

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE RESOLUTION RELATING TO FORGED DOCUMENT

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 16, 1995

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, November 1, 1995, three of my Republican colleagues went to the floor during time set aside for special orders. All three speakers spoke about an event that occurred in the subcommittee, in which a document under the purported letterhead of the Alliance for Justice actually had been prepared by the subcommittee chairman's staff.

The titles of those three speeches were, and I quote: "Hearing 'Prop' Incident Does Not Merit Ethics Investigation," "Alliance for Justice," and "Innocent Mistake Transformed Into an Ethics Complaint."

Mr. Speaker, all three speeches dealt with the ethics investigation that is currently pending before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

Under a ruling of the Speaker pro tempore on May 25, 1995, those speeches were inappropriate and should not have been permitted. In that ruling, a Member who had made a reference to a matter relating to Speaker GINGRICH pending before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct was warned:

Members should not engage in debate concerning matters that may be pending in the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

I would also note that the speeches also attempted to ascribe motivations to the Member who transmitted the ethics complaint. For example, one speaker stated that the motivation was "partisan politics" and another blamed it on a "political culture."

I would note that the precedents of the House rule XIV clearly establish, and I quote from section 749 of the annotations to the House rules, that:

(6) Members should refrain from references in debate to the motivations of Members who file complaints before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

Although the Speaker has recently been vigorous in enforcing these restrictions during special orders, even on his own initiative, when Members are less likely to be present on the floor to make a point of order, he did not do so on Wednesday night.

Those speakers alluded to remarks made by my Democratic colleagues and by me, which were prior to the receipt by the Committee on Standards of Conduct of a complaint, but I will not directly respond to them, because I respect the Rules of the House which prohibit statements with respect to conduct that is subject to a pending ethics investigation.

On October 25, the House voted to table a resolution offered by the gentlewoman from New York, Mrs. SLAUGHTER, to request that the Speaker investigate this matter and take appropriate action. Instead, the matter is now pending before the Ethics Committee. The appropriate forum for discussing matters such as whether Chairman MCINTOSH was responsible for ethical violations relating to forged documents can no longer be debated on the House floor. We must await the decision by the Ethics Committee. Therefore, I will not address

remarks by the Republican Members concerning whether the document in question was a "criminal forgery," or whether the apology of Chairman MCINTOSH was timely.

I will address one final matter, which relates to actions taken by the House and is not the subject of the ethics investigation nor relates to the personalities or conduct of the individuals involved. In his remarks on Wednesday, one of my Republican colleagues made the following statement:

I would like to expose some of the inaccuracies expressed last week in speeches given by my Democrat colleagues with regards to this incident. I will give them the benefit of the doubt, and assume that they too were errors . . . it was stated that the motion to table Mrs. SLAUGHTER's resolution was voted down twice—when in fact it was only voted down once by the House.

Actually, it is my Republican colleague who is speaking inaccurately. The motion to table Mrs. SLAUGHTER's resolution was not voted down once, nor was it voted down twice. The motion to table Mrs. SLAUGHTER's resolution was adopted. I had made reference to the fact that the House voted twice to table the resolution. I was referring to both the voice vote, and the recorded vote. At no time did I state, as my Republican colleague erroneously stated, that the House voted down the motion to table.

I would like to return the kind words of my Republican colleague, and I too will give him the benefit of the doubt, and assume that his statement was just an error.

TRIBUTE TO CHIEF ANTHONY L. PADUANO

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 16, 1995

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about the end of an era on the Jersey Shore as our community pays tribute to Chief Anthony L. Paduano of the Neptune Township, NJ, policy department on the occasion of his retirement. Chief Paduano will be honored in a tribute at the Squire's Pub in West Long Branch, NJ, on Friday, November 17, 1995.

Chief Paduano is a life-long resident of Neptune. He was born in the township and attended the local public schools. After serving as a paratrooper in the 11th Airborne Division, he joined the Neptune Police Department in 1961. Throughout his distinguished career, Chief Paduano has moved up the rank from sergeant to captain to deputy chief. He was appointed chief in 1983, commanding the 65-member police department.

The list of Chief Paduano's accomplishments and associations is a long one: He has been involved with the Monmouth County Police Chief's Association, the board of directors of the Monmouth County Police Academy, the New Jersey Traffic Officers Association, the Monmouth County DWI Strike Force, the Monmouth County Prosecutors Advisory Committee, the Neptune Township PBA, Local 74, and the Fraternal Order of Police, Neptune Township, Lodge 19. In all of these endeavors, Chief Paduano has done far more than to just lend his name; he has been a leader, motivating others through his hard work and his solid example—just as he did every day on

the job at the Neptune Police Department. Chief Paduano is also a devoted family man, and it is my pleasure to extend my best wishes to his wife Nancy, their three children and two grandchildren.

It is an honor for me to pay tribute to Chief Paduano on the occasion of his retirement, as well as his having been named the 1995 Man of the Year by the Kiwanis Club of Neptune-Ocean Township. I hope the chief enjoys his retirement, but continues to lend his talents and energy to the betterment of our community.

THE "TOP TEN" REASONS TO SUPPORT THE CLINGER AMENDMENT WHICH WOULD END THE EXPLOITATION OF CIVIL SERVANTS FOR PARTISAN ENDS

HON. STEPHEN HORN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 16, 1995

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this evening I urged the adoption of the Clinger Amendment to the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995—H.R. 2564. That proposal would prohibit the use of taxpayer dollars to develop materials which are "intended to promote public support or opposition to any legislative proposal—including the confirmation of the nomination of a public official or the ratification of a treaty—on which Congressional action is not complete."

We are not trying to stop the appropriate officials from communicating with Congress. We are trying to stop what both Democratic and Republican administrations have done over the last three decades and that is having neutral civil servants ordered to prepare kits, pamphlets, booklets, news releases, and various types of film, radio, and television presentations which are designed for use by various special interest groups. These private groups have a vested interest in preserving in perpetuity a tax-supported federal program.

I have no objection to any group lobbying for a particular program that it finds of some value. I do have an objection when what should be a private effort is supported with public funds. It is just plain wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the following exhibits follow my remarks in order to illustrate this growing problem: First, "Top Ten Reasons To Support Clinger Amendment," second, "VA chief uses computers, pay stubs to bash GOP," third, "VA chief terms 'outrageous' GOP 'cheap politics' charge," and fourth, "Secretary of Veterans Affairs Jesse Brown's Taxpayer Paid Messages."

TOP TEN REASONS TO SUPPORT CLINGER AMENDMENT

1. Department of Veterans Affairs—Employee check stub with message from Secretary Jesse Brown urging opposition to House budget plan.

2. Department of Commerce—Secretary Ron Brown's invitation to associations for an "informational" briefing discussing opposition to Congressman Mica's Commerce legislation.

3. Department of Labor—Newsletter sent to hundreds of organizations leading off with a quote that "GOP lawmakers should stop preaching tax breaks for the rich . . ."

4. National Spa and Pool Institute—Letter to EPA Administrator Carol Browner complaining about receipt of lobbying materials warning of the dire consequences of enacting