

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

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 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.