The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker has announced the following guidelines——

Mr. DOGGETT. This is an announcement by Speaker GINGRICH?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. First by Speaker O'Neill. It has been a continual policy. It has been the policy of the Speakers. Let the Chair quote precisely from section 757 of the Manual:

> The Speaker has announced and enforced a policy of conferring recognition for unanimous consent requests for the consideration of unreported bills and resolutions only when assured that the majority and minority floor and committee leaderships have no objection.

Mr. DOGGETT. Further parliamentary inquiry, the minority leadership has been consulted. Every Democrat has signed on to this proposal to allow us additional time to consider the details of this Medicare plan, and my inquiry would be then if the Democratic minority leadership has agreed to this, it is only the Republican leadership that wants to thwart a fair and open hearing?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not aware of clearance by all necessary Members.

Mr. DOGGETT. All Democratic Members have signed on to this resolution and the ranking member.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, point of order.

Mr. DOGGETT. The Democratic membership here is indicating for fair and open hearings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is no longer asking for a parliamentary inquiry. He can draw his own conclusions. The Chair has stated the fact.

Mr. DOGGETT. Further parliamentary inquiry, what procedure then would be appropriate for a Member, myself or a Member of our leadership, the gentlewoman from Connecticut, to present? What timing, what form would be appropriate to present a unanimous consent request so that we could have a full hearing on Medicare instead of just 1 day?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair must be aware of clearance by all the necessary Members, as announced in the Speaker's policy.

□ 1015

Mr. DOGGETT. Further parliamentary inquiry then, Mr. Speaker.

If the Democrat leadership comes to the floor of this House and announces its desire to have this resolution considered immediately, will the unanimous-consent request be accepted at that time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KNOLLENBERG). The Chair will repeat. The Chair will not entertain that request according to the guidelines as a matter of discretionary recognition.

Mr. DOGGETT. So, further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

So a statement then on behalf of the Democrat leadership by the minority leader or by all members of the Democrat Caucus that they request that this unanimous-consent request for full and complete Medicare hearings occur, that would not be enough to get it entertained here on the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman understand the Chair's guidelines? They have been stated at great length.

Mr. DOGGETT. If I understood it, I would not be asking the further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has referred to what is proper. The leadership on both sides must consent to this request, and they have to clear this. It cannot be brought up in this manner.

Mr. DOGGETT. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

Unless Speaker GINGRICH clears us having more than 1 day of hearing, it cannot occur. Is that the ruling of the Chair?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The majority floor leader and the chairman of the Committee on Rules must clear this request.

Mr. DOGGETT. So, unless the Republican chairman of the committee, Mr. SOLOMON, and——

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, point of order.

Mr. DOGGETT. We cannot take up a full hearing.

## ELIMINATING THE FRAUD AND ABUSE WHICH RIDDLES MEDICAID

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

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, for years the liberal Congresses have been mandating States to spend billions of dollars on programs. I know because I served in the California State Legislature. One such program is Medicaid, which now consumes nearly one-fifth of our State's budgets. This coupled with the fact that $16 billion a year from this program is lost to fraud and abuse demonstrates the need for genuine reform.

Republicans know that more Washington bureaucracy is not the prescription to save this program. That is why the legislation which we are introducing will give more freedom to State and local officials. And recipients need not fear that they will lose benefits. Our resolution will increase funding to the States by 39 percent over the next 7 years.

Only by dismantling the oversized, inefficient Washington bureaucracy can we eliminate the fraud and abuse which riddles Medicaid. Only by increasing funding to the States can we heal this ailing program.

## WHAT'S GOOD FOR THE GOOSE

(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, ''I am concerned that the scope, authority and independence of the special counsel will be limited by the guidelines the Ethics Committee has established. 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. The rules normally applied by the Ethics Committee to an investigation of a typical member are insufficient in an investigation of the Speaker of the House. Clearly, this investigation has to meet a higher standard of public accountability and integrity.''

Prophetic words, indeed, Mr. Speaker.

These are the words of the current Speaker of the House in 1988 referring to the investigation of a former Speaker of this House.

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. Mr. Speaker, I made the point yesterday with precisely the same speaker that it is out of order, according to the House rules, to discuss a matter that is pending before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the words, every single word except for ''prophetic words, indeed,'' Mr. Speaker, that I spoke were the words that the current Speaker spoke in 1988. This is not a reference to the current investigation or the current Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will read the following statement:

> The Chair has consistently ruled that it is not in order during debate to refer to the official conduct of other Members where such conduct is not under consideration in the House by way of a report from the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct or as a question of the privileges of the House.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I do so so that, when I speak, I will understand the parameters of that.

As long as the focus is on the powers of a special counsel rather than a particular inquiry before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, it would not be out of order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman referred to a particular inquiry pending before the committee.

VerDate 20-SEP-95 07:02 S

Mr. DOGGETT. But he can refer to the powers of the committee and the general subject of ethics?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would judge those references when they are made.

POINTS OF ORDER

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state her point of order.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I just want a further clarification.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] is saying he is talking about a precedent of prior investigations. He is discussing precedents that were discussed in this House at prior times. Therefore I am not quite sure I understand, under the Speaker's guidance, why he is not allowed to proceed with the precedent and a statement made in 1988. He is not talking about an individual in 1995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members should avoid references to current investigations pending before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Further point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Is the Chair saying then no discussion can be made of precedents, and past cases, and how the House proceeded on those past cases?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Not if related to current matters.

Mr. HOKE. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

It was clear that the Member had not referenced what he was speaking to. He was clearly alluding to a current investigation that was taking place.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has already ruled that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] should not refer to the current investigation.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Let me conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying this House and the Speaker cannot tolerate a double standard. What is good for the goose is good for the gander.

## NEW MEDICAID APPROACH

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion about Medicare in this Chamber, but I believe it is time to begin the discussion of Medicaid.

I recall when I served on the Michigan legislature some of the oldtimers told me when the original Medicaid bill was passed a Member got up and refused to vote for it. He said, ''I predict that someday this State will spend $50 million a year on this program.''

Mr. Speaker, he was wrong. Today the State of Michigan is spending $2 billion on that program every year, approximately 20 percent of their general fund budget. That was true for State after State.

In my State of Michigan, Mr. Speaker, when I was in the legislature, it was very frustrating because we knew where we could save money in the Medicaid program, but the Federal Government refused to give us the freedom to pursue the actions that we wanted to pursue.

I believe it is very important that we proceed with the approach the Republicans are advocating, giving the States leeway in how they go on the program and giving them block grants so they can run it efficiently and properly. I urge that we adopt the new Medicaid approach operating through State block grants.

## MEDICARE PREMIUM INCREASE

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the biggest Medicare cut in history, $270 billion, and the smallest possible number of hearings, one, and even in that hearing the deck is being loaded. The majority is picking a dozen or so witnesses and letting the minority pick a handful.

What are they trying to hide? The biggest premium increase in Medicare history doubling part B in 7 years, and a lot of people cannot afford this. In Michigan 85 percent of the seniors have income under $25,000 and 70 percent under $15,000.

A constituent wrote this to me:

> Please do not let these cuts to Medicare pass. It really would be very devastating for us. Please, please fight this for us.

That is what we Democrats are doing. We are determined to win this battle that is aimed right at the heart of seniors.

## THE FEDERAL SHUTDOWN—NOT 1 MINUTE, NOT 1 SECOND

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

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise on behalf of millions of Federal workers who have become the unwilling passengers in what has been dubbed the great train wreck; the only thing is, a train wreck is an accident, and this is a situation we can avert.

There is a need to get this country's fiscal house in order. I support this, and it can be done without interfering with the lives of Federal workers. It can be done without the disruption a Government shutdown will have on our citizenry.

Our Federal work force provides this country with unquestionable loyalty and dedication. We remember the Federal worker, devastated and injured after the Oklahoma City bombing, still anguishing over her inability to get checks out to recipients.

Federal workers across the country and in my district do not want a shutdown this year or any subsequent year. They want to work, and I want them working.

The NIH researcher who is working on a possible cure for cancer should not miss work. We need that young woman working. There are people depending on her. I say, not 1 week, not 1 day of missed work.

The DOE scientist who is searching for alternative forms of energy should not miss work, not 1 hour, not 1 minute of missed work.

The education specialist who is designing strategies that will benefit our children should not miss work. Future generations are depending on this man. I say, not 1 second, not 1 fraction of a second of missed work.

The consequences are too great.

## OUTSIDE COUNSEL WHEN INVESTIGATING THE SPEAKER SHOULD NOT BE LIMITED IN SCOPE

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

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, we have an Ethics Committee and I would like to offer a primer on how the House should handle ethics cases.

Let me quote from a Member of this House, who also happens to be an experienced expert on ethics cases, who stated in 1988: ''The rules normally applied to Members of Congress are insufficient in an investigation of the Speaker of the House.'' I repeat. He said, ''The rules normally applied are insufficient in an investigation of the Speaker of the House.'' ''Clearly, this investigation,'' he said ''has to meet a higher standard of public accountability and integrity.''

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this should be the standard by which all ethics cases before this House should be considered. When the House chooses to appoint an outside counsel to investigate a Speaker, that counsel should be allowed to investigate any and all possible wrongdoing and not be limited in scope.

## WE CANNOT ALLOW THE GOVERNMENT TO SHUT DOWN

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, for several terms now I have introduced legislation which cannot pass the Congress of the United States, cannot be enacted into law, because it makes good sense. I have introduced legislation that would avoid the train wreck to which the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] has just referred. What it does is if, on September 30, the Congress of the United States and the President have failed to enact a budget, then automatically into play comes instant replay of last year's budget beginning on October 1.

VerDate 20-SEP-95 07:02 Sep 21, 1995