do not have the words taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has done that.

Mr. DURBIN. If the gentleman from Illinois might inquire of the Chair, relative to the ruling of yesterday as modified in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it is unclear to me as to how far Members can go in reference to any Member of the House including the Speaker in terms of things that they have done, things that they have said, things that have been written about them, and it is curious at this point as to how far we can go in the statements on our 1-minute speeches or in special orders without transgressing the stated rules of the House.

If I might, I would like to ask the Chair's position as to whether Members in statements on the floor can make any references to activities of Members which may raise ethical questions.

□ 1040

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). 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.

First, clause 1 of rule 14 establishes an absolute rule against engaging in personality in debate where the subject of a Member's conduct is not the pending question.

Second, it is the long and settled practice of the House over many Congresses to enforce that standard by demands from the floor that words be taken down under rule 14. Although the rule enables the Chair to take initiative to address breaches of order, the Chair normally defers to demands that words be taken down in the case of references to Members of the House. On occasion, however, the Chair has announced general standards of proper reference to Members, as was the case

on June 15, 1988. 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 stated:

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 Member of the House in a way that inevitably engages in personalities.

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 2 of Hinds' Precedents, at section 1248.

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 past conduct of the Presiding Officer is out of order not because he is above criticism but, instead, because of the tendency of piecemeal criticism to impair the good order of the House. Speaker Reed's rationale is recorded in volume 5 of Hinds' Precedents, at section 5188, from which the Chair now quotes as follows:

The Chair submits to the House that allusions of criticisms of what the Chair did at some past time is certainly not in order. Not because the Chair is above criticism or above attack, but for two reasons: First because the Speaker is the Speaker of the House, and such attacks are not conducive to the good order of the House; and, second, because the Speaker can not reply to them except in a very fragmentary fashion, and it is not desirable that he should reply to them. For these reasons such attacks ought not to be made.

Mr. DURBIN. If the Chair would yield for another parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On behalf of the Parliamentarian, the Chair apologizes to the House for any deviation that may have taken place from the new rule.

Mr. DURBIN. Parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I have a unanimous-consent request. I would ask unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. I will yield to my friend from Massachusetts in a moment. But if I may say this, this Member and most Members have the highest regard for the professionalism of the House Parliamentarian and his staff, and I want to make that clear and a matter of public record. If an apology has been extended, from this Member's point of view it is certainly accepted because I believe their level of professionalism is respected by all. We clearly will have differences of opinion on rulings.

I just would like to ask two questions by parliamentary inquiry and then I will sit down. I thank the Chair for

rereading the ruling. It is improving every time he reads. But I would ask this question. Can a Member during the course of a 1-minute make any reference to an activity of another Member, including the Speaker, which has taken place outside this Chamber?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Based on the precedents, only a factual reference can be made.

Mr. DURBIN. A factual reference can be made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without any suggestions whatsoever of impropriety.

Mr. DURBIN. One further inquiry. Does this limitation in terms of reference to personal conduct beyond factual conduct apply to those who serve in Government and the executive branch as well as the legislative branch?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It applies to the President of the United States.

Mr. DURBIN. Does it apply to anyone else serving in the executive branch?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It applies to the President of the United States.

The gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, and this will be the final comment by me on this issue. We are eager to get on with the business of the House. But there are some very fundamental issues, as we have heard on the floor this morning, at stake here. We are being told that the Speaker is being placed above criticism and comments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is incorrect in drawing that conclusion.

Mr. BONIOR. The issue that we have before us in basically closing down voices. The RECORD of this House is being changed arbitrarily, committee meetings are being shut down prematurely. Private meetings on major policies issues are being held outside this institution. Members are being gagged on the House floor.

The question I have, Mr. Speaker, is this going to be the policy of the new majority in the 104th Congress?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Absolutely not. Absolutely not.

The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will proceed with five 1-minutes per side.

#### CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

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

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, our Contract With America states as follows: That on the first day of Congress, a Republican House will force Congress

to live under the same laws as everyone else, will cut one-third of committee staff, and will cut the congressional budget. We have done that.

In the next 85 days we will vote on the following 10 items. One, a balanced-budget amendment and line-item veto. Two, a new crime bill to stop violent criminals. Three, welfare reform to encourage work, not dependence. Four, family reinforcement to crack down on deadbeat dads and protect our children. Five, tax cuts for families to lift Government's burden from middle-income Americans. Six, national security restoration to protect our freedoms. Seven, Senior Citizens Equity Act to allow our seniors to work without Government penalty. Eight, Government regulation and unfunded mandate reforms. Nine, common sense legal reform to end frivolous lawsuits. Ten, congressional term limits to make Congress a citizen legislature.

This is our Contract With America.

#### DOUBLE STANDARD

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that we can have two standards for speech, I do not believe that we can change the precedents and the rules of the House arbitrarily, and certainly in this Chamber we should not abridge the first amendment.

I just want to comment that I am not sure that most of our Members and most of the public can appreciate how serious a violation we think the Speaker has engaged in and how deeply we take this issue.

There are, I think, two different areas we have to look at to understand why we would charge this as a total betrayal of trust. Whether it is a total betrayal of trust because of his lack of judgment, or whether it is a total betrayal of trust because of deliberate actions I do not think we know yet.

Those are the words of now-Speaker GINGRICH regarding Speaker Wright on the floor of the House. He went on further to call Speaker Wright a collaborator and a quizzling, and all of these words were spoken after the ruling quoted by the Chair of June 15, 1988.

#### THE MORE WE KNOW

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, "I understand you want to write a book. I own a publishing company you know." Could these words have been uttered in the Rayburn Room just off the House floor?

Mr. Speaker, the more we know, the more we have to wonder, what went on in the backrooms of the Capitol. Only a full airing of the facts will determine whether something illicit took place. Only an outside, independent, counsel can tell us for sure.

What was said? What was promised? What is the deal? What is in the con-

tract? It is time that an independent counsel expose the truth.

Mr. Speaker, do the Republicans have a contract with America or a contract with Rupert Murdoch?

No one serves two masters, Mr. Speaker. No one serves two masters.

#### LET US BEGIN TO SOLVE THE SERIOUS ISSUES FACING OUR NATION

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the American people are looking to the 104th Congress more than any Congress in recent memory with hope and anticipation that we begin to solve the serious issues facing our Nation. Hard-working Americans from across the country have come to Washington to discuss tax relief for families, term limits, and unfunded mandates. Members of Congress have also traveled throughout their districts, their respective districts, talking about crime and welfare reform, a balanced budget amendment, and a tax policy that creates more jobs and better salaries.

But, Mr. Speaker, each day on C-SPAN we listen to some—not all, not even the majority, but some Members of the Democratic Party—and all we hear are attacks on our Speaker, attacks on what he teaches in his college course, attacks on what he writes, attacks on what he believes. If these senior Members of the opposing party spent more time working on substantive legislation and less time attacking our Speaker, this would be a better Congress.

#### DOING THE PUBLIC'S BUSINESS IN A TRULY OPEN AND PUBLIC FASHION

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

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago America was told that this body was taking action to ensure that just about everything we do is done in full public view. No secrets and nowhere to hide—and that is exactly the way it should be.

But now, in an ironic twist, it appears that there is an effort by some to silence any and all discussion of the Speaker's potentially lucrative book deal.

The citizens of this country deserve to know what kind of financial arrangements have been made in this book deal and what has been discussed behind closed doors that may affect public policy.

There are a lot of things we do not know about the book deal. And that has to raise serious questions and concerns about possible improprieties and conflicts of interest.