

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

Congress pass a balanced budget amendment this year.

Today, we will begin the debate on several different proposals that have been introduced as possibilities. All of these proposals have merit—and I believe that all of them are serious efforts at formulating the best possible amendment to the Constitution.

However, I am concerned that we do not lose sight of our goal. As we engage in this debate, and examine the strengths and weaknesses of the various proposals, I urge my colleagues to remember how important it is to pass a balanced budget amendment. Our debt currently exceeds \$4.3 trillion. Since this House last voted on a balanced budget amendment last March, our debt has increased by more than \$160 billion.

This country needs a balanced budget amendment and the Stenholm-Schaefer amendment is our best hope. While all other proposals will be dead on arrival in the Senate—the Stenholm-Schaefer amendment has the bipartisan support needed to actually pass in the Senate and I urge my colleagues to support it.

□ 1230

THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

(Ms. MCCARTHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, as debate begins on the balanced budget amendment, there are two issues we need to keep in mind.

First, the mere ratification of the balanced budget amendment will not balance the budget. Between ratification of the amendment and the year 2002—when the amendment would come into force—we will continue to face yearly deficits of \$200 billion. That is why it is imperative that we stipulate how the deficit will be reduced and why we need to be up front with the American people and explain the detailed steps we will take in balancing the Nation's books.

Second, we have to guarantee that we will not balance the budget on the backs of the States. Shifting spending from the Federal Government to State and local governments is not the answer and—despite the Rules Committee not placing in order my amendment on cost shifting—our State and local governments deserve to be protected from any such attempt to do so.

THE CONSTITUTION: A DOCUMENT INTENDED TO ENDURE FOR AGES TO COME

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. Madam Speaker, over a period of more than two centuries, we have amended the Constitution 27 times, 27 times in more than 200 years.

Madam Speaker, the text of the 27th amendment was prepared September 25, 1789, and was not ratified until May 19, 1992, 203 years later.

With this amendment and the amendment for term limits, the majority proposes to ratify the Constitution two times in 100 days. The House Committee on the Judiciary approved the balanced budget amendment in exactly 1 week after we convened the 104th Congress. The Senate Judiciary Committee approved it 1 week after the House did.

Now, 3 weeks after we have convened, we are being asked to actually amend the Constitution and send it to the States. This impetuous pace, this haste, is a far cry from John Marshall's of the Constitution as the document intended to endure for all ages.

Madam Speaker, amending the Constitution is a serious matter. It is not to be done in haste.

CREATE LOAN GUARANTEES HERE AT HOME

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

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, this morning we have spent a great deal of time in Banking talking about a \$40 billion potential guarantee to Mexico. We heard arguments that the reason we ought to do this is because it is good for America; it is good for Mexico, because Mexico is on our borders; it will create jobs.

As I listened to the discussion, and I give consideration to the fact that so many of us are talking about reductions in various programs, welfare and other programs, I could agree with that if we could also make the same kind of passionate arguments for the creation of loan guarantees in this Third World nation within our borders. If we could conglomerate those communities, give loan guarantees to create small businesses, then those persons we bring off of welfare would have job opportunities in the communities in which they live. When the loans are repaid, we take that money, reinvest it in those communities, create more jobs, create more job opportunities, and then we do not have to worry about growing welfare or other entitlement programs.

Madam Speaker, I believe if we are looking for a way to be able to solve the problem of the growing budget in this area, then the best way to do it is let us talk about loan guarantees, not just for Mexico. If it is good for Mexico, it ought to be good for America to do it here at home.

THE NATIONAL DEBT AND THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, we cannot go on as a nation piling debt on debt year after year. The national debt

is nearly five times higher today than it was when Ronald Reagan became President in 1981. That is a disgraceful, bipartisan legacy of irresponsible spending and tax giveaways.

The total debt of the Federal Government totals more than \$4.6 trillion, more than \$16,000 for every man, woman, and child in America. Interest alone will total more than \$225 billion, more than 10 times all the Federal funds spent on all education programs and assistance by the Federal Government.

Some oppose the balanced budget amendment over genuine concern for the fate of Social Security, child nutrition, education funding, or other meritorious programs. An honest assessment of these programs shows us they have not done well while we accumulated \$4 trillion in debt these last 12 years.

There is not a penny in the Social Security trust fund. It has all been borrowed and spent, replaced by a pile of IOU's.

Twenty percent of my State's children live in poverty and go to bed hungry every night.

We all know the shortfall in education funding. It is time to balance the Federal budget.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 17, TREATMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY UNDER ANY CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT REQUIRING A BALANCED BUDGET, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1, PROPOSING A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 44 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 44

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 17) relating to the treatment of Social Security under any constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget, if called up by the majority leader or his designee. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to final adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 2. At any time after the disposition of the concurrent resolution made in order by the first section of this resolution, the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1) proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The first reading of the joint resolution shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the joint resolution for failure to comply with