President that acts like Hollywood. Mr. Speaker, it is time for the President to pay attention to the concerns of average Americans, not the labor bosses, not the Hollywood pals who make millions of dollars each year. It is time to make America better. It is time for a real American hero, Bob Dole.

□ 1015

DO NOT PUT THE OUTSIDE COUNSEL'S REPORT ON ICE

(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, once again I rise to call on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to do the right thing, to release the outside counsel's report on Speaker NEWT GINGRICH.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LINDER, Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, several days in a row the gentleman from Georgia has risen on the floor of the House to address matters that are inappropriate, because the rules of the House specifically prohibit speaking of matters before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

The gentleman does not seem to get that point. And on each occasion that I have raised this point of order, the Speaker has agreed with me. I would like the Speaker to make a ruling on this matter today.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker. If the gentleman is familiar with the rules, he should know that the customary way to object is to ask that the Member's words be taken down.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I have a right to make a point of order at any time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule on the gentleman's point of order. The Chair will repeat the admonitions of the Chair from September 12, 1996, and September 17, 1996.

It is an essential rule of decorum in debates 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 form of charges that are personally critical to 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 XIV is a prohibition against engaging in personality in debate. It derives from article 1, 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.

On January 27, 1909, the House adopted a report that stated the following:

> It is the duty of the House to require its Members in speech or debate to preserve that proper restraint which will permit the House to conduct its business in an orderly manner and without unnecessarily and unduly exciting animosity among his Members.

This is Cannon's Precedents, volume 8, at section 2497. This report was in response to improper references in debate to the President, but clearly reiterated a principle that all occupants of the Chair in this and in prior Congresses have held to be equally applicable to Members' remarks in debate toward each other.

The Chair asks and expects the cooperation of all Members in maintaining a level of decorum that properly dignifies the proceedings of the House.

So the Chair would request that the gentleman proceed in order.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the outside counsel, James Cole, has prepared an extensive 100-page report on the Speaker's ethical violation. The American people deserve the right to know what is in that report.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, it is entirely possible that the gentleman in the well did not hear you, or it is entirely possible that the gentleman in the well does not know what the rules are. But I think you just ruled that he was speaking out of order, and I would like to have the Chair readdress his addressing matters before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker? Let me say to my——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair sustains the point of order from the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. LINDER, and asks the other Member from Georgia, Mr. LEWIS, to please keep his remarks in order.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] appears to me to try to make a point of order and only on the point of order to silence the other gentleman from Georgia by having the Chair not only rule the gentleman out of order, but to perhaps even make the gentleman sit down.

I would like to know, is the Chair aware of any example in the entire history of this House of Representatives where the Speaker has unilaterally silenced a Member before his time has expired on his 1-minute without the consent of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On September 12 and on September 17 of this year, the Chair sustained points of order against Members who repeatedly made references in debate to a matter pending before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

On those occasions, the Chair indicated that pursuant to the rule such Members could be required to take their seats where they declined to proceed in order at the directive of the Chair after points of order had been sustained against the references while demanding that an offending Member be seated is normally insisted upon only where there is a formal demand that the words be taken down pending disposition that the words be taken down. Pending disposition of the matter by the Chair and by the House, it is within the Chair's authority under rule I and rule XIV to deny that Member further recognition as a disposition of the question of order, subject to the will of the House on the question of proceeding in order.

A Member's comportment in the face of repeated admonitions by the Chair to proceed in order has itself been the subject of a ruling of the Chair that the Member may not be recognized to proceed unless permitted to do so by the House. That is cited on page 319 of the manual. Once a Member has been recognized and has the floor, rule I and rule XIV permit the Chair to respond to repeated points of order while permitting the House to determine the propriety of the Chair's rulings and its willingness to permit the Member to proceed in order.

Thus, if the Chair were to direct that an offending Member be denied the floor for the duration of the time for which he was recognized, he would do so in the context of a ruling that would permit the House to determine whether the Member should proceed in order.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, it appears from your ruling, one, that there is no precedent in this House prior to this Congress of the action that you said is appropriate for the Speaker. That is No. 1. I asked if there was any precedent; the only precedent you have

mentioned is just approximately a week ago, last week, so it is of this Congress, and within the last week, not any prior history in the whole United States.

No. 2, it appears from what you said, even though you feel that you have the authority under that ruling to make any Member sit down for not following regular rules of order, that the ultimate decision upon a proper motion made is that the House itself has to decide, which has always been the precedent of this body. The House decides whether a Member does or not, not the Speaker; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the first question, the Chair is not commenting on the historical precedent.

On the second point, the gentleman is essentially correct.

Mr. VOLKMER. Well, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say, I have been unable to find the precedent that you have listed from last week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] may proceed in order for the balance of his time.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my colleague from Georgia, Mr. LINDER, I will not be harassed, bullied, or silenced. I know the rules of this House as well as the gentleman. But the gentleman knows, I have learned in my life that there are times when the rules must be challenged to confront an injustice. I will not sit down or keep silent until the report is released to the American people.

Last week NEWT GINGRICH brought an ice bucket to this floor to demonstrate a small savings achieved in the House. It is strange indeed that those savings are approximately the same amount as the cost of the report by the outside counsel. Now the Speaker and the Republicans in this House want to put the outside counsel's report on ice and it is wrong, just plain wrong.

HEALTH CARE ASSURANCE FOR RETIRED EMPLOYEES ACT

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

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of 750 retirees in my district who were betrayed by their employer, and on behalf of retirees across the country who are increasingly victimized by corporate irresponsibility.

Last month in Milwaukee, the Pabst Brewing Co. abruptly informed its retirees that it would no longer provide health and death benefits. Just like that. Years of hard work and dedication. Labor agreements. Promises. Out the window.

This is a disturbing trend. Last week I introduced the Health Care Assurance for Retired Employees Act, or the CARE Act. It would provide that companies give their retirees 6 months notice of any changes to their benefits. Further, the Labor Department would have to certify that the changes were in accordance with the applicable collective bargaining agreements.

Under the CARE Act, retirees aged 55 to 65 would have expanded access to health insurance under COBRA until they were eligible for Medicare. Medicare's late enrollment penalties would be waived, and a 6-month Medigap open enrollment period would be established.

I ask my colleagues to please join me in cosponsoring this bipartisan bill which will provide fair and workable safeguards for your retired constituents.

WAR ON DRUGS REQUIRES COMMITMENT AT THE TOP

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, whether we like it or not, some among us are expected to be role models. By sheer virtue of a media-intensive position, actors, athletes, and politicians are often thrust into the role model limelight.

That's why it comes as no surprise that after a substantial decline during the late 80's and early 90's, overall drug use nearly doubled in the last 4 years.

It also should come as no surprise that those who idolize are often young and impressionable, and that overall drug use among 12- to 17-year-olds between 1992 and 1995 went up 78 percent.

Mr. Speaker, starting from the top, those of us in Congress and those at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue should renew this Nation's commitment to fighting perhaps our most important war to date—the war on drugs.

CLOUD OF SHAME HANGS OVER CIA

(Ms. MCKINNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, a cloud of shame is hanging over America's intelligence community. In August, the San Jose Mercury News reported that the Central Intelligence Agency shipped cocaine into south central Los Angeles, then used that money to buy guns to overthrow the Government of Nicaragua.

And while Aldrich Ames was busy selling us down the river, our ''Central Intoxication Agency'' was selling crack cocaine in south central Los Angeles.

It is no wonder we could not predict the fall of the Soviet Union; the CIA was too busy shipping crack into the United States.

Mr. Speaker, as the ''Hemp-Dope'' ticket traverses America proselytizing about the increase in drug use, the administration they hope to emulate, the Reagan-Bush administration, was running crack in the 1980's.

I urge my colleagues to just say ''no'' to the ''Central Intoxication Agency'' and the ''Hemp-Dope'' ticket.

□ 1030

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, in 1993, Bill Clinton's National Security Council dropped the priority of the drug war from 3 to No. 29, that's 29th out of 29 priorities. At the same time, he slashed the Office of National Drug Policy by 83 percent.

In his budget for fiscal year 1995, Clinton proposed doing away with 621 total drug enforcement positions throughout the Government. And from 1992 to 1995, the Drug Enforcement Administration lost 227 agents.

In 1994, the Clinton administration told the Treasury Department's Financial Crimes Enforcement Network to devote only 50 percent to drug enforcement, instead of the normal 80 percent. This unit provides intelligence on money laundering by drug dealers.

And during his whole term as President, Bill Clinton has rarely talked about the drug issue or the explosion of drug use by our children.

Mr. Speaker, America cannot survive with this kind of leadership. The children of America need a President who is willing to wage a real war on drugs.

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, oftentimes over the last 2 years in this Congress we have not been bipartisan and we certainly have not looked out for the best interests of our children. Tomorrow, with the partial-birth abortion ban vote, we have an opportunity to be both bipartisan and to look out for our Nation's children.

This partial-birth abortion procedure is horrific. It is gruesome. It is totally unacceptable. I would hope Democrats and Republicans, men and women, prochoice and prolife Members would come together and join together tomorrow to have an important debate and an important vote in outlawing a procedure that hopefully most prolife and prochoice Members agree should be permanently banned in the United States of America.

IN APPRECIATION

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

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all of those who participated in the special order in my behalf yesterday evening on the floor of the House. Their remarks brought tears to my eyes, and I appreciate it so much.

Leaving is a sad day for me, but 34 years is long enough. My career in the