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 perdency 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 eying 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 multimillion-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?