

his congressional office, dated July 28, 1988. In this press release, Mr. GINGRICH demands that the special counsel appointed to investigate House Speaker Jim Wright be given *carte blanche* authority. Let me point out that this special counsel was appointed under a Democratic Congress with the consent of the then-Speaker, Jim Wright. I quote from this press release:

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 position in America. Clearly this investigation has to meet a higher standard of public accountability and integrity.

So far, the Speaker of the House, Congressman NEWT GINGRICH, has failed to respond publicly to three charges lodged against him in the Committee of Standards of Official Conduct, except in terms of the vernacular that I quoted earlier, nor has he consented to the appointment of a special counsel. It is he who placed himself in the glasshouse 7 years ago. It is he who has raised the questions of integrity, character, and conflict with which we now contend, and it is he alone who can remove this cloud, not only from himself, but from the body over which he now presides.

NEWT GINGRICH is third in line of succession to the Presidency, occupying the second most powerful position in America. As such, and to quote his own words, "Clearly, this investigation has to meet a higher standard of public accountability and integrity."

GINGRICH INSISTS ON THOROUGH INVESTIGATION

WASHINGTON, DC.—Congressman Newt Gingrich (R-GA) today insisted that the House Ethics Committee give the special counsel appointed to investigate House Speaker Jim Wright the independence necessary to do a thorough and complete job. Discouraged by several news reports that special counsel Richard Phelan would be restricted in the scope of his investigation, Gingrich took a series of actions including writing to House Ethics Chairman Julian Dixon (D-CA), forwarding the letter to his colleagues in the House, and speaking on the House floor on the need for a truly independent counsel with full leeway in pursuing the investigation.

In his letter to Chairman Dixon, Gingrich wrote:

"I have a number of concerns regarding the Ethics Committee's contract with and instructions for the special counsel hired to conduct the investigation into Speaker Jim Wright's questionable financial dealings.

"First, I am concerned that the scope, authority, and independence of the special counsel will be limited by the guidelines the Ethics Committee has established."

Gingrich agreed with concerns raised by Common Cause Chairman Archibald Cox in a letter to Chairman Dixon earlier this week. The Common Cause letter urged the Ethics Committee to commit itself to the following measures:

1. The outside counsel shall have full authority to investigate and present evidence and arguments before the Ethics Committee concerning the questions arising out of the activities of House Speaker James C. Wright, Jr.;

2. The outside counsel shall have full authority to organize, select, and hire staff on a full- or part-time basis in such numbers as the counsel reasonably requires and will be provided with such funds and facilities as the counsel reasonably requires;

3. The outside counsel shall have full authority to review all documentary evidence available from any source and full cooperation of the Committee in obtaining such evidence;

4. The Committee shall give the outside counsel full cooperation in the issuance of subpoenas;

5. The outside counsel shall be free, after discussion with the Committee, to make such public statements and reports as the counsel deems appropriate;

6. The outside counsel shall have full authority to recommend that formal charges be brought before the Ethics Committee, shall be responsible for initiating and conducting proceedings if formal charges have been brought and shall handle any aspects of the proceedings believed to be necessary for a full inquiry;

7. The Committee shall not countermand or interfere with the outside counsel's ability to take steps necessary to conduct a full and fair investigation; and

8. The outside counsel will not be removed except for good cause.

Gingrich wrote to Chairman Dixon, "It is my impression from press reports that the Ethics Committee has specifically failed to meet the Common Cause standard. Furthermore, it is my understanding that the special counsel cannot go beyond the six areas outlined in your June 9, 1988, Resolution of Preliminary Inquiry. This leads me to believe that the special counsel will not be allowed to investigate the questionable bulk purchases of Mr. Wright's book, "Reflections of a Public Man," as a way to circumvent House limits on outside income.

"I am particularly concerned that the unusual purchases by the Teamsters Union, the New England Mutual Life Insurance Co., a Fort Worth developer, and a Washington lobbyist will not be investigated.

"I believe many will perceive this action as an attempt by the Ethics Committee to control the scope and direction of the investigation."

Gingrich requested a copy of the contract arranged between the Ethics Committee and Mr. Phelan. He also asked to know the extent of Mr. Phelan's subpoena power.

Gingrich said, "The House of Representatives, as well as the American public, deserve an investigation which will uncover the truth. At this moment, I am afraid that the apparent restrictions placed on this special counsel will not allow the truth to be uncovered.

"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 the 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."

SPENDING CUTS

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

Mr. GOSS. Madam Speaker, I read in last Friday's Congress Daily that the chairman of the Budget Committee in the other body is looking for between

\$150 and \$200 billion in discretionary cuts as part of his effort to bring about a balanced budget. Some might see that as a difficult or even an impossible task. But a careful and honest assessment of all discretionary accounts yields heartening news. It can be done, I say. It can be done. There is at least this much nonpriority spending we can eliminate. In fact, I would argue that there is much more than \$150 to \$200 billion. As we move toward the budget and appropriations process, it is imperative that we address the wasteful spending that bloats our Federal budget, as everybody knows. As I have done for the last 3 years, I have again submitted to the budgetary leaders of both Houses of Congress my annual list of discretionary spending cuts for their consideration. These 75 cuts would save the American taxpayer \$275 billion over 5 years.

Madam Speaker, critics of the balanced budget amendment contend that it would mandate draconian cuts in entitlement programs because our discretionary budget simply just does not offer significant savings. The facts clearly show otherwise. In reality, we continue to fund outdated and duplicative programs that operate in the shadows serving our bureaucracy and special interests rather than the American people we work for. We desperately need to shed some light on these ancient programs. The Appalachian Regional Commission, a Great Society era created as a temporary response to poverty, continues to spend hundreds of millions of dollars annually with little discernible impact on the long-term economic health of the United States of America.

These are probably very worthy projects, but I do not think they really are getting at the core of poverty and they probably would not compete as well with other Federal dollars for more urgent needs. Only in Washington could this be construed as a legitimate response to poverty. The Rural Electrification Administration, which provides electricity for my home in Sanibel, formed in 1935 when only 10 percent of projects have included funding for the NASCAR Hall of Fame and most recently \$750,000 toward a new football stadium in South Carolina. Rural America had electricity, continues to spend billions of dollars subsidizing rural electric and telephone companies—this despite the fact that today 99 percent of rural America has electricity and 98 percent has phones. I suggest those who do not have it do not want it. Taken alone, each of these programs may not amount to large costs—but when you start adding them up, going through a whole list of projects, you can see why we have a budget crisis.

Unfortunately, programs like these are the rule rather than the exception. Of course, Government must lead by example. That is why I have proposed

also reducing the legislative and executive branch appropriation by 20 percent, which would save \$3 billion over the next 5 years. The American people spoke clearly last November—they want to downsize the Government. We should understand that message. And that process needs to begin at the top with Congress and the President. To be credible, we must not only eliminate wasteful spending but we must also be willing to look at good programs and prioritize our limited financial resources so we get the most important served. I do not pretend to think that we can correct decades of neglect and abuse overnight. While these 75 proposals which I offered are not a cure-all, they will hopefully serve as the first shot in the coming budgetary battle between the defenders of the status quo and those of us who came here to make a difference.

The debate is between the habitual big spenders in the District of Columbia and those newcomers who have dared to suggest maybe the Federal Government should stop the waste, fraud, and abuse of the precious tax dollars. There is no one in America who has come forward to claim or even to imply that every Federal dollar spent is a dollar well spent. On the contrary, there are tens, if not hundreds, of millions of Americans who know we are not handling their tax dollars as wisely as possible and they are asking us to do better. There is no excuse for us not to do better. We can start now, we can start today. I urge my colleagues to look at my list of spending cuts, and if they do not like my list, make your own. There are plenty of places to cut spending.

CUTS IN VETERANS' BENEFITS CALLED CALLOUS AND UNCONSCIONABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. STOKES. Madam Speaker, last week the House Appropriations Committee voted to drastically cut \$206 million in funding for programs that serve our Nation's veterans. I do not think this is the proper way to demonstrate our commitment to individuals who have made the ultimate sacrifice in serving this Nation and protecting our lives and property.

It is especially callous that these cuts come from funds earmarked for medical equipment and ambulatory care facilities. The Veterans' Administration currently has an unmet need of necessary medical equipment exceeding three-quarters of a billion dollars. The bill passed by the Appropriations Committee would increase that unmet need by at least \$50 million.

How can we even consider such reductions when information we hear daily tells us of new and emerging medical conditions being experienced by

our veterans. Just when our veterans' medical centers and medical teams are recognizing and attempting to address these problems, the Republican-controlled House wants to slash funds that would be used to purchase such types of equipment as cat scanners, x-rays, EKG machines, and other vital equipment. Already, due to budget constraints, the VA is not able to replace and improve medical equipment nearly as often as the private sector.

Even more shocking is the \$156 million reduction in construction projects. These funds are targeted for ambulatory care facilities—a crucial aspect of the VA's medical care agenda at a time when our aging World War II veterans are requiring more medical assistance. Clearly, this is not the time to cut back on ambulatory care facilities.

If the rescissions have been recommended by the Republicans on the committee to offset the costs of the California earthquake and other natural disasters, it will create another disaster for thousands of our veterans. If these actions are intended to offset the cost of future tax cuts—including capital gains for middle-class families and affluent investors—it is unconscionable.

These cuts are ill-considered. The veterans of this Nation have dutifully served this country. We owe them the same full measure of devotion they gave in protecting this Nation with their lives.

THE ROLE OF THE ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

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

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, this past week in a press conference with the President's Presidential press secretary, we heard him say that, "Prime Minister Rabin is calling. I think it is fair for us to say because he is upset and alarmed by the action taken in the House of Representatives to cut back on funding in the fiscal year 1995 supplemental bill for debt forgiveness for Jordan."

While he said that, we do not know if that is why Prime Minister Rabin was calling. We have learned that very often what this White House says has no relation to the facts, but that is what he said.

He further said the President told the Prime Minister in candor that we face a very tough audience on Capitol Hill. "This is an example of the tilt toward isolation that you now see in the Republican-dominated Congress."

That is vintage Bill Clinton, blame the other guy, "I didn't do it, I am trying to help you, the devil made me do it, the dog ate my lunch, the dog ate my homework."

Madam Speaker, the President's entrance into the Middle East is to first

make it partisan and to politicize foreign affairs. It is most shameful that it is done in one of the most troubled areas of the world. Why does he do this? Because for 2½ years this Nation has lacked a coherent global vision, a global view.

What are our U.S. national security interests? When I look across world, I see our friends in NATO, the former Soviet bloc, it is absolutely in the interests of the United States that the former Soviet-bloc nations discover that capitalism and freedom work.

I see our increasingly important trading partners on the Pacific rim and, of course, the tinderbox for the world, the Middle East. And where are our troops that are supposed to be the shield of the Republic and the shield of our foreign affairs? Our troops are in Rwanda, Somalia, Haiti, Cambodia, Macedonia, northern Iraq, hardly a reflection of a coherent world view.

The peace process today in the Middle East has been carried out without United States leadership. This is the first administration of the last four that has shown no interest in leadership in the Middle East peace process.

The PLO agreement was reached, not in the United States, but in Oslo. Of course, the great handshake took place on the south lawn, but we were not involved until after the agreement had been reached.

The Jordanian-Israeli agreements were bilateral. The agreements were signed on the south lawn, but we were not there in the leadership. But lacking any domestic agenda this year, the President has decided to weigh in on the Middle East and has done so by politicizing it and making it partisan. He can do something about this right in his own administration. Israel is a nation that is in a defensive posture, with armed aggressors all around her, and is building a defensive ARROW missile system for protection to shoot down incoming ballistic missiles. We now have an Arms Control and Disarmament Agency that has been in effect since 1972—and an ABM agreement—that is negotiating further agreements with former Soviet-bloc nations for reasons that absolutely escape me.

We are the only Nation that can add to the technology required for a bullet to intercept a bullet. We have done that with the ERINT missile, called the PAC-3, built by Rockwell. But this administration, under what I presume to be simply bureaucratic inertia, has chosen to limit further technological advances in this intercept missile technology to 3 kilometers per second, precisely what we have now. I do not know why we would want to limit any future technology, since there is not a nation in the world competing with us in this technology, why would we ask them to agree with us to limit what we can do?

Mr. President, if you want to do something about the Middle East and for the future safety of this very vulnerable friend in this troubled part of the world, abolish the Arms Control