

the CAREERS bill, which may be one of the most important pieces of legislation that comes before the House in this session, I would like to just call your attention to one area.

There are those who are working diligently to keep the monopoly that the State voc rehab people now have and enjoy that is totally opposite of what the disability community wants.

So I would hope, when you listen today, you will think about what we have received in a letter from ARC, which is formally known as the Association for Retarded Citizens of the United States. This is what they say:

To delink the vocational rehabilitation system from this new system in careers will only serve to isolate the VR system and people with mental retardation from employers. No one would gain except those professionals in the voc rehab system whose agenda is to protect turf. We do not think that is what reform is all about.

#### THE AMERICAN PEOPLE DESERVE AN INVESTIGATION, NOT A WHITEWASH

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, after months of stonewalling, Republicans on the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct have reportedly agreed to appoint an outside counsel to investigate the allegations against Speaker NEWT GINGRICH. That is the good news. The bad news is Republicans on the committee now want to limit the scope of that investigation. In other words, they want to hire an outside counsel, but then they want to tie his or her hands.

In 1988, when another Ethics Committee investigation into another Speaker, considered doing the same thing, here is what NEWT GINGRICH had to say:

The American public, deserve an investigation which will uncover the truth. At this moment, I am afraid that the apparent restrictions placed on this special counsel will not allow the truth to be uncovered.

Let us hold the investigation of Speaker GINGRICH to the standards he himself set. Appoint an independent outside counsel. The American people deserve an investigation, not a white-wash.

#### POINT OF ORDER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is speaking out of order and discussing a matter that is currently before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] is

correct. Members should not refer to issues pending before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

#### FOLLOW THE SAME RULES MR. GINGRICH ASKED FOR BACK IN 1988

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, today's New York Times reports that the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has finally decided to appoint an outside counsel to investigate Speaker GINGRICH. In 1988, Mr. GINGRICH himself offered some advice on how much authority outside counsel should have.

#### POINT OF ORDER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. EHLERS. My point of order is that the Member is proceeding to discuss a matter pending before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and that is out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members shall refrain from discussing issues pending before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to be heard on a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] will state her point of order.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1995, Speaker GINGRICH announced a new policy concerning speech on the House floor. Let me quote directly from his announcement:

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.

My point of order is: Does this new policy apply in this case?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair informs the gentlewoman from Connecticut that the Chair has properly related the rules of the House as interpreted from the Chair.

Ms. DELAURO. So that the rules of the House have changed since 1988 when the Speaker at that time was able to make his comments?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The rules of the House have not changed. The rules of the House are being enforced.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the rules of the House in 1988 allowed the then Mr. GINGRICH to make his comment about an investigation before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. Have the rules of the House now changed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not aware of any point of order at that time. The rule is currently being enforced in response to a point of order.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] may proceed in order.

Mr. BONIOR. Let me then, Mr. Speaker, refer, if I might, to the his-

tory going back to 1988 and the then-Member from the State of Georgia, Mr. GINGRICH, offering advice on how much authority an outside counsel should have.

He wrote,

The outside counsel should have full authority to investigate and present evidence and arguments before the ethics committee concerning the question arising out of the activities of (at that time) Speaker Wright. It should have full authority to organize and hire staff. It should have full authority to review all documentary evidence available from any source and have full cooperation from the committee. The committee shall give the outside counsel full cooperation in the issuance of subpoenas.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues and this Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to follow the same rules that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] has asked back in 1988.

#### IT IS ABOUT TIME

(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, news reports today suggest that the House Ethics Committee, composed of five Republicans and five Democrats, has concluded they must hire an outside counsel to investigate Speaker GINGRICH. All I can say is, it's about time.

Now, however, there are those who would limit the scope of the outside counsel's investigation, tying his or her hands.

#### POINT OF ORDER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] will state his point of order.

Mr. EHLERS. Once again, Mr. Speaker, I rise to make the point of order that the gentleman has mentioned a case pending before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and it is not in order to make those comments.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, tell me why I am being muzzled. Tell me why there is a conspiracy to silence me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will ask the gentleman to refrain from references to issues pending before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. That is the precedent and the rule of the House.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BONIOR. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, the question I pose to the Chair to help clarify this so we can have a legitimate and coherent debate on this issue, if in fact it is relevant; the question I pose to the distinguished Speaker this morning is: Is it in fact all right for Members to

address something that occurred back in 1988 with respect to the actions of a Member of this House with regard to the scope and inquiry of one of its committees?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members may not refer to the current ethical standing of other Members of this House.

Mr. BONIOR. So, further requesting a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, if we are talking about something that occurred back in 1988, that obviously is not current, and the gentleman from Georgia would be in order to talk about what was suggested by Speaker GINGRICH back in 1988.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Unless it is in reference to an ethical situation of a Member that is still in the House.

Mr. BONIOR. That Member certainly is not in the House at this point, so I would assume from that answer, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] would be within the bounds of the Chair's ruling to discuss the comments made in 1988 by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has already ruled that the Members shall refrain from addressing any issue that is pending before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct relating to, a current Member of this Congress.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] may proceed on order.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Let me quote what Speaker GINGRICH said in 1988 about the investigation of Speaker Wright:

I am concerned that the scope, authority and independence of the special counsel will be limited by the guidelines the Ethics Committee has established.

Gingrich went on—

The House of Representatives, as well as the American public, deserve an investigation which will uncover the truth. At this moment, I am afraid that the apparent restrictions placed on this special counsel will not allow the truth to be uncovered.

Speaker GINGRICH was right then, and the same rules should apply today. Let the special counsel uncover the truth. If the Speaker has nothing to hide, do not limit the scope of the special counsel's investigation.

#### HURTFUL COMMENTS

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, just this past weekend, the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], made some very hurtful and intemperate remarks about New York, New York City and New York State, for which he has apologized, but frankly the hurt is still there.

The Speaker said that New York was "a culture of waste for which they expect us to send a check and that this country is not going to bail out habits that have made New York so extraordinarily expensive."

I want to say to the Speaker that New York City and New York State for many, many years has been sending the Federal Government much more than it is getting back; in fact, to the tune of \$9 billion. New York sends and New York State sends to the Government much more than it gets back.

The State of Georgia, quite frankly, sends \$1 billion less than it gets, \$1 billion less than it gets. So Georgia is a net gain in terms of Federal largess and New York is a net loser. In fact, in the Speaker's district, that district has received more pork frankly than any other district.

Let me just say we should be very careful before we make such hurtful statements, and let me say the Speaker is now in New York raising money. If he detests us so, he ought not to do that, and I hope his budget would change and that New York would get some more help.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1617, CAREERS ACT

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 222 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 222

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1617) to consolidate and reform workforce development and literacy programs, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment recommended by the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 2332. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered by title rather than by section. The first six sections and each title shall be considered as read. Points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with clause 5(a) of rule XXI or section 302(f) or 401(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. Before consideration of any other amendment it shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Goodling or his designee. That amendment shall be considered as read, may amend the portions of the bill not yet read for amendment, shall be debatable for ten minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against that amendment are waived. After disposition of that amendment, the

provisions of the bill as then perfected shall be considered as original text. During further consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1030

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 222 is the rule for the consideration of H.R. 1617, the Consolidated and Reformed Education, Employment, and Rehabilitation Systems Act, better known as the CAREERS Act.

This is an open rule. It provides for 1 hour of general debate, to be divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities. After general debate, the bill will be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The bill will be considered by title. The first six sections in each title now printed in the bill shall be considered as read. The rule provides priority recognition for Members who have preprinted their amendments. Finally, the rule provides for a motion to recommit with instructions.

This bill will consolidate more than 150 existing separate, duplicative and fragmented education and job training programs into four consolidated grants to the States. It represents a dramatic improvement over current law not only by consolidating so many different programs but also by providing States and local communities with greater opportunity and flexibility to design programs to meet the needs of their citizens, rather than the needs of the Federal Government.

This bill will also turn two Government sponsored enterprises "Sallie Mae"—the Student Loan Marketing Association—and "Connie Lee"—the College Construction Loan Insurance Association—entirely over to the private sector. And last, but certainly not least, this bill reduces the Federal deficit by cutting bureaucracy and waste, saving \$6.5 billion over 5 years with no disruption of service to individuals.

This rule provides for full, fair, and open debate and is brought up under an