

Thompson	Velázquez	Waxman
Thornton	Vento	Williams
Thurman	Visclosky	Wise
Torricelli	Volkmer	Woolsey
Towns	Ward	Wyden
Traficant	Waters	
Tucker	Watt (NC)	

NOT VOTING—40

Ackerman	Gutknecht	Reynolds
Andrews (NJ)	Hayes	Ros-Lehtinen
Becerra	Hyde	Rose
Berman	Kennedy (MA)	Salmon
Chapman	Kennedy (RI)	Seastrand
Collins (MI)	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
de la Garza	Lincoln	Smith (TX)
Deutsch	McHugh	Torres
Dixon	McNulty	Wilson
Flake	Metcalfe	Wynn
Gekas	Murtha	Yates
Geren	Nussle	Young (FL)
Gingrich	Pelosi	
Gutierrez	Quillen	

□ 1157

So the motion to strike the words was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESPONSE OF MEMBER FOLLOWING THE VOTE

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, may I be recognized?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Without objection, the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK] may proceed in order.

(There was no objection.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have reviewed my statement carefully. I do not see anything in my statement that should be so objectionable and obnoxious. I have been elected to this House to speak the truth. There is nothing in the rules that says "CARRIE MEEK can't speak the truth," and that is what I have done.

And, Mr. Speaker, I respect my Republican colleagues who have spoken the truth as they saw it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK] has expired.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

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

Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is based upon the Speaker's recent ruling and the action by this Chair and by this body. The question I have may involve several Members about to speak.

Is the Speaker entitled to a higher level of avoidance than other Members? That seems to be the issue raised in the Speaker's response on this.

Mr. DELAY. Regular order, Mr. speaker.

Mr. WISE. Does the body refrain from raising certain questions about the Speaker that it could raise about other Members in the Chamber?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All Members are entitled to have no per-

sonal references made about them when that question is brought up.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, continuing my parliamentary inquiry, then the Speaker is not entitled to any higher standard than any other Member in regard to personal references, is that correct, or any lower standard?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has already ruled, but the Speaker as a Member and as presiding officer is entitled to the respect of all Members.

Mr. WISE. But what about the Speaker? Is the Speaker as Speaker entitled to any different level of attention or respect than any other Member in the Chamber?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker is entitled to respect.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] is seeking recognition.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, this goes directly to the issue. Can any questions be raised about the personal financial dealings by the Speaker that have been reported in the public media?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has ruled and the House has supported the Chair's ruling on the point of order from this side.

Mr. WISE. Is it the Chair's position that no questions can be raised about the Speaker's personal financial dealings?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are proper channels in the House for questioning the conduct of Members, including the Speaker.

Mr. WISE. If there is not an ethics investigation pending—

Mr. DELAY. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WISE. With a privileged resolution or an ethics resolution not pending, is it appropriate to question any of the financial dealings of the Speaker in the context of 1-minute speeches or other activities?

Mr. DELAY. Regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is entertaining a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WISE. I will restate it if the Chair wishes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Simply put, in debate references personally to the Speaker are not in order.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, if I may be recognized, is it a parliamentary procedure in this House that when Members call for regular order, the Speaker is to rule and go to regular order, particularly in light of the fact that a Member is not stating a proper parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman should know in deference to him that the Chair was entertaining a parliamentary inquiry that was proper, and the Chair was answering.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] is now recognized for 1 minute.

THOUGHTS ON A NEGATIVE APPROACH

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LINDER. Regular order, Mr. Speaker. I have been recognized in the well of the House. Do I have the floor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, sometime just before the campaigns got in earnest, a former majority whip of this House, Tony Coelho, was brought in to help the Democrats win. He said this:

Ideas are not the issue. Candidates can't get reelected if they run on who they are and what they stand for. They have to go in and put negative ads out. The only way you can win races today is with negative advertising.

It seems to me that the minority has decided to continue the campaign and absent an ability to compete with the Speaker's ideas, they have chosen to tear down the Speaker personally. There are far more things to be done in this House than to make personal attacks. I do not recall—

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LINDER. Do I have the floor, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, I do not recall these questions being raised about a former Member of the Senate—

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman suspend, and will the gentleman from Massachusetts state his point of order?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Tentatively as to the Chair's ruling, the gentleman is impugning the motives of Members of this House. The gentleman at the microphone has just said he has imputed inappropriate motives to things that have been said, but the tenor of the Chair's ruling is that no personal references to other Members ought to be allowed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). The Chair will state that the gentleman from Georgia has not made a personal reference to any one Member. The gentleman from Georgia may continue.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to further ask if any of these ethical questions were raised about the book, "Earth in the Balance," which yielded a \$100,000 advance to its author, a former Member of the other body, and \$670,000 in royalties. Where were the questions of impropriety there?

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me these questions are very selective.