

the school districts, they also must live within their means and on their budgets as well.

Only in the Nation's Capital is the notion an oddity, living within a balanced budget. For decades now the Congress only seems to know about increased spending, and to feed that addiction with increased taxes.

The Republican majority, in response to the American people and in concert with them, have charted a new course, a course that embraces a balanced budget with a tax limitation provision. This is a course that seems unique only in Washington, DC, but commonplace everywhere else in the country.

Like an errant child who needs discipline, Congress needs a three-fifths tax limitation for that discipline. Let us pass it before over taxes again.

CONGRESS SHOULD ACCEPT THE PRESIDENT'S CHALLENGE AND BEGIN TODAY TO GET TO WORK FOR AMERICA

(Mr. LUTHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton's message last night was the message I heard from the Minnesotans I represent throughout last fall's campaign: If you work hard and play by the rules, you should be rewarded by a chance at achieving the American dream.

As a new Member of this body, Mr. Speaker, I came here to achieve results on a bipartisan basis for the people of my district. I applaud this Congress for its quick action on congressional reform but, Mr. Speaker, I say to the Members, that is just the beginning.

We must now get to work and fight to improve the lives of everyday Americans. Middle-class families are crying out for jobs that pay a liveable wage, for an education that provides the tools for the future, for affordable health care for themselves and their kids, and for streets free of violence and drugs. These are the reasons we were elected, to improve the lives of our fellow Americans.

Mr. Speaker, let us accept the President's challenge, stop the gridlock and bickering, and get on with making a better tomorrow. Let us begin today.

THE TAX LIMITATION BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today is a historic day. We are going to consider the tax limitation balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

No one, perhaps except President Clinton and some of his senior economic advisers, seriously questions whether we should balance the budget anymore. The question is how to do it.

In the Contract With America, the Republican majority says we should balance the budget with a three-fifths requirement to raise taxes, and put the emphasis not on raising taxes but on cutting spending. Why is this?

If we look at Federal spending over the last 40 years, there has been no year in which Federal spending went down. Every year Federal spending has gone up. In the years that we have had major tax increases, and we have had 16 major tax increases in the last 30 years, Federal spending has gone up and the deficit has gone up also.

Therefore, the American people want a real change. They want a tax limitation balanced budget amendment that puts the emphasis on balancing the budget by cutting spending, not by raising taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will vote for the Barton-Hyde-Dade-Geren balanced budget amendment to the Constitution with the three-fifths requirement for a tax increase.

CONGRESS MUST BALANCE THE BUDGET, BUT DO IT IN THE RIGHT WAY

(Mr. TUCKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, last night the President addressed us. We have heard some of our colleagues indicate that he was equivocal, that he had one speech for the left and one speech for the right.

Indeed, however, Mr. Speaker, the President was very lucid last night. He was very clear. What he said is that he believes in balancing the budget, but the devil is in the details.

What he said, Mr. Speaker, is that yes, he embraces some of the principles in the Contract With America, but, Mr. Speaker, as every good lawyer and, indeed, as every good lawmaker should know, a contract is only as good as its terms and conditions. You must look at the specificities.

The Republicans have not offered us any specificities on how they intend to balance the budget. All they can tell us is if we do not balance the budget, we will indeed be paying for it with our children's future. If we balance the budget on the backs of our children, on the backs of our Social Security recipient, they will indeed be paying for it in their future.

Mr. Speaker, we must be conscientious. We must listen to the President of the United States. We must do it right, but we must do it rightly.

CONGRESS MUST PASS THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO PROTECT THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, history puts so much in perspective and in context. We are going today to bring forth before this House a constitutional amendment to require that our Federal budget be balanced.

Very prosperous countries in the past, very wealthy countries, even in this hemisphere, for example, Argentina, if we look at the history in the early part of this century, Argentina was among the most prosperous countries in the world. If we look now at the dilemma that we are faced with in Mexico, an economy that is part of NAFTA, and it is a very thriving economy, these instances in our recent history and in the recent history of this hemisphere point to the fact that fiscal irresponsibility can destroy even prosperous, even very growing economies.

When we realize that even Keynes, Mr. Speaker, never envisioned permanent deficit spending, we realize that we must put our budget under constraints. We must put ourselves under constraints, as every family in America has to. We must pass this amendment to balance the budget.

URGING THE PRESIDENT TO HELP IMPLEMENT REFORMS CONTAINED IN THE CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

(Mrs. WALDHOLTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, Republicans in this Chamber have vowed to keep faith with the American people. The Contract With America lays our specific guidelines to reform the way the Federal Government conducts its business.

By ending unfunded mandates, our Government will stop the process whereby the Federal Government simply dictates policy to the States, whatever the cost. And, by passing the balanced budget amendment, the Federal Government will be forced to live within its means, a responsibility that American families accept everyday.

Mr. Speaker, Americans have overwhelmingly endorsed this reform agenda. We urge the President to help implement this agenda to restore to the Federal Government the basic values of accountability, responsibility, and individual liberty.

□ 1220

BATTLE OF THE CONTRACTS

(Mr. DURBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, stay tuned America for the battle of the contracts today on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives. In one corner the Republican contract, which

will bring us today the balanced budget amendment. And what is included in the amendment which my Republican colleague applauds? Opportunities to make deep, slashing cuts in Social Security and in Medicare. In fact, every version of the Republican contract on the balanced budget amendment leaves Social Security and Medicare vulnerable.

How vulnerable? In my home State of Illinois some 30 percent in cuts in Medicare are projected, reducing the benefits for senior citizens, more out-of-pocket payments and the closing of rural and inner-city hospitals.

And in the other corner the Roosevelt Democratic contract. Roosevelt's contract for Social Security, 60 years now of dignity and independence for senior citizens, and a Democratic contract on Medicare, which makes sure that seniors do not have to worry, as they did in the past, about the payment of medical bills.

As Speaker GINGRICH and others reminisce about FDR, they might want to reflect on his values and the time-honored contract he made with the American people, today, in this debate.

HOW TO SHRINK THE FEDERAL BUDGET

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, here is a balanced budget, not a balanced budget amendment, but a balanced budget that we voted on last March. Do my colleagues know what? This budget did not raise taxes, did not cut Social Security, did not cut into veterans' contracts or obligations that we owe them.

What it did was shrink the size of the Federal Government. It eliminated 150 programs like the Interstate Commerce Commission. It privatized 25 government agencies like the Federal Aviation Administration. It downsized the Department of Education, which has not produced anything in education, from 5,000 employees down to 500. Thirty-six thousand Commerce Department employees have not produced one nickel of profit in America, and we cut them from 36,000 down to 3,000.

That is how to shrink the size of the Federal Government. We do not cut Social Security; we do not have to, and my colleagues know that.

BALANCE THE BUDGET WITHOUT A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

(Mr. CONYERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, balancing the budget is a good idea, but using our country's most precious and time-honored document, the Constitution, to do it is a bad idea. It is unnecessary. It would delay the budget balancing, and could impede rather than

advance economic growth. And the 60-percent supermajority on budget matters, revenue, and public debt policy would mean the minority, not the majority, would control, and gridlock over our most important fiscal decisions would result.

During the last Congress we adopted a budget to cut a record \$500 billion from the deficit. Contrast that with the new Republican majority proposal to put off the budget balance in exchange for a promise in the Constitution to do it after 7 years and two presidential elections.

And in fact, the new majority has steadfastly refused to put its budget-cutting numbers on the table. We know why. Our knees would buckle, the States' knees would buckle, but most importantly, the American citizens' knees would buckle.

CUTTING THE FEDERAL BUDGET

(Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, my Democrat colleagues make a strange argument against the balanced budget amendment. They say do not pass it because if we do, we will have to cut spending.

The corollary of that is that they think it is wise to continue to increase the deficit \$100 to \$300 billion every year for the next decade.

Two, this year the estimates are down, but Members know as well as I do it is only a couple of years until they zoom up to \$400 billion a year.

Yes, a balanced budget amendment will mean that we will have to cut spending, and to the extent that we do it honestly by downsizing agencies, by raising the retirement age so that Federal employees retire when the rest of the world retires, by means testing Medicare premiums, by doing sensible, realistic, honest changes in Federal public policy, to that extent, you bet we will be able to protect Social Security, health care security for our seniors, and those programs critical to the American people.

TRUSTING THE AMERICAN PEOPLE TO MAKE DECISIONS ON A BALANCED BUDGET

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year the Republicans got quite upset when people called their Contract With America a contract on America. Today we are finding out, in fact, those who called it a contract on America were more accurate, because it is a contract on our senior citizens, both to their Social Security payments and to their health care coverage given to them under Medicare.

The gentleman held up a budget just a minute ago that he said would balance the budget. The only problem was only 73 Members voted for that. The fact of the matter is that the people were not prepared to vote for it.

What we see now is the effort of them to rush the balanced budget amendment through, but not have the courage of their convictions to tell Americans in advance where they will cut the budget. The last time they tried to do this only 73 Members voted for it. So what do they want to do now? They want to rush the balanced budget through, not have the courage, the ultimate cynicism of not trusting, not trusting the American people to look at their plan and make a decision whether they want it or not.

It is balanced budgeting in the dark, not in the open as they pledged to do.

KEEPING AMERICANS IN THE DARK ABOUT THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, last night the President said that his budget "protects against any cuts in education."

But, the President's determination to preserve education funding is on a collision course with the Republican Contract on America. This contract promises to balance the budget, cut taxes, and increase military spending, all at the same time. Clearly this contract is a puzzle which is missing most of its pieces.

Today on the House floor we will be debating one piece of this devious puzzle—the balanced budget amendment. Mr. Speaker, if Republicans stick to their contract, they will have to cut more than \$1.3 trillion in nonmilitary programs in the next 7 years.

I ask the Republicans—why won't you educate the American people about the cuts you plan to make in our children's education? Mr. Speaker, our children and their parents have a right to know the fine print of the contract.

The Republicans say they want openness in government, that they want to shine some light on this institution. But in this week's debate on the balanced budget amendment, they are keeping America in the dark about the future of children.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

(Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the only bipartisan, bicameral balanced budget amendment. I speak of the Stenholm-Schaefer amendment, House Resolution 28, of which I am a cosponsor. I cosponsored this resolution because I believe it is absolutely imperative that the 104th