

But I cannot believe that half of the population of this country really need some help. I cannot believe that half of the population in this country really need some government help. It is hard for me to believe.

Who are these folks up here? They are the ones having children, trying to send their kids to school, support their families, having a little house and condominium, plus they have to pay for all this national defense, 2½ million fellow employees, all this, plus they have to support one more family down here. You have to support your family plus one more family down here. Do you think that is fair?

Mr. Speaker, right now it is almost a 1 point ratio, and the bottom is growing, growing, each year. Now, let us take a look at this. They are talking about a huge tax credit. What is it? A \$500 tax credit per child. That is what we are talking about, a huge tax credit to the super rich. Let me tell you who they are. The \$500 tax credit stops at incomes of \$75,000. If you make more than \$75,000 a year, you do not even get a \$500 tax credit for your child. Your child is not worth \$500. The only folks who get the \$500 credit will be right here, these folks.

Our liberal friends are screaming it is unfair, it is a huge tax credit to the rich people, because they are forgetting what is a tax credit. A tax credit means you have to pay a tax to get a credit. These people do not pay any taxes. Therefore, we cannot give them a tax credit. Do you think we should pay them \$500 in cash instead?

Second, as I mentioned earlier, the super rich. If you make \$75,000 a year you are super rich. I have been hearing this time after time, that we give a huge tax break to those folks who do not need the money. You mean they do not need the money? Why are we doing this \$500 tax credit? Because by doing it, by doing this, it can save money; by doing this, the billionaires can borrow money, create more jobs, so these folks can go up. That is the idea of the \$500 credit.

We cannot go on with this. The last 30 years, it does not work. We have to create more jobs to help these folks, so these people can go up to being the tax-paying group, instead of the tax-consuming group.

#### AN INJUSTICE CENTERED ON SILENCE

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, we can have a legitimate dispute over matters such as that which we just heard, knowing a different perspective on some of these issues, knowing that the whole idea of middle class to at least one of our Republican colleagues was that those who earned even as much as \$183,000 were lower middle class, but there are some issues that ought to go

beyond partisanship. They ought to go beyond differences in philosophy. I think we have seen one of those issues presented in this House tonight.

Of the many injustices that have occurred on the floor of this House this year, none, certainly, is any greater than what which we saw tonight. I refer to an injustice not based on what was said here on the floor of this House, but on what was not said.

Usually when people on one side or the other complain about an injustice, they are talking about a vote that was taken and many speeches and debate, as we have had here today. But this was the muzzling of debate. This was the gagging of debate. This was an injustice that centered on silence, not on anything that was said. This injustice related to the handling of a privileged resolution that was presented here on the floor of the House tonight, presented by the gentleman from Florida, Mr. HARRY JOHNSTON and Mr. PETERSON. It concerned a very important matter, that being the ethical standards that prevail in this House or do not prevail in this House.

The timing of the consideration of this resolution was interesting, at the end of a long day of debate. The timing of this resolution seemed to be designed, along with the motion to table that immediately cut off consideration of this measure, immediately cut it off without any presentation of the kind of debate that we are seeing here tonight on matters concerning the budget, and yet, which go to the core of the operation of this Congress; that is, the confidence of the American people in the integrity of this body.

Let me just read to you, since it was done so hurriedly, and without any opportunity for debate, from this resolution:

"Whereas the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is currently considering several ethics complaints against Speaker NEWT GINGRICH"—and indeed, they are, there have been a number of such complaints—"and whereas the committee has traditionally handled such cases by appointing an independent nonpartisan outside counsel," a procedure which has been adopted in every major ethics case since the committee was established, and, indeed, that is also accurate; in fact, on at least nine occasions, including Speaker Jim Wright, an independent counsel was appointed—"and whereas, although complaints against Speaker GINGRICH have been under consideration for more than 14 months," for 14 months, for every day of this great revolutionary new Congress those complaints have been pending and nothing has happened, "this committee has failed to appoint an outside counsel, and whereas the committee has also deviated from other longstanding precedents and rules of procedure, including its failure to adopt a resolution of preliminary inquiry before calling third-party witnesses and receiving sworn testimony,"—and in the section

of the resolution, of course, referring to the rules of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct which, based on the news reports, have not been complied with.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman would yield for a moment.

Mr. DOGGETT. For a question, certainly.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, is it not correct that each one of these complaints that has been brought against the Speaker of the House has been brought by a Member of the opposite party, the Democratic Party, the minority party?

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, it is correct that we have yet had an opportunity to discuss these complaints, and, yes, they have. And the whole thrust of this resolution is to have someone who is neither Democrat nor Republican participate in an independent consideration of those complaints to find out if they have been partisan or nonpartisan. And, as the resolution so indicates, whereas these procedural irregularities and the unusual delay in the appointment of an independent outside counsel have led to widespread concern that the committee is making special exceptions for the Speaker of the House; and, whereas the integrity of the House depends on the confidence of the American people, and the fairness and impartiality of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct; therefore, be it resolved that the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct should report to the House no later than November 28, 1995, concerning first, the status of the committee's investigation of the complaints against Speaker GINGRICH; the committee's disposition with regard to the appointment of a nonpartisan outside counsel and the scope of the counsel's investigation; and, finally, a timetable for committee action on the complaints.

That is to say, that the resolution did not go so far as to actually demand the immediate appointment of an outside counsel, but only that the committee come forward and report on what it has been doing throughout this year. Yet, Mr. Speaker, every Republican who voted refused to have even an investigation reported to this House on this critical ethical matter.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, is it not the longstanding tradition and, in fact, the rules of the House that no Member is to discuss the workings of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct? Are these not rules that were adopted under previous Democratic Congresses, and it is not legitimate for Members to discuss the internal workings of the Committee on Standards of

Official Conduct on the floor of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct and the Chair will read from page 526 of the House Rules manual under rule number XIV:

Members should refrain from references in debate to the official conduct of other Members where such conduct is not under consideration in the House by way of a report of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct or a question of privilege of the House.

The gentleman is correct.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, what in the rules prevents a Member of this House from discussing an action that has taken place on the House floor? The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] is not discussing what is occurring in the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. The gentleman is discussing what is happening on the House Floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The discussion of the pendency of matters before the Standards committee is not in order.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, is the Chair suggesting that it is out of order to discuss a matter which occurred on the House floor? Because that is the action to which the gentleman's remarks were referring.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin is placing words in the Chair's mouth. That was not the Chair's response. The response was that the statements that the gentleman from Texas was making referring to matters currently before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct are not in order.

All the Chair is stating at this point is that for further purposes of discussion this evening, if a point of order is raised, there should be no further such discussion as the gentleman from Texas raised.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, then is it the ruling of the Chair that the resolution that the House just voted to table on the floor of this House concerning the desire for a report from the committee, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, is improper and cannot be discussed even during special orders?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is simply stating that in response to the parliamentary inquiry from the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that the references that the gentleman from Texas made in discussing that resolution went beyond reciting its consideration. That is the very limited extent of the Chair's response.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, so, the Chair is not saying that the resolution itself, which I read from throughout the course of my remarks, would not be the proper subject of debate here in the course of special orders?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution was considered as a question of the privileges of the House—

Mr. DOGGETT. And so it is a proper subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. And is no longer at this time under consideration by the House, based on the action of the House previously today.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Texas entitled to discuss action which took place on the House floor? Is there any action that takes place on the House floor that any Member of this House is not allowed to refer to?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would the gentleman from Wisconsin begin again, the Chair was preoccupied looking up the rule in the manual.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am simply asking if the gentleman from Texas is within the rules of the House if he continues to discuss a matter which occurred on the House Floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not issue anticipatory rulings. The Chair simply responded to the parliamentary inquiry from the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The 5 minutes of the gentleman from Texas having expired, there is no longer anything before the Chair to consider, and the Chair will not and cannot issue anticipatory rulings.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, because the Chair has ruled, if I understand it, in response to the parliamentary inquiry that certain remarks would not conform with the rules of the Chair, and since all of my remarks centered on reading a privileged resolution that the House had just tabled, is it the ruling of the Chair that because the resolution was tabled, it is not proper for consideration here since it dealt with the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and pending business?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Only to the extent that the gentleman's remarks went beyond that.

Mr. DOGGETT. So, reading the resolution would be within the rules of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution has, in fact been tabled—

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the fact that it has been tabled. That is what I have been talking about the last 5 minutes. My inquiry, Mr. Speaker, is whether or not a discussion of the action in tabling that resolution, and my reading of the resolution that was tabled, would be within the rules of the House, because your previous response to the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Pennsylvania suggests otherwise.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The content of the resolution is not the proper

subject for debate in this House when it is no longer pending, and it is no longer pending.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, is it proper to read verbatim, without any commentary whatsoever, a resolution which has been tabled by the House, in a special order after regular business has ended?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Not if the text of the resolution itself involves official conduct.

Mr. HOKE. So, Mr. Speaker, reading the text verbatim of a resolution which has been tabled pertaining to a matter before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is, in fact, out of order after it has been tabled?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the Chair is not, however, ruling that it is out of order for any Member of this House to address any action taken by the House on this floor, is the Chair?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is making no global rulings.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I think what the Chair is saying is that the gentleman can proceed if he is not discussing the committee, but discussing floor action.

#### THE BALANCED BUDGET ACT: A HISTORIC VOTE

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

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, in listening to the closing debate by our very able chairman of the Committee on the Budget, I was struck by his comments acknowledging the many people who have been working for so many years to enact or to present to this floor for a vote, finally, a Balanced Budget Act.

In listening to Chairman KASICH's comments, it struck me at this very moment how rare of an honor it is indeed for me to be here today to have cast a vote on such a historic piece of legislation. In fact, it is this very legislation which embodies the very principles that I campaigned on just 12 months ago.

The Balanced Budget Act of 1995 represents the essence of what I believe in: a fiscally sound and responsible Federal Government that passes on a better America to its future generations. This truly for me is a defining moment in our Nation's history.

The Balanced Budget Act is not a smoke-and-mirrors sham in an attempt to fool the electorate. This budget is a real, honest plan that offers the people we serve the first balanced budget in a