

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, there are only 15 days left before this Congress adjourns, and, with so little time left, it is critically important that the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct immediately release the 100-page report by the outside counsel probing the dealings of Speaker NEWT GINGRICH.

POINTS OF ORDER

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Connecticut is referring directly to matters before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct. The gentlewoman is directed to continue in order.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to heed the words of Speaker GINGRICH in 1989, and I quote: "I think it is vital that we establish as a Congress our commitment to publish that report," making reference to the report against Speaker Jim Wright at the time, "and to release those documents, so the country can judge whether or not the man second in line to be President of the United States of America, the Speaker of the House, should be in that position."

Stop the coverup. Release the report.

Further in 1989, Speaker GINGRICH said—

POINT OF ORDER

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

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to enforce the rules of this House, because each of these Members has found ways to go back to the references to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, when they should be called out of order and asked to sit down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has repeatedly asked Members to respect the rules of the House and rulings of the Chair. There are opportunities available to the Chair to enforce the rules of the House. The appropriate manner in which to enforce it at this moment in time is a point of order made by another Member.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, is the Speaker ruling that the comments made by Speaker GINGRICH in March 1989 are inappropriate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has not ruled on the historical references made by this Speaker or the previous Speaker. The Chair is ruling that the observations concerning the pending matter, the matter pending be-

fore the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, should not be brought to the floor of the House.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentlewoman was quoting the Speaker of the House from March 1989.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. With all due respect, in the hearing of the Chair, the gentlewoman went beyond that and inserted in the middle of her historical reference another reference.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Connecticut was going to comment upon a 1990 statement made concerning a past case. Is the Speaker saying that is improper for her to do that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Once again, the Chair has not stated nor made any ruling in reference to the historical observations made by this speaker. It was relative to other observations made by the speaker.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, it would then be relevant for the speaker to comment on a 1990 Member without objection?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is doing its best to be clairvoyant, but the Chair will make its ruling when matters occur, and not in anticipation of speech.

Mr. STUPAK. I heard 1990. I just did not want another comment about something in anticipation, so the gentlewoman can at least finish her statement, in all due respect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed in order.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, a further historical, further perspective. I quote from Congressman GINGRICH at the time in 1989: "The 435 Members of the House should look at all of the facts, should have available to them all of the reports and all of the background documents, and the American people should have the same."

Indeed, the American people are owed the same. Release the report.

RESPECT RIGHTS OF COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, the tactics being employed on the floor today I think are extremely unfortunate. All 435 Members of this House know that the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is made up in a bipartisan way, the only such committee of the Congress, where there are equal numbers of Democrats and Republicans. These 10 Members serve on this committee for the benefit of all of us, and there is not one Member that does not understand that they have a very, very difficult job.

We also know that over the years this committee, under difficult cir-

cumstances, has always done its job, and they have done it in a bipartisan way. The committee continues to work in such a fashion, and we ought to respect the 10 Members, 5 Democrats and 5 Republicans, who are on this committee, respect the work they do on behalf of the institution, and on behalf of each and every one of us, who at some point in time or another have been subject to such allegations.

Please respect their rights.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE ON COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, "I have a number of concerns regarding the Ethics Committee's contract and instructions to the special counsel.

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

"The committee shall give the special counsel full cooperation in the issuance of subpoenas."

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is not adhering to the rulings of the House again with respect to speaking on the floor regarding matters before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, if I may be heard on the point of order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will hear the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the words I have uttered up until the time I was interrupted are not my words. They are in fact the words of Speaker GINGRICH on July 28, 1988, in a letter from Speaker GINGRICH to the Honorable JULIAN DIXON, the former Chair of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this is proper.

If I can continue to be heard on the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am not speaking to a matter that is currently before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. I am speaking to a matter that was before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in 1988, where the question was raised at that time as to whether or not that committee had, one, limited the scope of inquiry by the special counsel, where the question was raised as to the contract between the special counsel and the committee, and whether or not the committee was—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will kindly suspend. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have not been heard on the point of order. I have a right to be heard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is acceding to the gentleman from California's points. The gentleman may proceed in that context.

Mr. MILLER of California. I only wanted you to do that after I presented the evidence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has ruled. The gentleman may proceed in order, with his 1-minute time limitation.

Mr. MILLER of California. Further, "The committee shall give the outside counsel full cooperation in the issuance of subpoenas.

"The outside counsel shall be free, after discussions with the Committee, to make such public statements and reports the counsel deems appropriate.

"The outside counsel shall have full authority to recommend what formal charges be brought before the Ethics Committee.

"The committee shall not countermand or interfere with the outside counsel's ability to take steps necessary to conduct a full and fair investigation."

The Speaker went on to say it was his impression from the press reports that "the Ethics Committee has specifically failed to meet the test that was set forth by Common Cause."

He says, "I would therefore like a copy of the resolution, the guidelines adopted by the Ethics Committee outlining the authority the committee has given the special counsel in order to carry out the responsibilities of the outside counsel."

Mr. Speaker, if it was good in 1988 for Speaker Wright, then it is good today for Speaker GINGRICH.

AMERICA CANNOT AFFORD DOLE'S MASSIVE TAX CUTS

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

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago a Republican President told the city of New York and, by extension, all American cities to drop dead. Now with Bob Dole, the Republicans are planning the funeral. It just takes simple arithmetic to know that his plan to cut taxes by \$550 billion just does not add up, especially for urban America.

Bob Dole says he would not put forward such a plan if it would mean massive cuts in Medicare and would hurt Social Security. He told a group of veterans last month he would not cut their programs. He also said he would increase defense spending. But he still says he can do all of this and balance the budget by 2002.

Now, this is not pie in the sky; this is a whole bakery in the sky. But for cities the big question is what is left to cut? The answer is programs that are

helping urban America, programs that are helping working families, cuts in Medicare, education, and health and environment.

But urban Americans just cannot afford Bob Dole's bakery in the sky. The difference between Bob Dole and Bill Clinton could not be more stark.

DEBATE SHOULD NOT BE STIFLED IN THE HOUSE

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

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I love this House of Representatives. I love what it stands for. And when there is a shadow cast upon the Speaker of the House of Representatives, there is a shadow cast upon this institution, there is a shadow cast upon the democracy that this institution represents.

As a reporter, I will tell you that many times I have seen myself in a position where I have been threatened by someone who was in authority, who did not want me to bring forward a certain news story, bring forth certain facts. But never in my life did I imagine it would be when I would leave the job of being a reporter and come to be an elected official on the floor, that my colleagues would say let us stifle the debate. Let us not talk about it. Let us not remove the shadow that hangs over the head of the Speaker and this House and this Nation by allowing sunlight to shine upon it. Let us stifle the people.

It was when the Democrats were running the House that then Congressman GINGRICH was allowed to say I think it is vital that we establish as a Congress our commitment to publish the report to release those documents so that the country can judge. Today the country cannot judge, Mr. Speaker.

A GOVERNMENT OF LAWS, NOT OF MEN

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, these 1-minutes opened with the Speaker talking about an ice bucket, and then we went to the gentleman from California talking about historically how this House was dealt with every single issue dealing with conduct, no matter who the Member was, that we treated ourselves as a group that abided by laws, because that is the tradition of our country, a government of laws and not of men.

But the one thing we have not seen and that we have now seen today is the Speaker forgot to tell us his recipe for ice, and that is to take anything that deals with him, add water, and freeze it, and you never let it come out.

□ 1045

Today free speech has been frozen on the House floor. I never thought I could

live to see that day. We have now had a ruling today that newspapers can discuss these issues, editorial boards can discuss these issues, but the Members of this body who are most affected are gagged and frozen.

URGING SUPPORT OF H.R. 4066, EMERGENCY DISASTER ASSISTANCE SUPPLEMENTARY APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I had not planned to speak on this issue, but what I would say is it is unfortunate we would want to use a rule to stifle an opportunity to have full discussion and we should find ways, whether we like what is going to come out on any given thing, to be able to discuss things with a certain amount of civility.

What I do want to say, to use the rest of my 1 minute, is that America has been struck by hurricanes and hurricanes, and certainly we are aware of the devastation that Fran has brought more than five States throughout this country, and the oncoming of other hurricanes is very present with us.

More than 800,000 people in my State were without electricity and water and now some one-third of them still remain without electricity or water. More than 26 people have lost their lives in this hurricane.

Yesterday, many of us introduced into the House a bill, H.R. 4066, an Emergency Disaster Assistance Supplementary Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1996. I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support that for the life and the protection and property of all the people who may potentially be hurt. FEMA needs our help. We need to act immediately.

WE MUST NOT SLASH MEDICARE

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

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Presidential candidate Bob Dole came back to Washington in an attempt to rally the troops around his tax cut proposal. It has become increasingly obvious, sadly, that the leadership of this House and the Presidential Republican candidate are capable of generating only one basic idea, and that basic idea is to cut taxes for the wealthy at the expense of every other American.

There is no way we can reduce taxes by \$550 billion, which is what Mr. Dole proposes to do, without slashing away at Medicare even more severely than was attempted by this House in the budget that was passed here and vetoed by the President. We saw an attempt to cut Medicare here by \$270 billion. The Dole plan will cut it, in all probability, by more than twice that amount.