

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about why those two ideas do not belong in the Constitution, because although, as well-intended as they are, as needed as they are with respect to the adoption of that kind of a balanced budget, the fact is that they belong in budget legislation and not in the Constitution.

In order to create a budget, when the President creates a budget, what he does, and when the Congress creates a budget through the Committee on the Budget, of which I am a member, what we do and what the President does is, he relies on the CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, or OMB, Office of Management and Budget, or Joint Tax Committee, to come up with projections about what we are going to spend, what we are going to receive in revenues, and then to make recommendations about what the budget should be based on those things.

The fact is that all of those projections made by OMB, CBO, or Joint Tax are, by definition, wrong. They must be wrong, unless by some incredible, extraordinary chance of luck they should be on the dollar.

However, what we are asking in this constitutional amendment, the way it is worded, is that the President and the Congress should determine in advance what will be in balance, what will not be in balance, what exactly every agency is going to spend, and how much money we are going to raise. It is impossible to do that.

What we do know absolutely is how much money the Government has borrowed and what the debt ceiling is. This is the absolute brick wall that will stop, except with a supermajority. Remember, this is not a complete stop sign. It is merely a hurdle you have to go over. It is a 60-percent hurdle in order to continue this binge of deficit spending we have been on, but it is a very, very important hurdle.

That requirement, that you must have a supermajority, a three-fifths majority in order to raise the debt ceiling, that is the linchpin of this constitutional amendment from the spending side, because what it means is that you cannot deficit spend without a three-fifths majority. That is the one that will work.

Bill Barr, former Attorney General under President Bush, has made that clear in his testimony. Dr. William Nescanin, former head of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Reagan, has made that point, and other judicial scholars and constitutionalists agree that it is the three-fifths supermajority to raise the debt ceiling which is the true linchpin that will finally at least create the resistance that Thomas Jefferson talked about in 1789 to borrowing money.

Jefferson said in 1789 he had one concern about this Constitution that he had been so instrumental in crafting and then adopting. His concern was that it did not create any resistance on the part of the Federal Government to borrowing money. That is what this

constitutional amendment will do, it will create the resistance of a three-fifths majority to borrowing more money and increasing the debt service, or increasing the debt ceiling.

What I am urging today, Mr. Speaker, is as we consider this balanced budget amendment there will be, I hope, in order a substitute that I took to the Committee on Rules yesterday, that is in all parts identical to the bill that was reported out, and I urge that Members will support that substitute that will be on the floor.

FORMER REPRESENTATIVE GINGRICH WOULD URGE ETHICS INVESTIGATION OF PRESENT SPEAKER GINGRICH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, there are those on the other side of the aisle who make light of the pending investigation on ethics of Speaker GINGRICH. I believe they do so at their own peril, and in contradiction of the position taken by Representative GINGRICH in July 1988.

In July 1988, Speaker GINGRICH, or at that time Representative GINGRICH, waxed very eloquent in a press release regarding the duties and the burdens of the Speaker and the duties and burdens of the House in investigating the Speaker of the House, and the fact that it should not be done by peers in the House of Representatives but in fact by an outside counsel, because it is so important to assure the integrity of that office.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are confronted with a situation where several Members, several Republican Members of the Ethics Committee, have past associations with GOPAC, the secret and multi-million-dollar slush fund which is the subject of the ethics complaint.

Here we are, we have members of the committee who have a conflict of interest, who should recuse themselves, but if they recuse themselves, only new members could be appointed by the Speaker, so the Speaker in effect would be appointing his own judge and jury.

There is only one way out of this for Speaker GINGRICH. That is for Speaker GINGRICH to take the advice of Representative NEWT GINGRICH in 1988 and appoint an outside counsel, so the American people can be assured that the integrity of this office is upheld and the integrity of the U.S. Congress is upheld without any possible assertion of undue influence.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President on the state of the Union.

□ 0950

CAN'T WE ALL JUST GET ALONG?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I have given some thought to the events of the past week, the discussions and the debates. Through it all I am reminded of something I learned from my father years ago, and, that is, that great minds debate issues, average minds discuss events, and small minds talk about other people.

I have been dismayed that of all the many issues facing this Congress, particularly as we debate the Contract With America, that we find the other side, the minority party, concentrating on personal attacks on a Member of the Republican side.

Perhaps there is some basis for that, although I do not believe so. But the point I am making is, we have a number of major issues facing the Congress in the first 100 days and beyond. Furthermore, I believe the philosophy underlying the Contract With America deserves discussion and debate on behalf of the American people.

I believe it is important for us to engage in a dialog with the American people and discuss these issues with them, both Republicans and Democrats. I find it personally dismaying that so much emphasis during the 1-minute speeches and the 5-minute speeches has been concentrated on one particular person and one particular aspect of what that person has done.

I do not believe that this is behavior befitting the institution of the Congress. I believe that we have better things to do, we have more important things to do, and we have more important issues to discuss.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join in debating the issues that face this country, and the issues that are being presented to us daily on the floor.

There are certain things we can discuss during these 1-minute and 5-minute speeches which cannot or do not lend themselves very well to debate during the specific bills which are brought before the body. I think that we should take the opportunity during these 1-minute and 5-minute discussions to in fact debate the philosophy underlying this. I would also like to see more discussion about foreign relations

during these periods of time. We face very difficult issues and choices, particularly as it relates to the Russian involvement in Chechnya, the battle going on in Bosnia, the devaluation of the Mexican peso and the implications for us.

We do not need more rancorous debate about individuals and persons and their behavior. We need positive, constructive debate about the issues facing this Nation and what we as a Congress are going to propose to do about those problems.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EHLERS. Just one moment, please.

Finally, I am reminded of the comments of Mr. Rodney King, whom I did not think I would ever quote on the floor of Congress, but give his famous statement, "Can't we all just get along?"

Can't we all just get along for the good of the American people and for the purpose of debate in this body?

I would be pleased to yield the remainder of my time to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's speech because I think those of us on this side want to make sure the body moves forward, too. We are sent here to do the Nation's business. But I hope the gentleman read yesterday's Newsweek story because I think that is why some of us on this side are so concerned. I hope that the gentleman reads that because I think if he reads that, he too will join us in saying there are some serious questions here that need to be asked and need to be dealt with.

I would hope we could get these questions about the book deal outside of this arena, to independent counsel, or get it out of here so we could move on to those topics. But in the Newsweek yesterday, they came out and showed that this is not the first incident where Mr. Murdoch has been called into question. That in the last 10 years, there have been at least 6 suspicious book deals when he needed to get special privileges in other legislative bodies for his publishing empire. I think that raises some very serious questions that we should ask.

The gentleman is right, we should not debate them here, but should we not get them outside this body to an independent counsel somewhere to get this solved and raise the cloud?

I yield back to the gentleman. Would you not agree on that?

Mr. EHLERS. As I understand it, you are suggesting an investigation of Mr. Murdoch. But that is not what I have heard the discussion about during the past week.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. If I may reclaim my time, what I am asking is that we have an investigation of the Speaker's book deal with Mr. Murdoch.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LINDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate your point. I do not take my advice on politics from—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's 5 minutes has expired.

Mr. LINDER. There should be an investigation of Mr. Murdoch. I appreciate your point.

WELFARE REFORM: BEYOND SLOGANS TO ACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY] is recognized during morning business for 4 minutes.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, right now as we go forward on our work in this new Congress, there is no debate on whether we should reform welfare. That debate is over and both sides of the aisle agree that we should and the taxpayers have reached a consensus that the system does not work as we know it today. But saying that, it is not enough. It is time for all of us to understand that real reform is not a matter of finding the best slogans. In fact, it is a cruel hoax to the American people to say that we can do welfare reform easily. In fact, it is going to be very difficult to carry out welfare reform.

Today I would challenge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to move beyond the slogans that we have adopted these last few months to get that message out and get down to the real work of doing welfare reform.

Let us begin to deal with the realities of what real reform will mean and come to grips with some of the most difficult issues.

Let me give some examples. Slogan 1: "Those who refuse to accept responsibility should not receive a free ride."

We all agree. But when I take a very good read of the contract, I see that if in fact a woman establishes the paternity of her child, gives the name of the father, gives the address of the father, and yet that paternity does not get legally established by the State organization or an agency that is dealing with this thing, that child will not receive any assistance.

The contract states that any child whose paternity is not established would be in fact ineligible for benefits. This would be in any case unless in fact paternity was established. Yet we know in real life that State agencies often take up to 6 months to establish paternity. We also know that there are those who have fathered children, leave the State, cannot be found and paternity cannot be established. That makes no difference. The child will not in fact receive any help.

Slogan 2: "Welfare reform must aim at keeping families together."

My heavens, that is exactly what all of us want. Without a family, it is

very, very difficult to grow up and be able to take care of yourself in life. Yet we tell this as a fact. But if we look at the contract, we see very little reference other than that area about paternity about what responsibilities the father carries.

Therefore, many of us in this Congress want very deeply to have the welfare reform bill move along quickly, as rapidly as it can, being well-done, and have child support enforcement move along with it.

Child support enforcement is a necessary vehicle to go along with welfare reform so in fact two people, those two people that had the children, are involved in supporting that child and the taxpayer does not get left.

We know that if we do this, there is a much better chance that that child will grow up and be able to feel good about itself.

I think that we should continue to ask that those that are doing the welfare reform have child support enforcement happen at the same time.

Some say there are acceptable alternatives to letting the young, often immature mothers raise their children in inadequate surroundings with insufficient support. We all agree on that. But let us not also be fooled by the idea that everybody who has a child out of wedlock establishes an apartment and is on their own. Ninety percent of those people, those young women, live with a member of the family or a relative, with a mother, a father or a relative.

When we go beyond that, we have to be very careful that we do not let others fall through the cracks, and I mean fall through the cracks by not having adequate support that we all say we want. Not orphanages, of course not. But we certainly should look at group homes.

I will continue this later because there are other things we are trying to do that are simplistic. It is going to be hard to do welfare reform. We want to do it, but we should do it right.

REDUCTION URGED IN ROLE OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, even though the State of the Union speech is still to come, given the advance reports of the President's remarks, I am not hesitant to comment.

Separate from any specific White House proposal, it is the general inside-the-beltway, business-as-usual approach that concerns me. That attitude doesn't just come from the White House; but it permeates both the public and private sectors of Washington.

I was elected, Mr. Speaker, to reduce the role of the Federal Government, to rid us of regulation, and to put an end