for a number of these tax-exempt foundations that were set up by Speaker GINGRICH and that were associated with him. The time has come for an independent counsel to look into every one of these foundations. Anything less than that is really a betrayal of the American people.

USE OF SURPLUS FEDERAL PROPERTIES FOR PUBLIC SAFETY NEEDS

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I want to offer my condolences to the families and loved one of those killed in Saudi Arabia yesterday, another act of terror. Madam Speaker, under current law, the Bureau of Justice may transfer any surplus property which they administer over to the State and local authorities provided that the property is used for the establishment of prisons. I am introducing a bill that would allow State and local authorities to use surplus Federal properties and other public safety needs such as police and firefighting training facilities. This will help prevent terror and lawlessness in our own country. Prisons may still be build under this measure.

This bill provides flexibility to make the best use of these facilities, based on local needs.

This is particularly helpful for communities attempting to reuse closed or realigned military bases. I work closely with the Bureau of Justice on this measure and it has bipartisan support. I intend to introduce this legislation tomorrow. Please join me and cosponsor this important measure.

ETHICS COMMITTEE MUST STOP STALLING

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

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, the Los Angeles Times details how House Speaker NEWT GINGRICH used six nonprofit foundations to funnel money for his own political profit. I quote:

> From 1984 to 1994, Gingrich and his cadre of key advisers used no fewer than six nonprofit groups to extend the reach of GOPAC, the partisan committee that fueled the successful 1994 Republican drive to gain control of the Congress. Together the foundations were part of a loose network of Gingrich-related enterprises dubbed Newt's world.

This is outrageous, it is unseemly and it is illegal. It violates Federal tax law that prohibits exempt organizations from any, any form of partisan politics. Those are the issues, serious issues. The serious questions are, why has not the Ethics Committee pursued the ethics compliant filed in January 1996 that alleges the misuse of the tax-free foundation called the Abraham Lincoln Opportunity Society? Why has not the committee forwarded these allegations to Special Investigator Cole? Can it be that in NEWT'S world the laws that the average person must abide by do not apply?

FUNDS FOR ELDERLY AND DISABLED HOUSING, SUPPORT FOR THE LAZIO AMENDMENT

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

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Lazio amendment to restore funding for housing for the elderly and disabled. The Lazio amendment would restore $140 million for section 202 elderly housing and section 811 housing for the disabled. This amendment is deficit neutral because it is offset from reductions in HUD's annual contributions fund, HUD's unallocated dollars.

By adding these funds over the life of these buildings, tens of thousands of our Nation's seniors and disabled persons will have housing opportunities they would otherwise not have. These funds not only provide affordable housing; they also provide those key supportive services that mean independence to seniors and our disabled citizens.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge all Members on both sides of the aisle to support the Lazio amendment.

MORE ON THE ETHICS COMMITTEE

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, it is a shame to have used children to raise funds for political campaigns. I believe an independent counsel is needed.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the majority whip, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, I want to respond to the majority leader who came to the floor this morning. We have had repeated stories now, in the Washington Post, the Washington Times, the Atlanta Constitution Journal, the Los Angeles Times, papers all across this country, revealing that, as my colleagues have stated on the floor, there were six separate tax-exempt foundations in which the Speaker's committee GOPAC funneled money to the tune of about at least $6 million through.

We have waited for 6 months for the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to act on a complaint that I filed 6 months ago. No action has been taken, not even an action to do a preliminary inquiry to investigate. They have not referred it to the outside counsel.

It is incumbent upon them to act in one way or another or to dismiss this case. But to sit there, let the clock run out, idle away the time so they can escape without any consequences by the end of this session is irresponsible. It is disrespectful to this institution.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GREENE of Utah). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, if no motion to table is filed to immediately cut off debate on the privileged motion this afternoon on this matter about the Speaker's ethics, then will the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] and all of his side have an opportunity to speak and ask questions at that time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not ruling on that at this point. It would be appropriate to bring up at a later time.

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, I have just heard several Members speak on the floor of the House with respect to matters that they claim the Ethics Committee is doing or not doing with regard to claims made against the Speaker. Is it appropriate, under the rules of the House, to refer to matters that are before the Ethics Committee when no one is supposed to know what they are discussing?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will respond to the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry as follows:

It is an essential rule of decorum in debate that Members should refrain from references in debate to the conduct of other Members where such conduct is not the question actually pending before the House by way of a report from the Committee on Standards of Official conduct or by way of another question of the privileges of the House. This principle is documented on pages 168 and 526 of the House Rules and Manual and reflects the consistent rulings of the Chair in this and in prior Congresses and applies to 1-minute and special order speeches.

Neither the filing of a complaint before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, nor the publication in another forum of charges that are personally critical of another Member, justify the references to such charges on the floor of the House. This includes references to the motivations of Members who file complaints and to Members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

Clause 1 of rule 14 is a prohibition against engaging in personality in debate. It derives from article I, section 5 of the Constitution, which authorizes each House to make its own rules and to punish its Members for disorderly behavior, and has been part of the rules of the House in some relevant form since 1789. This rule supersedes any claim of a Member to be free from questioning in any other place.