height of hypocrisy, the height of hypocrisy for the Democrats to come down here and complain about what the Republicans are doing after the way they have run this House for the last 40 years.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the gentleman's words be taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). The gentleman will be seated.

The Clerk will report the words.

□ 1230

The Clerk read as follows:

But it is apparent to anyone who is paying attention to what is going on that the Democratic Party is doing everything they can to derail the Contract With America. They are proposing hundreds of amendments to slow down the process. All I want to say is that it is the height of hypocrisy, the height of hypocrisy for the Democrats to come down here and complain about what the Republicans are doing after the way they have run this House for the last 40 years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). The Chair is prepared to rule.

It would be out of order for the gentleman to make reference to a particular Member, but precedent suggests that reference to procedures, or amendments, or to parties is not out of order.

The House will proceed in regular order please.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. NADLER. The second half of the statement of the distinguished gentleman made reference to the hypocrisy of the Democrats. The context clearly indicated that it was the Democratic Members of the House that he was referring to. My parliamentary inquiry, therefore:

Since the rules prohibit the impugning of motives of Members of the House, and the gentleman impugned the motives of a group of Members of the House, just under half the Members of the House; so is it not permitted under the rules then to impugn the motives of an individual Member of the House, but to impugn the motives of a group of Members of the House is permitted?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair believes that collective political motivation can be discussed and it was not discernible that it was relating to any particular Member.

The House will proceed in regular order, please.

## CALLING FOR A RENEWED COMMITMENT TO AMERICORPS

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

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the President in his efforts to strengthen our communities and enable young Americans to further their education through the National Service Program, AmeriCorps.

As a former Peace Corps volunteer, I know the value of serving our community here in the United States as well as around the world.

Despite its short existence, President Clinton's National Service Program has already achieved remarkable results in terms of participation, serving our communities, and extending the invaluable benefits of higher education to tens of thousands of young Americans.

In my hometown of Louisville, the 22 volunteers of the ACME Program, which is affiliated with AmeriCorps, serves at-risk youths in local schools through safety and education programs. Also in Kentucky, AmeriCorps sponsors a housing and homeless program. This program seeks to provide affordable housing for those in need.

I believe that programs such as AmeriCorps can only make our Nation stronger and bring our people closer. Mr. Speaker, I call for a renewed commitment to AmeriCorps.

## THE TIME TO DELIVER IS HERE

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

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the body to comment about the elections on November 8 and the clear statement the American people spoke of at that point, which was to reduce the size, the scope, and the intrusiveness of the Federal Government. It has come that time to stand and deliver.

I call on the administration to put forward proposals looking at all Federal agencies for their continued work and their efforts in questioning whether or not we should reduce the Federal role in these areas, and I ask the administration to address that and to examine whole roles of agencies and programs. This body has been continually focused on the costs of these programs. I would ask the body to consider the responsibility of us to our children and the enormous deficit that has been put forth, the enormous debt that has been accumulated and what responsibility we have to the children of this country to free them of that debt.

Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to spend our children's inheritance. It is quite another to spend them in debt, as we have, and also the opportunity we have to free the society of these strains.

## GET THE FACTS STRAIGHT

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, to correct the record, I believe the gentleman from the 18th District of Illinois [Mr. LAHOOD] who surely is no rookie to the process here, perhaps unintentionally mischaracterized what has happened in terms of the history of the House. He said, if I understood him correctly, that no piece of major legislation has ever passed under open rules while the Democrat majority was in power.

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services and as a member of the Committee on Natural Resources, Mr. Speaker, I can tell my colleagues that the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] conducted every single piece of legislation under open rules. Every single hearing, including the budget hearings, were open. Every single Member of the then-minority who wanted to offer an amendment was able to do so, no matter how long, no matter how lengthy. That was the case.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a mischaracterization not to indicate to the American people and to new Members of the House here that time was equally divided always under the chairmanships of the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Get the facts straight, get the process right, and good legislation will follow.

□ 1240

## U.S. INVENTORS THREATENED BY NEW REQUIREMENT OF GATT IMPLEMENTATION LEGISLATION

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, pardon me for talking about legislation for a few moments.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking my colleagues today to join with almost 100 Members of this body in cosponsoring H.R. 359. This legislation is aimed at preventing a crime against the American people. That crime was made possible by a provision, not required by GATT but snuck into the GATT implementation legislation, that will have the effect of decreasing the number of years of patent protection enjoyed by American citizens.

H.R. 359 ensures that Americans will have the 17 years of protection that has traditionally been our right. Almost 100 Republicans, Democrats, protectionists, free-traders, liberals, and conservatives have joined together to prevent this rip-off that could see billions of dollars that should go to American inventors and investors instead ending up in the bank accounts of foreign and multinational corporations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members to please join in cosponsoring H.R. 359.

## THE NEW ANTIFEMININE TRENCH INFECTION PILL

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, last week I addressed the House on the Speaker's college course about the sexes, and since then we have learned a lot more.

The Speaker at that time had made some comments about how men did so much better in trenches than women because men were like little piglets and liked to roll around and women got infections every 30 days.

Well, since then, the Defense Department has spoken, medical science has spoken, and all sorts of people have spoken, and they seem to be very contrary to what the Speaker has talked about.

But in the interim, from my district comes good news. Father Marshall Grouley has brought forth the new antifeminine trench infection pill, and I think this is going to be the answer for those who are still doubting unbelievers. He also notes there are some possible side effects for women taking this—that, No. 1, they might find sudden urges to roll around in trenches as piglets; No. 2, they may suddenly decide they have to hunt giraffes; and No. 3, they may have a compulsive need to sell a book.

## MEXICAN BAILOUT SAID TO DEPEND ON HILL APPROVAL

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, unlike the allegations of the earlier speaker, the gentleman from Indiana, I do not want to slow down the contract. I am eager to debate the contract on the floor. I would even like to debate it in the committee. I would even like to have an open process, as has been promised in committee and on the floor, and let the sunshine in. But we are going to have to remove some of the gag rules being imposed by the new Republican majority before we can do that.

But there is one thing I do want to stop dead. I want to stop dead the misbegotten bailout of the Mexican economy and those who have been speculating so lucratively in Mexico. It was proposed by President Clinton, but now it is being quietly manipulated through Congress behind closed doors by Speaker GINGRICH and Majority Leader DOLE.

Here is the headline in the Washington Times: ''Gingrich Sees Hill Approval of Mexican Bailout.''

If this bailout passes this body, it will be Speaker GINGRICH's version of a bailout, not President Clinton's. I ask the Members to defeat the bailout, no matter whose it is.

## A REDEFINITION OF THE REPUBLICAN ROLE IN GOVERNMENT FOR THE LAST 40 YEARS

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues that for 2½ months now Republicans have been engaged, as they were in 1-minutes this morning, in trying to convince either themselves or the Democrats or perhaps the American people that for the first time in 40 years the Republicans are in the majority in this Congress.

Well, during those 40 years, we had the following Republicans as President: Eisenhower, Nixon, Ford, Reagan, and Bush—all during those 40 years. For more than half of those 40 years Republicans were elected to the highest office in the land. And just taking former President Reagan, during three-fourths of his administration, Republicans controlled the United States Senate.

Mr. Speaker, my purpose here is to do nothing but to lay the facts out. Republicans have not been excluded from the Government for the past 40 years; they have run it for more than half of that time.

## MEXICAN LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM REMAINS A WHITE HOUSE INITIATIVE

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. President, the gentleman from Oregon has indicated that the Republican leadership in the House has some sort of an agenda to move forward the Mexican loan guarantee program. That is not factual. The Republican majority has a responsibility, which we are exercising, to listen to the President of the United States when he proposes a legislative initiative, and that is what the Republican majority has done.

Obviously, the President has not made his case well or sufficiently with respect to the Mexican loan guarantee for both minority and majority Members. The ball is back in your court, Mr. President; it is not a Republican initiative in the House.

## A MESSAGE TO THE MAJORITY: ''DON'T TREAD ON ME''

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

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the Republicans are already reversing their own reforms. First they say that committees should not meet on the floor during debates under the 5-minute rule because Members cannot effectively be in two places at the same time. Actually, they had a pretty good idea. Unfortunately, they decided to renege on it last night.

What they said is, ''Well, we're going to change the rules.'' I know they take offense at the parliamentary skirmishes that are going on right now, but when you change the rules and try to silence the Democrats, when you say, ''We'll take 58 minutes or 67 minutes and give you 3 minutes,'' we are not going to stand for it.

I think the message we want to transmit this morning is that there will be comity on this floor—not comedy, but comity—fairness and a sharing of the time, or else. I conclude with the words cited in the American Revolution, quite simply, ''Don't tread on me.''

## THE TIME ALLOCATION ON YESTERDAY'S MOTION TO ALLOW COMMITTEES TO SIT DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

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

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that the record be set straight. Twice today we have heard it alleged that yesterday the Republicans took 57 minutes and gave the Democrats 3 in debate. The fact is that the debate took 8 minutes. The Republicans happened to use 5 minutes, and the Democrats used 3 minutes.

Now, when we counted them up afterwards, it was not exactly balanced, and maybe it should have been. It certainly was not 57 to 3, and those kinds of facts need to be set straight.

## THE ROLE OF FEDERAL REGULATION AS IT RELATES TO THE UNFUNDED MANDATES ISSUE

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to comment on some remarks from my distinguished colleague on the other side of the aisle, whose name I do not yet know.

He commented that opposition to the bill on unfunded mandates arises from distrust of the capability or wisdom of State governments, that they cannot make decisions and, therefore, we must make the decisions for them.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that in many cases the Federal Government must come to the aid and assistance of State and local governments because they are unable to protect themselves, either because rivers know no State boundaries and a polluter in one State causes pollution in a second, a third, and a fourth, and it demands Federal legislation to protect States because they cannot do it themselves, or, second, a State may wish to regulate an economic activity which harms its people but is told, ''You cannot regulate that activity because if you have that regulation, the large corporation will move and take its jobs and taxes to another State,'' not because the regulation is not a good and fair one but because they have the power to do so. The Federal Government must protect the States in that instance.