

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to take strong exception to the Republicans' proposed massive Medicare cuts.

These cuts will force senior citizens in my district and around the country to pay \$3,500 over 7 years. Many seniors will have to make hard choices between food on their table or the medical attention that they desperately need to survive.

Slashing Medicare will not only hurt seniors, it will hurt all Americans. Medicare cuts will hurt many hospitals that rely heavily upon Medicare reimbursement.

Republicans argue that these cuts are necessary to save the system. However, the very same Republican budget that cuts Medicare contains a \$288 billion tax giveaway for the most affluent Americans.

Senior citizens have worked hard and contributed all their lives to this country. They deserve affordable health care. Let us end these shameless cuts and consider real health care reform.

REPUBLICANS FIGHTING FOR SENIORS

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the Republicans have in fact looked at the problem and seen that the Medicare trust fund will go out of business by 2002. We will have no Medicare. But under our proposal, there is an increase from \$4,700 to \$6,300 for the Medicare recipients.

This is not a cut. Only in Washington, DC can an increase be a cut.

Working in a bipartisan fashion, we want to make sure our seniors are protected.

Not only are we going to protect Medicare but we are making sure that Social Security is off the table. More importantly, we just recently rolled back the 1993 increase in Social Security taxes and we allow seniors under 70 years old not to be capped at \$11,280 for income but be able to make up to \$30,000 a year over the next 5 years without deductions from Social Security.

We are fighting for senior citizens. We ask that everyone join together and work with us so that we can make sure that Medicare is preserved, protected, and improved.

CALL FOR AN OUTSIDE COUNSEL IN SPEAKER'S ETHICS CASE

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, the Speaker of our House is an intelligent person. He is a student of history. He has been a professor of history and indeed he has helped write a lot of recent history. He knows well the historical precedent to avoid even the semblance of conflict or impropriety.

Now the House and the House Ethics Committee faces an important question on ethical violations—

Questions concerning the activities of GOPAC under the control of the Speaker; questions concerning possible conflicts of interest with a book deal and a publisher who might have involvement and interest before this body.

Despite promises that the Ethics Committee would approve any signing of a book deal, the Speaker went ahead and signed it, anyway, and then received a letter from the Ethics Committee saying you should not make any assumptions about our signing or approving that conduct.

In previous high-profile cases, 22 out of 46 since 1968, an outside counsel has been appointed including for the most recent Speaker under investigation, Speaker Wright. Today the Ethics Committee is deadlocked on partisan lines.

Historical precedent is clear here—avoid even the semblance of a conflict. I would urge the appointment of an outside counsel.

THE ANSWER IS NO

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

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, on June 4, 1992, on "Larry King Live," then-candidate Bill Clinton said, "I will present a 5-year plan to balance the budget."

About 3 weeks ago, President Clinton said that he would balance the budget within 10 years. What do we have today? We have got nothing. It is 3 years later from the original promise and the American people are still waiting to hear from this President on a balanced budget.

Two nights ago on "Larry King Live," the President once again artfully dodged Larry King's question about the lack of any attempt by the administration to balance this budget.

We have got to balance the budget in this country. We have a huge problem in this country that is accumulating at a rate of \$33 million an hour.

What does our President do? He goes out and vetoes the first serious attempt in a long time to cut spending.

Does he have an alternative? The answer is no.

Can he balance the budget in 5 years? The answer is no.

Can he balance the budget in 10 years? The answer is no.

Is he even going to try? The answer is no.

Mr. Speaker, it is up to us, the Republicans in the U.S. Congress, to balance this budget.

EDUCATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS BRIGHTEN WITH PRESIDENT'S VETO OF RESCIS-SIONS BILL

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

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to commend President Clinton for vetoing a bill that took food out of the mouths of children, heat out of the homes of the elderly, and trees out of national forests.

The bill cut student loans and summer jobs for young Americans trying to do something with their lives. It used money for those programs to provide timber barons with massive Government subsidies. This is a clear-cut case of clearcutting.

The new majority has taken a chain saw to education funding and to our disappearing natural resources. But the President's pen was mightier than the chain saw.

His first veto was a defining one. He stuck up for education and the environment.

The Republicans stuck up for corporate welfare and environmental destruction.

Mr. Speaker, the new majority has passed some awful legislation. I hope the President's veto pen has plenty of ink.

THE TRUTH

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, one after another after another of our liberal colleagues take to the well to carp, to moan, to deceive and to distort. * * * They can say the most outlandish things with such ease, you would swear that it was Mephistopheles himself that was up there speaking.

For instance, they say that Republicans are drastically cutting Medicare. It is not true and they know it. Far from cutting Medicare, Republicans are strengthening the program and saving it from certain bankruptcy as said so by the trustees of the program itself. * * *

It is there. Why are my—

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the gentleman's words be taken down. Twice during this time, he called the Members of Congress liars and I would like to have those words taken down or an apology issued.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman will suspend and the Clerk will report the words.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, if the appropriate rule with respect to accusations of untruths arise, does it require

you specify a certain Member of Congress? In other words, must it be specific as to a certain Member?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not issue an anticipatory ruling. The Chair will wait until the words of the gentleman have been reported by the Clerk.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman raises an important point which I would like to frame as an inquiry in the same vein. When would be the proper time to do that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. At the conclusion of the disposition of the Clerk reporting the words of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

□ 1025

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if we could also make sure a sentence before the term "liar" or "liars" is used so we can see the total context, if that is possible.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, while the gentleman's words are being taken down, where is the gentleman supposed to be? Where is the gentleman supposed to be while his words are being taken down?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is required to be seated.

Mr. VOLKMER. He has not been seated, he has been speaking with the Parliamentarian.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio will please be seated.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. HOKE. To request unanimous consent that the word "lies" be stricken and to proceed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. VOLKMER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri will proceed with his reservation.

Mr. VOLKMER. At this time will the gentleman apologize for using the words to this House?

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, my understanding with respect to this—having—

May I answer the question?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOKE. My understanding is that references in general to the entire group, either of Republicans or Democrats, with respect to that word are in fact in order. But I am willing to withdraw that word, and if we are going to move in a different direction with respect to that, I have no problem with it in the future. But, and so I feel per-

fectly, so I think the proper thing to do is to ask unanimous consent to withdraw the word.

Mr. VOLKMER. Will the gentleman also issue an apology—I am reserving the right to object—to this House for using that word in the House?

Mr. HOKE. The word, that word has been used many times in the context of general spoken admonition to an entire group by both sides. If we are going to go in a different direction, that is fine with me.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, continuing to reserve the right to object, could we possibly have the words read to the House, both the sentence before, and frankly in two cases during the 1 minute of my colleague I heard the word "liar." I would like to hear both of them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is the Chair's understanding that the Clerk has been transcribing that for some time now. Does the gentleman continue under his reservation?

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield under his reservation?

Mr. VOLKMER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, my concern, I would say to the gentleman from Ohio, is yes, there is in the precedent a general application of the word. However, then you get down to the question, and this is what I would propound to the Chair at the appropriate time, you get down to making it more and more specific. In this case several Members on this side of the aisle had risen to make certain statements about Medicare. I think it can be reasonably inferred that the gentleman's remarks went directly to them, not to a body at large, and that is why the apology is sought.

Mr. HOKE. Well, I would disagree with you. I think when the words are respoken or reread you will see that the words are very general in nature; they have to do with liberal colleagues, and that is who is being spoken to. The word "liar" is not there; the word "lies" is there. And it has nothing to do with a specific person. It is not directed to a specific person, and I would just as soon have it clarified. If we are not going to use the word "lies" to describe untruths in the future and we use the word untruths, then let that be the new rule, but at least let us have consistency with respect to this. If we can use the word "lies" to describe words that are spoken regarding a—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. HOKE. Then we will do it that way.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The Clerk will report the words.

The Clerk read as follows:

One after another after another of our liberal colleagues take to the well to carp, to moan, to deceive and to distort. The lies roll off their tongues so easily. They can say the most outlandish things with such ease, you would swear that it was Mephistopheles himself that was up there speaking.

For instance, they say that Republicans are drastically cutting Medicare. It is not true, and they know it.

Far from cutting Medicare, Republicans are strengthening the programs and saving it from certain bankruptcy as said so by the trustees of the program itself. They tell the same lies about the programs for children, about education, about nutrition, you name it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman renew his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. VOLKMER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). An objection has been heard.

The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair's ruling is that the use of the word "lies" in that context as it relates to specific Members and generally as it relates under the Rules of the House regarding Members' participation in debate, is inappropriate and is a breach of decorum.

Mr. VOLKMER. Is inappropriate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is inappropriate and a breach of decorum.

Mr. VOLKMER. And the gentleman's words will be stricken?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the words will be stricken.

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

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

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, does that also mean that since the gentleman's words were stricken, the gentleman is not permitted to take the floor for the rest of the day?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman may proceed in order.

Mr. WISE. Reserving the right to object, I presume the Chair is making that unanimous-consent request on its own, because I did not hear a unanimous-consent request that the gentleman be permitted to take the floor. Would some other gentleman wish to?

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker in keeping with the policies of the past 2½ years that I have been here, I would like to ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to be maintained on his feet on the floor of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is so ordered. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] may proceed in order.

The gentleman has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. HOKE. Why are my liberal colleagues so shall we say economical with the truth? Because they are in a panic, they have no new ideas to offer, no alternatives to pose, no plans of their own. They still do not understand what happened last November. Will they say anything and will they do anything to regain the power that they feel is their birthright? I believe they

will. Maybe it will take another election to prove this.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

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

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, is it not under the longstanding rules of the House inappropriate to address on the floor of the House matters that are under discussion and not disposed of in the Ethics Committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

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

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

Mr. WISE. Under that same principle, though, is there not a difference between matters that might be under consideration by the Ethics Committee and matters and allegations dealing with any particular Member that are important before the body, particularly if the body or some of the body is pressing for the appointment of a counsel to remove it from the Ethics Committee?

Finally let me add to that parliamentary inquiry, I thought the principle of this House as expressed by the Speaker of this House on March 8 in a press conference was, essentially paraphrasing, anything can be spoken about on the House floor? Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is the Chair's understanding that that matter was clarified from the Chair the other day, first of all. Second, that Members should not refer to matters pending before the Ethics Committee.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker then I have this parliamentary inquiry, and I quote:

The fact is, Members of the House are allowed to say virtually anything on the House floor. * * * It is protected and has been for 200 years. * * * It is written into the Constitution.

That was by Speaker GINGRICH on March 8, 1995. Is that not, is that not the policy? Was the Speaker—

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair believes it was. It is the Chair's understanding the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. BURTON, clarified that issue May 25 from the Chair.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, what was his ruling? Could the Chair clarify that for those of us who were not here?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair's ruling was that references in debate should not be made to ethical conduct of Members.

Mr. WISE. So then the announcement by the Speaker of the House has been preempted by that, by the Speaker pro tempore?

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, regular order. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct, that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, is it not true matters can be spoken on the floor of the House within the rules and it is explicitly against the rules to refer to matters before the Ethics Committee before the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That was the precedent and that is the rule.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry: Does that mean any matter before the Ethics Committee? I would like the Speaker to answer that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WISE. Does that mean any matter that might be brought to the Ethics Committee or letter that has been sent to the Ethics Committee. When is a matter before the Ethics Committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members should not engage in personalities in debate and discuss the ethics of Members.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry: If the proceedings of the Ethics Committee are secret, how do we know what is before the Ethics Committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Ethics Committee can report the matter in a proper way.

Mr. WISE. But how do I know not to wander into this area if I do not know what the area is because the proceedings are secret; that is what I do not understand.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Or a Member may rise to a proper question of privilege.

Mr. WISE. A parliamentary inquiry: A question of privilege to what? If the Speaker would guide the House we might avoid some of this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. To offer a resolution with respect to a matter and during the perency of the resolution those matters may be discussed.

Mr. WISE. I thank the Chair.

THE SPEAKER AND THE ENTERTAINMENT INDUSTRY

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I awoke this morning to an article in the paper entitled "Cecil B. Gingrich." Now it seems a major production studio is eyeing Mr. GINGRICH's novel "1945" for the big screen.

The novel contains a sex scene between a spy and the White House chief of staff, which led BOB DOLE to include the book in his criticism of the entertainment industry.

Mr. GINGRICH's Hollywood agent says he expects the Georgia Republican to receive more than \$1 million in movie rights. At a time when Speaker GINGRICH is asking senior citizens to take \$1,000 out of their pockets to pay for tax breaks for the rich, he is out there lining his own pockets with multi-million-dollar deals from media moguls and Hollywood producers.

MAKE ENGLISH OUR OFFICIAL LANGUAGE

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Speaker for endorsing English as our official language yesterday in his speech before the Iowa Chamber of Commerce. It is a fight I have been engaged in for a long time.

We Americans are a people from every corner of the globe, every religion, every ethnic background you can think of, but we are one Nation, one people. Why? Because we have a wonderful commonality called the English language. We are losing that today and losing it very quickly. One out of seven Americans does not speak English. U.S.A. Today has reported that it costs some \$12 billion a year at the Federal, State, and local level for bilingual education. I think it is time we go back to the concept again of one Nation, one people.

In Los Angeles now you can vote in seven different languages. In many parts of the country English is not the language that is spoken. And while we want everyone to have a chance to protect their culture, speak any language they want at home, to protect their culture and promote their culture, I think it is very important when you deal with the Government, when you vote, you do it in the English language so we can keep our wonderful commonality, we can keep this common glue that has held our country together so we do remain one Nation, one people, one flag, and yes, one language.

JAPAN SHOULD OPEN ITS MARKETS

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, last week a full-page advertisement appeared in the Washington Post that stated: "Leading Newspapers Agree: U.S. Trade Sanctions On Japan Are Not The Answer." The Washington Post raked in over \$25,000 on this one ad. The Wall Street Journal, another opponent of the sanctions, printed a similar ad, but the charges there were over \$123,000 for a page. Here on Capitol Hill, Roll Call, a newspaper that goes to every congressional office, printed an ad opposing the sanctions that cost \$6,200.

There is big money to be made by newspapers in opposing United States trade sanctions on Japan and in opposing the American people in the process, but is it not revealing who has their hands in the honey pot.

I would like to say who is going to stand up for the 700,000 United States workers employed in the auto industry, the 4 million workers who work in the textile, semiconductor, paint, and plaster industry and millions of Americans who would have jobs in the industry if Japan would open its markets?