

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