

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

cornered my colleagues and begged them to show me the secret plan. But it soon became clear: There is no plan behind the balanced budget amendment.

"How can we say what we will do, if we cannot say how we will do it?" The means are at least as important as the ends. Unless the end is simply the next reelection campaign.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support an amendment that presents a bottom line without a plan to get us there. When faced with a constitutional requirement, how will the Congress feel about ensuring the construction of the vital international sewage treatment plant being built on the United States-Mexico border in my district? Or protecting seniors from drastic cuts in Social Security? Or retaining San Diego's status as a navy mega-port? Or funding vital infrastructure to handle United States-Mexico commerce? Or keeping our promise to our area's veterans?

We all want a balanced budget. But that budget should not destroy our economy or attack our children, our senior citizens, our veterans.

THE ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES OF LAND TRANSFERS AFTER BASE CLOSURES

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, one of the many proposals floating around these days is the idea of eliminating the so-called nontraditional defense spending, which includes items such as the environmental cleanup of military bases. This is not only bad policy, but it is irresponsible. It will create not an unfunded mandate as much as an "unfunded liability."

As DOD closes numerous bases throughout the Nation, one of the biggest challenges that they face is how to transfer land to the local communities in the same condition in which they received it. However, environmental conditions on many of these facilities are abominable, and it will get worse if we put off cleanup for some unspecified date in the future. What is needed is more not less attention to the environmental concerns on these bases.

Gutting the funds for these programs sends the wrong message to our local communities. If this happens, local governments will be forced to pick up the tab for fixing a disaster that they had no part in creating in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the time to run away from our obligations. Instead, the Department of Defense should live up to their responsibility to clean up after themselves. By maintaining funding for "nontraditional" defense spending, this Congress can stand by our commitment to make our government more accountable to the

people it serves, and that is the right thing to do in my book.

Earlier we have heard a discussion about trying to point to issues. Well, there are issues and there are issues.

But the seriousness of these issues cannot be addressed as long as the leadership of the institution is under a cloud—and it is the responsibility of the majority to clean it up and a legitimate right of the minority to point it out.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no further requests for morning business, pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the House will stand in recess until 11 a.m.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 18 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 11 a.m.

□ 1100

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 11 a.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

May the spirit of thanksgiving, O gracious God, be ever in our hearts and may the significance of gratitude be written in our souls. Of all the attributes and virtues to which we aspire, of all the merits and worthiness to which we yearn, may the appreciation of thanksgiving and gratitude be in our thoughts at the beginning of the day and in our words at eventide.

For these and all Your gifts to us, O God, we offer this prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 278, nays 135, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]

YEAS—278

Allard	Franks (NJ)	Miller (FL)
Andrews	Frelinghuysen	Minge
Archer	Frisa	Mink
Armey	Frost	Molinari
Bachus	Funderburk	Mollohan
Baker (CA)	Gallegly	Montgomery
Baker (LA)	Ganske	Moorhead
Ballenger	Gekas	Moran
Barr	Geren	Morella
Barrett (NE)	Gibbons	Murtha
Barrett (WI)	Gilchrest	Myers
Bartlett	Gillmor	Myrick
Barton	Gilman	Nethercutt
Bass	Gonzalez	Neumann
Bateman	Goodlatte	Ney
Beilenson	Goodling	Norwood
Bentsen	Gordon	Nussle
Bereuter	Goss	Orton
Berman	Greenwood	Oxley
Bevill	Gunderson	Packard
Bilbray	Gutknecht	Parker
Bilirakis	Hall (TX)	Porter
Bliley	Hamilton	Portman
Blute	Hancock	Pryce
Boehner	Hansen	Quillen
Bonilla	Hastert	Quinn
Bono	Hastings (WA)	Radanovich
Boucher	Hayes	Ramstad
Brewster	Hayworth	Regula
Brownback	Heineman	Roberts
Bryant (TN)	Herger	Rogers
Bunn	Hilleary	Rohrabacher
Bunning	Hobson	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton	Hoekstra	Roth
Buyer	Hoke	Roukema
Callahan	Holden	Royce
Calvert	Horn	Salmon
Camp	Hostettler	Sanford
Canady	Houghton	Sawyer
Cardin	Hoyer	Saxton
Castle	Hutchinson	Scarborough
Chabot	Hyde	Schaefer
Chambliss	Inglis	Schiff
Chenoweth	Istook	Scott
Christensen	Johnson (CT)	Seastrand
Chrysler	Johnson, Sam	Sensenbrenner
Clement	Johnston	Shadegg
Clinger	Jones	Shaw
Coble	Kaptur	Shays
Coburn	Kasich	Shuster
Collins (GA)	Kelly	Sisisky
Combest	Kennelly	Skeen
Condit	Kildee	Skelton
Cooley	Kim	Smith (MI)
Coyne	King	Smith (NJ)
Crapo	Kingston	Smith (TX)
Cremeans	Klecza	Smith (WA)
Cubin	Klug	Solomon
Cunningham	Knollenberg	Souder
Danner	Kolbe	Spence
Davis	LaHood	Spratt
Deal	Largent	Stearns
DeLay	Latham	Stenholm
Diaz-Balart	LaTourette	Stockman
Dickey	Laughlin	Stokes
Dingell	Lazio	Studds
Dixon	Leach	Stump
Dooley	Lewis (CA)	Talent
Doolittle	Lewis (KY)	Tanner
Dornan	Lightfoot	Tate
Dreier	Linder	Tauzin
Duncan	Livingston	Thomas
Dunn	LoBiondo	Thornberry
Edwards	Lofgren	Thornton
Ehlers	Longley	Thurman
Ehrlich	Lucas	Tiahrt
Emerson	Luther	Torricelli
English	Manzullo	Tucker
Ensign	Martini	Upton
Everett	McCollum	Vucanovich
Ewing	McCrery	Waldholtz
Fawell	McDade	Walker
Fields (TX)	McHale	Walsh
Flake	McHugh	Wamp
Flanagan	McInnis	Watts (OK)
Foley	McIntosh	Weldon (FL)
Forbes	McKeon	Weldon (PA)
Ford	McNulty	Weller
Fowler	Metcalf	White
Fox	Meyers	Whitfield
Franks (CT)	Mica	