have started a movement to eliminate conservative talk radio unless equal time is allowed for liberal viewpoints. Basically, they want a reinstatement of the unfair Fairness Doctrine. But what the critics may really be irate about deals more with illegal immigration than it does with talk radio, because that is the current controversial issue on talk radio stations.

Since their voices are so rarely heard in Congress, the American public has come to express their opinions by talk radio, especially on this issue of illegal immigration. The backroom, closed-door meetings the Senate has had to reach a deal on amnesty that the American public certainly doesn't want has encouraged talk radio shows to inform the public of this absurd nonsense of amnesty.

Talk radio has been one of the only vehicles that has kept the public informed about the ''give America away'' amnesty program and the political pandering and preference policies for illegals that the Senate bill is advocating.

So because the amnesty crowd doesn't like what they hear on the radio, they want the Federal Government to control this speech by forcing radio stations to give them free air time. If the liberals don't like talk radio, it is patently unfair to force radio stations to pay for and give away air time to them. You see, liberals can't make their case on their own radio station because no one listens to them.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Constitution protects free speech, not equal speech. Congress is to make no law abridging the freedom of speech whether we like the speech or not.

It's simple, Mr. Speaker, speech is to be free, not fair. Fair is too subjective a word. Our grandfathers guaranteed us free speech, not fair speech, and there is a big difference.

Congress is to stay out of the controlling of speech business because it says so in the U.S. Constitution. Our ancestors wrote the First Amendment mainly to protect two types of speech, political speech and religious speech. Those are the most controversial of all types of speech and the most important types of speech. That's why they are protected in our Constitution.

By trying to regulate what is said on the airways, the Federal Government and the speech police are speaking out of line.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY 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 North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina 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 gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WATERS 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 Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana 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 New York (Mr. HINCHEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HINCHEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

DEMOCRATS NOT MOVING TOWARDS ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SALI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SALI. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this body recognizes the honor our constituents have reposed in us in allowing us to serve them here. For me to represent the people of my hometown, my home county, the entire western part of my State in the House of Representatives is an extraordinary honor.

Like all my colleagues, I try to remember why my constituents sent me here. Perhaps Thomas Jefferson captured best what our service here as Members of Congress should really be about, and I quote. ''A wise and frugal government, which shall leave men free to regulate their own pursuits in industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor and the bread it has earned.'' This philosophy is not reflected in the priorities of the new majority which, interestingly, celebrates Thomas Jefferson as its founder.

It has appeared to me over the past 6 months the priorities of the new majority are increasing government spending, growing the Federal bureaucracy and deepening America's dependence on foreign fuels.

In the past 3 months of the second quarter of this year, the new majority has approved more than $80 billion in new spending, new spending for programs, including a proposal to spend Idahoans' hard-earned tax dollars to pay off the student loans of practicing attorneys. At a time when the national debt is out of control, authorizing $80 billion in new spending just cannot be seen as fiscally responsible.

This new majority has also proposed an increase in Federal bureaucracy. Just recently I was in a hearing discussing legislation that would add yet another layer of red tape to Federal agencies in order to improve customer service. Adding another layer of government bureaucracy is far from frugal, but more ironically, since when has more government ever improved government? Since when has adding more government ever improved government?

Another priority of the new majority is the energy bill, which I've been calling the ''no energy'' bill. America should be moving towards energy independence. America's economy growth, Idaho's manufacturing and agriculture future and our families' ability to make ends meet are all intertwined. The new Democrat majority, however, is not moving towards energy independence. Rather, the ''no energy'' bill will only serve to increase America's dependence on foreign fuels.

In their bill, our friends across the aisle propose to curtail nearly all forms of domestic exploration and development, including resources of ANWR, natural gas reserves, offshore drilling reserves, oil shale deposits, nuclear power and hydropower. Such a policy can only increase America's reliance on foreign fuel. Instead, America should be fully engaged in exploration and development of domestic energy.

This exploration and development should be coupled with the development of alternative energy. The majority, however, proposes to bury the development of alternative biomass energy in a myriad of legal challenges and bureaucracy surrounding the so-called Clinton administration Roadless Rule.

The new majority's assault on energy development does not end there, instead extending the assault to one of the most green energies, wind energy. The new Democrat majority recently held a hearing to give ear to complaints that wind energy causes fatalities among the bird and bat populations of this country. Now, holding a hearing on bird and bat fatalities from wind energy does not just sound absurd; it is, particularly when you consider that many more times birds are killed by office windows, cars and trucks, and, of course, cats than by windmills. What's next, outlawing sky scrapers? Outlawing cars and trucks?

America's energy crisis must be solved. Continued reliance on foreign energy while simultaneously curtailing domestic development and exploration will only result in higher and higher fuel prices at the pump. That is an unacceptable result, and Congress must be committed to pursuing policies to reduce our dependence on foreign fuel.

Unfortunately, the priorities of the new majority, as evidenced over the second quarter, are not Idaho's priorities, and consequently, they are not