

REPUBLICANS SEEK COMMON-SENSE REFORMS IN GOVERNMENT AND A BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, let me say this to my friend from New Jersey. If he truly believes that information, which obviously his speech writer was inhaling when he wrote, then I would like to challenge him here and now for a debate on the environment on the House floor.

Usually during special hours when the Democrats have the floor, they do not yield to Republicans. I will do it on my own hour to debate such outrageous fantasy about cuts in the environment.

The fact is we have a \$5 trillion debt. The Republican Party is trying to put sanity and commonsense reforms both in environmental legislation and in all government legislation.

I think it is very important to cut out the rhetoric and get back to the fact that the children in America, a baby born today, owes \$187,000 over the next 75 years just in interest on the national debt.

It is time for the Democratic Party to quit hiding its head inside the sand, quit coming out with the partisan demagoguery and face the real problem of trying to balance the budget and have commonsense reforms in government. I hope my friend will debate me.

RISING IMPORTS, DWARFING U.S. EXPORTS MEAN LOST U.S. JOBS AND SINKING WAGES

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, there is an economic wind blowing across our Nation that has thus far failed to capture the attention of the leading Presidential candidates, and I am specifically referring to lost U.S. jobs and sinking wages eroded by rising imports dwarfing U.S. exports.

The latest Commerce Department figures show that for midsummer we had the highest trade deficits in over a decade. Over \$11.7 billion for the last month. The trade deficit with Japan, up 33 percent. Car parts, imported cars from Japan far dwarfing our exports. Trade deficit with China, up 15 percent. Imported clothing, imported shoes, imported textiles, meaning more lost jobs in this country.

Our dependence on oil continues to grow as we see U.S. troops being sent to Kuwait rather than energy resources developed here at home.

I am glad somebody notices. The Philadelphia Inquirer from September 8 through 22 is running an incredible series: "America: Who Stole the Dream?" Please read it. People in America somewhere are noticing, even if the Presidential candidates are not.

MOST PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTIONS ARE ELECTIVE

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

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it has been widely reported that partial-birth abortions are extremely rare. Pro-abortion groups claim there are no more than 500 partial-birth abortions per year, and they are only performed in extreme circumstances, such as when the child is severely deformed or the mother is in grave danger.

These myths are finally being dispelled. The Record newspaper reported that a single abortion clinic in New Jersey performs 1,500 partial-birth abortions each year. One doctor was quoted as saying that "only a minuscule amount" of partial-birth abortions are performed for medical reasons.

The Washington Post also reported yesterday that most partial-birth abortions performed are elective. I quote: "[T]he 'typical' patients tend to be young, low-income women * * * whose reasons for waiting so long to end their pregnancies are rarely medical."

The evidence is overwhelming: the vast majority of partial-birth abortions are elective. I ask you, how long will we continue to allow children in this country to be partially delivered and then killed?

IT IS STILL THE SAME IN D.C.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to cut the budget, the GAO called the OMB, the CBO, the RTC, the NSC, the ITC, the GSA, and the IRS, and they had no success. So the GAO then called the DOD, the DOE, the DOT, and the DDT, and they could find no cuts. So the GAO then called the CIA, the DIA, the OSI, the PCB's, and the PCP's, and they could find no cuts. So, then they called OSI, ORI, and IUD and could find no cuts. And finally, so frustrated, they called the PMS, and there were no cuts to be made.

So they decided there should be a whole new program called the Accounting Selection System, hereafter to be known as A-S-S, which only goes to show us, when it comes to bureaucrats and cuts, it is still the same in Washington, DC. It is called the B.S. in D.C.

And with that, I yield back the B-O-M-T.

THE TAX-AND-SPEND DEMOCRATS

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, the ultra liberal Clinton administration is at it again. Yesterday Interior Sec-

retary Bruce Babbitt endorsed a plan to tax anything and everything having to do with enjoyment of the great outdoors.

This plan would impose a 5-percent tax on, and, mind you, this is just a partial list, backpacks, camping stoves, canoes, canteens, climbing equipment, flotation vests, also hiking boots, mountain bikes, outdoor sleeping mats, ski equipment, sleeping bags, tests, paddles, binoculars, cameras, film, books on bird identification, and audio tapes of wildlife calls.

Mr. Speaker, this is just a glimpse, a reminder, of what the tax and spend liberal Democrats would do if returned to power next year. They just refuse to acknowledge that what the American people want is fewer taxes, not higher taxes.

EDUCATION FUNDING

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this September a record number of children entered elementary and secondary schools across this country. Every one of them should be concerned about what the House Republicans did with respect to education. Although we have never had so many children in our schools, House Republicans cut funding for elementary and secondary education by \$400 million.

In subcommittee I offered an amendment to add \$2.1 billion to Head Start and education. It was defeated on a party-line vote. On the floor, House Democrats offered an amendment to add these desperately needed funds. It was defeated on a party line vote.

But yesterday, the Senate voted to add \$2.3 billion to educate America's children. I hope that House Republicans have done their homework and will support this very important addition for America's children and America's families.

THE PRESIDENT AND THE RICH

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, if you had \$25,000, you could have spent last Friday evening with Bill Clinton, Hillary Clinton, and Barbra Streisand. Where else but in Hollywood can Bill escape the nagging problems of the average American, like the increasing drug use among teens, in order to rub elbows with his rich and famous pals?

That is \$25,000. Can you believe it? Mr. Speaker, the average American family of four working people with an annual income of about \$30,000 a year would have had to fork over almost all of their paycheck for an entire year just to have dinner with Bill and Hillary Clinton.

We had a great President from Hollywood, Ronald Reagan. Now we have a

President that acts like Hollywood. Mr. Speaker, it is time for the President to pay attention to the concerns of average Americans, not the labor bosses, not the Hollywood pals who make millions of dollars each year. It is time to make America better. It is time for a real American hero, Bob Dole.

□ 1015

DO NOT PUT THE OUTSIDE
COUNSEL'S REPORT ON ICE

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, once again I rise to call on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to do the right thing, to release the outside counsel's report on Speaker NEWT GINGRICH.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LINDER, Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, several days in a row the gentleman from Georgia has risen on the floor of the House to address matters that are inappropriate, because the rules of the House specifically prohibit speaking of matters before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

The gentleman does not seem to get that point. And on each occasion that I have raised this point of order, the Speaker has agreed with me. I would like the Speaker to make a ruling on this matter today.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker. If the gentleman is familiar with the rules, he should know that the customary way to object is to ask that the Member's words be taken down.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I have a right to make a point of order at any time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule on the gentleman's point of order. The Chair will repeat the admonitions of the Chair from September 12, 1996, and September 17, 1996.

It is an essential rule of decorum in debates that Members should refrain from references in debate to the conduct of other Members, where such conduct is not the question actually pending before the House, by way of a report from the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct or by way of another question of the privileges of the House. This principle is documented on pages 168 and 526 of the House Rules and Manual and reflects the consistent rulings of the Chair in this and in prior Congresses and applies to 1-minute and special-order speeches.

Neither the filing of a complaint before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, nor the publication in another form of charges that are personally critical to another Member justify the references to such charges on the floor of the House. This includes references to the motivations of Members who file complaints and to members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

Clause 1 of rule XIV is a prohibition against engaging in personality in debate. It derives from article 1, section 5 of the Constitution, which authorizes each House to make its own rules and to punish its Members for disorderly behavior, and has been part of the rules of the House in some relevant form since 1789. This rule supersedes any claim of a Member to be free from questioning in any other place.

On January 27, 1909, the House adopted a report that stated the following:

It is the duty of the House to require its Members in speech or debate to preserve that proper restraint which will permit the House to conduct its business in an orderly manner and without unnecessarily and unduly exciting animosity among his Members.

This is Cannon's Precedents, volume 8, at section 2497. This report was in response to improper references in debate to the President, but clearly reiterated a principle that all occupants of the Chair in this and in prior Congresses have held to be equally applicable to Members' remarks in debate toward each other.

The Chair asks and expects the cooperation of all Members in maintaining a level of decorum that properly dignifies the proceedings of the House.

So the Chair would request that the gentleman proceed in order.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the outside counsel, James Cole, has prepared an extensive 100-page report on the Speaker's ethical violation. The American people deserve the right to know what is in that report.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, it is entirely possible that the gentleman in the well did not hear you, or it is entirely possible that the gentleman in the well does not know what the rules are. But I think you just ruled that he was speaking out of order, and I would like to have the Chair readdress his addressing matters before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker? Let me say to my—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair sustains the point of order from the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. LINDER, and asks the other Member from Georgia, Mr. LEWIS, to please keep his remarks in order.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] appears to me to try to make a point of order and only on the point of order to silence the other gentleman from Georgia by having the Chair not only rule the gentleman out of order, but to perhaps even make the gentleman sit down.

I would like to know, is the Chair aware of any example in the entire history of this House of Representatives where the Speaker has unilaterally silenced a Member before his time has expired on his 1-minute without the consent of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On September 12 and on September 17 of this year, the Chair sustained points of order against Members who repeatedly made references in debate to a matter pending before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

On those occasions, the Chair indicated that pursuant to the rule such Members could be required to take their seats where they declined to proceed in order at the directive of the Chair after points of order had been sustained against the references while demanding that an offending Member be seated is normally insisted upon only where there is a formal demand that the words be taken down pending disposition that the words be taken down. Pending disposition of the matter by the Chair and by the House, it is within the Chair's authority under rule I and rule XIV to deny that Member further recognition as a disposition of the question of order, subject to the will of the House on the question of proceeding in order.

A Member's comportment in the face of repeated admonitions by the Chair to proceed in order has itself been the subject of a ruling of the Chair that the Member may not be recognized to proceed unless permitted to do so by the House. That is cited on page 319 of the manual. Once a Member has been recognized and has the floor, rule I and rule XIV permit the Chair to respond to repeated points of order while permitting the House to determine the propriety of the Chair's rulings and its willingness to permit the Member to proceed in order.

Thus, if the Chair were to direct that an offending Member be denied the floor for the duration of the time for which he was recognized, he would do so in the context of a ruling that would permit the House to determine whether the Member should proceed in order.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, it appears from your ruling, one, that there is no precedent in this House prior to this Congress of the action that you said is appropriate for the Speaker. That is No. 1. I asked if there was any precedent; the only precedent you have