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

This prevents for all time the specter of a Government shutdown. At the same time it permits the President and the Congress, if there is disagreement as to the extent of the budget, to continue to work to create a new budget. In the meantime, science goes on, research goes on, the Federal workers stay in place, no havoc is wreaked in the bureaucracy of Washington, although some people would say that might be a good thing. But the point is that we cannot allow the Government to shut down.

□ 1030

REPUBLICAN CHANGES TO MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

(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, out west where I came from people used to worry about snake oil salesmen, but we pretty much got that under control. Now we have a new type of snake oil salesmen on the other side of the aisle.

I think we heard in prior discussions going on this morning that we are not going to be allowed to discuss their compassionate, wonderful, no pain changes to Medicare and Medicaid. We are just to trust them.

We are going to have 1 day of hearing. My fast math says that is about 1 minute per every 120 pages of changes they have in their bill. Oh, I am sure we will get it.

I want to tell my colleagues, as a Westerner who grew up with the tradition of snake oil salesmen, that we thought were behind us, beware. Beware. If their cuts are so painless, so harmless, so futuristic, so wonderful, why can we not have time to look at them? Why can we not air them in the sunshine? This should not be a fungus, this should be a bill.

REFORM IN THE SUGAR PROGRAM

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today the Committee on Agriculture begins markup of the 1995 farm bill. I am concerned that the Committee on Agriculture is trading real reform in some commodity programs in exchange for no reform in the sugar program.

The proposal put forth by the sugar growers, which the committee intends to adopt, is not real reform. It continues a big Government program that forces the American consumer to pay double the world price for sugar. The sugar program will continue to cost American consumers $1.4 billion every year and continue to add $90 million to our deficit every year.

The Republican Party is committed to putting every program except Social Security on the table, and we want to have the right to debate the sugar program. Chairman ROBERTS is an honorable man and I trust he will keep his word to me and permit debate and vote on the sugar program.

Mr. Speaker, my bill to repeal the sugar program has 104 cosponsors, Democrats and Republicans. My bill to repeal the sugar program is real reform. The House has not considered the program since 1990. If we do not get a chance this year, it will be 2002 before we get a chance.

HEARINGS ON THE FUTURE OF MEDICARE

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, when Medicare was created in 1965, seniors came from all over the United States to testify before Congress as to how to meet the health care financing needs of our Nation's elderly. As we reconsider the future of Medicare for 37 million Americans, our seniors, indeed all Americans, deserve the right to a fair and open period of public comment on an issue of concern to every family in America.

Yet as the Republicans are about to embark on the most significant changes in the Medicare system, in Medicare's history, by proposing a $270 billion cut in Medicare, the Republicans are blanking out America's voices. How unfortunate that the Republicans intend to hold only 1 day of hearings on a proposal that the American people, and especially American seniors, have yet to see. This is fundamentally unfair.

Mr. Speaker, a great Republican President hailed our democracy as a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Our democracy is not just about free elections of representatives, it is about citizen participation in a free and open process in the formulation of public policy. Given the magnitude of the $270 billion cut, our citizens deserve better.

FEDERAL FUNDS FOR NATIONAL COUNCIL OF SENIOR CITIZENS

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

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I understand that being attacked and engaging in political debate is part of the terrain one deals with when one assumes this type of office, but imagine my surprise when I obtained a copy of the tax return of the National Council of Senior Citizens, a group which is currently orchestrating a tax on me in my district, which shows that they received nearly $73 million in Federal funds for the year ending June 30, 1994, almost 96 percent of their budget, from the Federal Government.

Furthermore, I obtained information that over the last two election cycles they had contributed nearly $417,000 exclusively to Democratic candidates. Not one red cent to a Republican candidate.

Again, it is a citizen's right to express their first amendment point of view, but is there a connection?

I also obtained a copy of the audit report of the National Council wherein they say in their report that the heavy reliance on governmental grants poses a potential danger to the long-term structure of the National Council. Absent such grants, the council would be unable to continue its current level of operations without seeking new revenue sources.

MORE HEARINGS NEEDED ON MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, when I held a town meeting on Medicare last week in West Virginia, there was justifiable and understandable confusion about the details. Republicans want to cut $270 billion over 7 years. Democrats say somewhere between $90 and $120 billion will be enough. The Republicans argue do they want to take the difference and give it to a tax cut?

Mr. Speaker, people have genuine questions, yet on something like this there ought to be more than 1 day of hearings, on programs such as Medicare and Medicaid, that affect 70 million Americans. Almost 700,000 West Virginians alone will have their health care somehow brought into question, whether senior citizens or Medicaid recipients. They deserve more than health stealth.

This is a B–2 bomber. I know why they like it on the other side. They like it because it is flying low on the radar screen with no details out there. They plopped the plan out on the table yesterday and they will mark it up today with no hearings on Medicaid, a program that affects 400,000 West Virginians. They want to do the same on Medicare with 300,000 West Virginians affected.

Mr. Speaker, surely the single greatest changes in America's health care plans deserve more than 1 day of hearings.

REPEAL OF GOVERNMENT SUGAR PROGRAM

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

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the repeal of the Government sugar program. There is no plausible reason why our Government is involved with setting and controlling the price of sugar. It is Big Government at its worst. It is a sweet deal for a wealthy few. It promotes the destruction of one of our prized environmental landmarks—the Florida Everglades.

VerDate 20-SEP-95