

to Federal formulas for everything from cradle to grave.

What I expect to hear the President say later today will not make that happen. His message will speak of a lofty reinvention of government, when what we need is restructuring of government—from the bottom up.

A State of the Union Message is called for by the Constitution. So is the concept of limited powers to be exercised by the Federal Government, and a federation of States to exercise the bulk of government powers. The 10th amendment in the Bill of Rights says all those powers not allowed to Uncle Sam belong to the States or the people.

Our message to the administration must be "before you get another taxpayer penny for the programs you propose, you must first satisfy us in Congress that you have constitutional authority to conduct it in the first place."

SPEAKER'S BOOK DEAL

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, later in this session the House will consider the Personal Responsibility Act. Is it not time for the Speaker and all of us to take some personal responsibility for our own actions?

When the flap came up over what the Speaker's mother said to Connie Chung concerning the First Lady of our Nation, he turned the issue to Connie Chung and not what was said. When the issue came up on the \$4.5 million book deal that was negotiated, the debate in the House was censored last week. And then over the weekend, our Speaker lashed out at the First Lady again and at a former Speaker. He repeated the charge that made him famous when he called former Speaker Jim Wright a crook. Never mind the fact that the former Speaker's book deal was worth \$12,000 versus our current Speaker's \$4.5 million deal. Even our most successful writer in this country does not command \$4.5 million of up-front money. Or the fact that it was simply unprofessional, undignified, and impugned the character of a former Speaker when he is retired and gone and cannot defend himself.

Much has been written about our Speaker's book deal, particularly the meeting with Mr. Murdoch and political apparatus, GOPAC, The Progress and Freedom Foundation, et cetera.

The Capitol Hill newspaper Roll Call has written in the Speaker's eloquent words from 1988 about another book deal, an outside counsel on ethics should be brought in for a "complete and thorough" investigation. We have a saying in Texas, what goes around comes around.

I ask today as Representative GINGRICH did in 1988 that the outside counsel investigate these ethical matters and clear up these questions once and for all, because just like the Energizer bunny, this issue will keep on going and going and going until we put it to rest.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD:

AN OUTSIDE COUNSEL

Much has been made in the last week of Members' speech. Consider this choice of words: "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, a position which is third in line of succession to the Presidency and the second most powerful elected position in America. Clearly, this investigation has to meet a higher standard of public accountability and integrity." So wrote Rep. Newt Gingrich (R-Ga) in a July 28, 1988, press release calling for an outside counsel in the House ethics probe of then-Speaker Jim Wright (D-Texas).

Now, the shoe is on the other foot, and Democrats are clamoring for (in Gingrich's nearly decade-old words) a "complete and thorough" investigation of a variety of allegations against the new Speaker. Unfortunately but predictably, the situation has grown ugly. And, as witnesses on the House floor for two days last week, it is now creating a spectacle before the American public. Which is perhaps the best reason for an outside counsel.

But there are others. The charges against Gingrich range from conflicts of interest and use of office for personal gain in connection with his HarperCollins book deal to improper use of funds from his tax-exempt outside groups.

Ironically, the book deal, which has drawn the most attention both from the media and Democrats, raises the less serious ethical questions. The facts: Gingrich agreed to and then canceled a \$4.5 million advance for two books to be published by HarperCollins, the company owned by Rupert Murdoch, who is currently lobbying to alter laws restricting foreign ownership of broadcast properties such as his Fox TV network. Despite urging from fellow Republicans to abandon the book deal, Gingrich holds onto it. Even though he's rejected the advance, he still could make millions from the book—partly depending upon how heavily HarperCollins promotes it, a decision ultimately in Murdoch's hands.

More serious are the allegations of the funding of Gingrich's college course, "Renewing American Civilization," and the extensive connections between Gingrich's political action committee, GOPAC; his Congressional office; and his outside educational arm, the Progress & Freedom Foundation. It is these charges that are the subject of the ethics case now pending against him. The Speaker's elaborate political dynasty appears to be constructed in a manner in which he can conduct political activities while skirting contribution limits and disclosure laws. The entire structure must be probed.

We do not fully agree with what Gingrich said in 1988; an investigation of the Speaker should not be held to any higher standard than one of any other Member. Whether a Speaker should be held to a higher standard of conduct is a separate question. At the very least, he should set that standard, and as Gingrich himself said so eloquently in 1988, an outside counsel would offer the most "complete and thorough" investigation.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WANT REAL ISSUES DISCUSSED

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

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the President's speech tonight. Not because he is going to deliver a great speech, because he always does, and not because of the excitement I am going to feel as an average citizen who 1 year ago was knocking door to door in a grassroots campaign to get here, because I will be excited, and not because his speech will reflect undoubtedly the conservative revolution of the 1994 election, because it will.

I look forward to the President's speech tonight because I am really curious and genuinely want to know if there is a member of the old guard out there that actually has a new idea on where to take this country.

For the past 3 weeks, since I have been here, I have been hearing speeches about Connie Chung and book deals and Nazi historians and now Energizer bunnies, when the fact of the matter is all of those things are nothing more than a smokescreen to deflect attention away from the fact that we as Republicans are putting forward an aggressive agenda that America wants.

I am curious. What does the Connie Chung debate do for children in inner cities that are hungry? What is the Speaker's book deal going to do for the average citizen, middle-class citizen that is having trouble going from paycheck to paycheck paying their bills, trying to put aside a few dollars for their children's education, trying to put aside a few dollars for retirement? What does it do? It does absolutely nothing.

What does it do to answer the difficult questions that are going to be facing us on how we balance our budget, how we make this Federal Government do what average middle-class citizens have had to do forever, and, that is, balance their checkbooks. It does absolutely nothing.

I cannot believe that the party of F.D.R. and the party of Harry Truman and of J.F.K. and of Bobby Kennedy, I cannot believe they cannot come up here and speak to the issues that will affect this country and this land.

I understand about partisan politics. I understand that it certainly happened on both sides of the aisle. But I would ask Members of the Democratic Party to follow the example of the gentlewoman from Connecticut, who came up a few short minutes ago and actually discussed welfare reform and talked about why she believed the Republicans' version of welfare reform did not make sense. Did I agree with her? No. Did I get something out of her discussion, though? Yes. It is a starting point for us to debate the issues.

I am not overstating the issue when I say that there are children that are literally starving in our inner cities. I am not overstating the issue when I say you can go across this world to Third World countries and find Third World country citizens that are living better than many citizens in the South Bronx, that are living better than many of our citizens in South Central L.A., that are living better than many Americans across this country that go to bed every night fearing for their lives, wondering whether they will wake up in the morning alive, whether their children will wake up in the morning alive, what will happen to their children when they go to school, when they have to pass drug dealers to go to school and make the decision every step along the line. Do I play by the rules, do I play fair? What do I do?

Those are the questions that are supposed to be brought to the floor of this House. And when you talk about a book deal and compare it to Speaker Wright's book deal, what are you doing? Read the Washington Post. The Washington Post this week editorialized that the book deal was not the same as Speaker Wright's book deal, that it may have been bad politics but it was not inherently illegal, or improper, or unethical.

Mr. Speaker, it is time in 1995 for us to turn our eyes and ears and open our minds to the real issues that are facing this country? That as we are \$4 trillion in debt, as our inner cities are crumbling, it is time to address the issues that really matter. That is what Americans demand of us and that is what we want.

RENEWED CALL FOR INDEPENDENT COUNSEL IN SPEAKER'S ETHICS CASE

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

Ms. DELAULO. Mr. Speaker, I concur with my colleague who was up here a moment ago, that in fact what we are about here is the people's business and that we need to talk about the issues that affect middle-class families, working families every single day.

As a Democrat, I have done that in the 2 terms that I have been here and I submit to you this evening that the President will build on what he said several weeks ago on a middle-class Bill of Rights that will include a minimum wage.

I would like to find out from my colleagues if that is something that he will support because in fact people in this Nation are not looking at an increased higher standard, but that is an important issue.

Education and training. Not cutting Social Security for families. And when we look at the balanced budget and what that is going to do, when my

friends on the other side of the aisle would not in fact exempt Social Security from the balanced budget amendment.

There is rhetoric and there probably is rhetoric on both sides. But let me tell you what is important and what my Republican colleagues do not want to talk about.

□ 1010

That is a need for an outside counsel to answer questions. That is what is being asked, answer questions about Speaker GINGRICH's financial empire.

The last 2 weeks have been filled with press revelations. We are not making these things up about this multi-billion-dollar book deal but, more importantly, about a private meeting with publishing magnet Rupert Murdoch. Any appearance of impropriety could have been voided if the contents of the book had been disclosed.

My colleague from Colorado talked about a Newsweek report. This week Americans read in Newsweek this is not the first time Rupert Murdoch has published a book by politicians, promoting them huge sums of money. In 1990 while seeking special rules to allow his Australian company to expand his empire in Great Britain Rupert Murdoch asked the help of the Thatcher government, and not long after Margaret Thatcher signed an eye-popping \$5.4 million book deal. This appears to be a pattern for Mr. Murdoch.

We need to have an outside counsel take a look at it.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT EFFECTS

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

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, this is an interesting day today. We are not only going to hear from the President of the United States later on tonight, but we have heard from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have offered us some interesting accolades.

First, we heard one of our Republican colleagues quote Rodney King. As long as I live I did not think I would hear one of my illustrious conservative colleagues quote Rodney King, but I have heard it today. And as we say in South Central, "Don't go there," because I do not think that he certainly understands the pain of a Rodney King.

Then we heard another one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, indicate that he had some empathy for South Central and for South Bronx and for the people across this country who are wallowing in the inner cities. I do not know if he has ever been to South Central, but I represent some of South Central and let me say, Mr. Speaker, when you hear the voice of those people talk on the one hand about their concern about the

people of South Central and on the other hand exempt Social Security from a consideration in the balanced budget amendment, then I say, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues speaketh with forked tongue because, Mr. Speaker, the balanced budget amendment is going to cause a great deal of pain for people in the South Central and South Bronx and parts of inner cities all across this country.

Indeed, when we get down to the details of what a balanced budget amendment is going to mean, we have to be honest and we have to be truthful with the American people and let them know that the people who are speaking about their concerns for the poor are going to try to balance the budget on the backs of poor people. And this is where the real debate is going to come in, Mr. Speaker. How are we going to balance that budget?

They say they are going to exempt Social Security, but when BARNEY FRANK offered an amendment in the Committee on the Judiciary, they did not support that amendment. So we can see, Mr. Speaker, that they talk the talk, but they are not walking the walk.

The balanced budget amendment is a good idea. A lot of politicians like to stand in line and say so. This is the right thing and it is a constitutional amendment in its time, but it is not a time to take away the money of those who have been putting into Social Security all their lives.

THE SEARCH FOR A BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, a Democratic President and Congress passed a budget that cut the deficit by more than \$600 billion over 5 years and produced real deficit reduction for 3 consecutive years—the first time this has happened since World War II.

The question today is: How should we build on this success? Should we now pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution?

Seeing the passionate fervor that was driving this amendment's sponsors, I began to ask my Republican colleagues the magic formula for achieving this budget miracle. With envy, I assumed my colleagues had already concocted the recipe for balancing our budget and were now simply applying the finishing touch: A constitutional requirement to do that which they had already devised.

My envy turned to curiosity. Like Roger Moore from the movie "Roger and Me," I set out through the Halls of the Capitol searching for the magic budget plan. I checked in the offices, the cloak rooms, and the chambers. I