

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I may have misunderstood the gentleman from West Virginia, but I heard the gentleman from West Virginia talk about any report from any committee. I do not think he directly attached it to the Ethics Committee. And so, therefore, I cannot understand what this ruling has to do with what the gentleman said.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Any reference to pending proceedings is out of order. The Chair in the course of this morning's activities first ruled on the gentleman from Georgia's point of order when there was a specific reference to the counsel's report, and now the Chair has issued an admonishment reiterating the rule of the House and would invite the gentleman from West Virginia to proceed in order.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

Is the Chair saying that we cannot refer to anything in any committee? That is what I understand the ruling to be. Because the gentleman is talking generically.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is in particular to matters before the Standards Committee dealing with sitting Members. That is the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 20 seconds remaining.

The gentleman from West Virginia will please proceed in order.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, the Speaker himself stated in 1989 the 435 Members of the House should look at all the facts, should have available to them all the reports and all the background documents, and the American people should have the same.

It is clear the Republican leadership today wants to talk about ice buckets, and they do not want to let me talk about whether reports from the Ethics Committee are being put on ice. I think it is a sad day.

THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION AND THE WAR ON DRUGS

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

Ms. GREENE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, let us talk about a real scandal, and that is the Clinton administration's approach to the war on drugs. Ever since President Clinton took office, his cavalier attitude about drug use has had widespread effect across the country. According to a recent administration study, overall drug use by teenagers has nearly doubled in the last 4 years. Marijuana use is up 37 percent, LSD use is up 183 percent, cocaine use is up 166 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I thought the President was supposed to be a role model for children. But when asked on MTV if he had the chance to do it over again would he inhale, the President replied, sure, if I could, I tried before.

Mr. Speaker, this is the wrong message for our children. The Clinton administration has dropped the ball on taking the war on drugs seriously, causing untold suffering, pain, and even death for our children and their families. To the people on the other side of Pennsylvania Avenue, it all seems to be a game, a game where the only response is, do whatever you want.

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

(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, in an editorial yesterday, the New York Times said, the House Ethics Committee, quote, "seems determined to sacrifice whatever little is left of its credibility by letting Congress adjourn without resolving any of the pending ethics complaints against Speaker NEWT GINGRICH."

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia will suspend.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania will state his point of order.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia is engaging in debate which is outside the rules of the House and should be admonished by the Chair.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia is merely reading from a New York newspaper.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri will suspend.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania is correct. Consistent with prior rulings, the gentleman from Georgia is advised to proceed in order.

Does the gentleman from Missouri wish to be recognized?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VOLKMER. Is the Chair now telling us that if there has been a periodical published, that in regard to the Ethics Committee, that we cannot comment on it? Or cannot read from it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Newspaper accounts detailing a pending investigation before the Standards Committee not yet brought to the floor of the House come under the same restrictions as the Member's own words. That has been the basis of the rulings of the Chair, yes, sir.

Mr. VOLKMER. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

In other words, you are saying, under your ruling, every Member of this House is gagged as far as commenting on a report from the Ethics Committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Precedents have long held that to be the

standard, that is correct. That is the ruling of the Chair.

The gentleman from Georgia may proceed in order.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I can clearly understand that the gentlemen from Pennsylvania and Georgia desire to silence us on this issue, but this issue will not go away.

Mr. Speaker, if I might continue.

The outside counsel, James Cole, has submitted an extensive report on his 9-month investigation of Speaker GINGRICH.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia will suspend.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania will state his point of order.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia continues to proceed out of order, and the Chair should require that the gentleman observe the regular order of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia must either proceed in regular order or be seated.

Mr. VOLKMER. Did the Chair rule that the gentleman's words were not in order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct. The gentleman continues to refer to a pending investigation before the Standards Committee.

Mr. VOLKMER. He merely stated that a report had been filed with the Ethics Committee. He did not mention any action of the Ethics Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is the Chair's opinion and ruling that that is part of the prohibited debate.

The gentleman from Georgia is invited to proceed in regular order.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, let me just say, enough is enough.

Mr. Speaker, if the Ethics Committee will not act, the American people have a right to judge for themselves.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia continues to proceed out of order in the House. The gentleman is not following the Chair's admonishment that Members have an obligation to the House and to the institution to proceed in order.

The point of order is that the gentleman is out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is again sustained, and the gentleman from Georgia is again advised to please proceed in regular order or be seated.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Ethics Committee has a responsibility and a moral obligation to release the outside counsel's report.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia will suspend.

The other gentleman from Georgia will state his point of order.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth time that the gentleman has referred to matters on the floor that

were in the Ethics Committee and ignored the admonition of the Chair. Maybe it is perhaps time for him to be seated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's point of order for the fourth time is sustained and correct and the other gentleman from Georgia is again invited to proceed in regular order.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, if the committee refuses to release the report, the American people can only assume a coverup of massive proportions.

Release this report. Release it now, Mr. Speaker.

UPHOLD THE RULES OF THE HOUSE

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, it is disappointing to watch this institution rip itself apart in the way that is happening here today. The fact is that every Member of this institution has an obligation to the rules of the institution. It is entirely legitimate for Members to engage in very tough debate, but they should do it within the rules. That is very hard when we all feel very emotional about some of these issues and we feel as though the politics of the moment demands that we step beyond what is required of us as House Members.

Mr. Speaker, I thought we all swore a duty to the Constitution of the United States. I thought that that is what this institution is supposed to be all about. The fact is that what we are witnessing this morning is people who put politics above that oath. That is a disappointment. It should never happen on this floor. It is obvious that, despite any kind of ruling of the Chair, Members are going to proceed because they think it is politically feasible for them to do so.

WHEN IS A REPORT A REPORT?

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I was prepared to speak on another matter, but I think I am prepared now to speak that in this body, Members have a right to speak. And if we cannot speak on the House floor, when we cannot mention words like report and what has happened to this country when one side is gagged because the other side has more votes than this side, I must ask, Mr. Speaker, when is a report a report?

When a gentlewoman from Connecticut discusses it with the majority leader, is it then a report? When later that day the majority leader says, oh, no, there is no report, then it is not a report? When the American taxpayers pay a half million dollars and then get 100 pages back, is that a report?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan will suspend.

The gentleman from Georgia will state his point of order.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is referring to matters again before the Standards Committee and the Speaker has ruled again and again that that is out of order. The gentleman should either continue in order or sit down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is well taken. To the extent that the gentleman from Michigan refers to a pending matter before the Standards Committee, he is asked to refrain from those observations and proceed in order.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I have listened very carefully to the gentleman from Michigan. Very, very carefully. Never once was the word Ethics Committee mentioned or Official Standards mentioned. Only a generic statement as to meetings between a gentlewoman, whom he did not identify the gentlewoman from Connecticut, and he only said the gentlewoman from Connecticut talked to the gentleman from Texas.

If you want to assume that he is talking about the Ethics Committee, you can do that. But that is what it is, an assumption. He never once mentioned it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In response to the gentleman from Missouri, the Chair determined the gentleman from Michigan's remarks to refer to the chairman of the committee, and, hence, the ruling.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry, he is engaging in debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan may proceed in order on his 1-minute address.

Mr. STUPAK. I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has ruled. The gentleman may either make a point of order or proceed in order.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a point of order.

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

□ 1030

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I have talked about 100 pages that cost the taxpayers half a million dollars. I have asked when is a report a report? I have asked when a Member from Connecticut discusses it with the majority leader is it a report? I have asked when the majority leader then denies there is not a report, then is it a report? And, based upon that, according to the gen-

tleman who made the objection and the ruling from the Chair, there is a report, if I reach your conclusions correctly.

So if there is a report, then why do you know there is a report, why do the people over here know there is a report, and none of us know there is a report? So if there is a report, why do we not just release the report?

That is my point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman fails to state a point of order. The Chair, however, has not ruled that there is a report. The Chair has ruled it is improper during the course of 1-minute discussions to discuss a pending investigation before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

The gentleman is invited to proceed in order on the balance of his time.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, since you have reached the conclusion that there is a report, let me then go back to what Speaker GINGRICH said in 1989, and I quote: The Speaker said: "435 Members of the House should look at all the facts, should have available to them all the reports and all the background documents, and the American people should have the same."

Mr. Speaker, since you have concluded there is a report, please release the report.

A WOLF IN SHEEP'S CLOTHING

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

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Speaker, some say that it is tough for normal, hard-working Americans to tell one political party from another. However, if you are out there looking to hang your hat on a defining issue separating the two major parties, look no further than taxes.

The Democrats' view of the economy could be summed up in a few short phrases, according to Ronald Reagan: If it moves, tax it; if it keeps moving, regulate it; and if it stops moving, subsidize it.

We believe that we need less Government and lower taxes. We need to let people keep more of what they earn and save, and we need to let people make their own decisions how they spend their money, not the Government.

Keep this in mind when you examine President Clinton's latest tax proposal: Initially it appears to be Republican, but upon closer examination, the tax cuts are temporary, while the tax increases are permanent, totaling \$63 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I think we all remember that story about the wolf in sheep's clothing.

RELEASE REPORT BY OUTSIDE COUNSEL

(Ms. DeLAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1