

with a stable permanent retirement system." There is a picture of a Social Security card being cut by scissors.

Perhaps my colleagues on the Republican side would like to read this, and as recently as last evening, a senior member of the Committee on Ways and Means on this floor said in the debate, "We cannot ask our children to support a growing number of seniors who live 20 and 30 years past retirement." The gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] said that.

If you do, in fact, wish to exclude Social Security, vote to do so.

#### THE FIG LEAF THAT WAS GOOD ENOUGH

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

(Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I took a special note today to go back to the Cloakroom and find that 412 of our colleagues voted for the resolution offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FLANAGAN].

Now, given the fact that we do not have 412 Republicans, apparently our Democrat friends, in spite of the fact that they called his resolution a fig leaf, yesterday thought it was a good enough fig leaf to vote for it. But yet today they will come to this floor and try and scare the senior citizens of our country into believing that we want to cut Social Security.

As I said yesterday during debate on the resolution offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FLANAGAN], I do not know of any politician, Democrat or Republican, who wants to cut Social Security. I have never ever heard one politician ever running for anything from dogcatcher to Congress who ever said they wanted to cut Social Security. We do not want to do it.

Apparently the Democrats do not want to do it, because the majority of you voted for Mr. FLANAGAN's fig leaf resolution yesterday, because you thought it was good enough to send a message.

Do not try to fool. Do not try and scare. Let us be honest with our senior citizens. Nobody wants to cut Social Security. We do not intend to do it.

#### THE 100-DAY NIGHTMARE

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

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the 100-day dream has become a 100-day nightmare. The process by which this balanced budget amendment to the Constitution came to the floor of this House is the classic example.

□ 0940

I serve on the Committee on the Judiciary out of which this balanced budget amendment comes. Two weeks ago on a Wednesday afternoon, with over 20 amendments still unoffered in committee, the committee closed down

operation and went home. The Rules Committee, with over 100 amendments still pending, limited amendments on the floor to 6.

To amend the Constitution, if we are lucky in this body, we will get 2 days of debate. This is not democracy, America; this is irresponsibility.

#### "IT'S THE MAJORITY, STUPID"

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

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, as we listen to the rhetoric and the misinformation and the scare tactics that are going to be on this floor today, I think it is important to remind people that it was the Democrats who cut Social Security benefits in the 103d Congress by \$48 billion, and not one Republican voted for it. And there is no threat in the 104th Congress.

Back in November the majority of the American people spoke loudly and clearly when they elected a Republican majority to this Congress; a majority of the people embraced the provisions in our Contract With America, which includes a balanced budget amendment. A majority of the people demanded that we change Congress, and a majority of the people sent a message that they want a smaller, less costly, more efficient Government. What my colleagues from the other side of the aisle seem to forget is that a majority of the people did not elect the Democrat President 2 years ago. In fact, only 43 percent of the electorate voted for our current President.

I urge the President and the rest of his party to join with the majority of the people in supporting the balanced budget amendment.

The majority has spoken; it is what they want; it is what they deserve.

#### IN SUPPORT OF THE STENHOLM BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

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

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. I have had three opportunities to vote on the balanced budget amendments since I have been a Member of Congress. We failed three times.

I do not think we will have a better opportunity than now to pass one, finally.

I support the Charlie Stenholm balanced budget amendment because it has strength and it is realistic and it is doable.

I also know that Members of Congress, most of us, are well-intentioned; we want to do the right thing; but the fact is every one of us has a laundry list of where we are going to cut costs. The problem is that we all have a different laundry list of where to cut, and therefore nothing is cut.

Every day we spend \$816 million interest payments on the debt alone—that is right, \$816 million every day. That is money that we could use to control crime, make job training and education available to more Americans and immunize our children.

Interest payments are simply devouring large portions of the Federal budget and preventing the Congress from funding programs that are important to the American people. We know we are accountable for our actions, we know we are not doing the right thing, we know we need some enforcement powers. We need to do it by passing a balanced budget amendment.

#### THE REAL AGENDA

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, let us talk about what the real agenda is and what the real problem is with sticking the term "Social Security" in the constitutional amendment. What you do then is you open a huge lobbyists' loophole in the Constitution, because what would happen is that anybody who wanted to bring some social welfare spending approach to Capitol Hill would simply call it "Social Security." Do you want to have midnight basketball? Fine, call it "Social Security." Do you want to have the Corporation for Public Broadcasting continue to get money? Call it "Social Security." Do you want to have the NEA to continue to get its funding for pornographic art, just call it "Social Security."

Every lobbyist coming to Capitol Hill asking for more spending would simply call it "Social Security" and say therefore it is not covered by the balanced budget. That would destroy Social Security.

Do you want the surest formula for destroying Social Security? Just put it in the Constitution in a form that people can use it to destroy the system. That would be the wrong thing to do on this floor today.

#### BALANCE THE BUDGET AND REDUCE THE FEDERAL DEFICIT

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

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I believe Congress needs to work toward balancing the budget and reducing the Federal deficit.

I believe we must legislate in a more fiscally responsible way that will ensure our Nation will remain financially strong for our children and grandchildren.

Over the next several weeks, we will debate many measures to achieve a balanced budget.

One measure, however, which I will not condone and will not even consider is any effort by this leadership to cut Social Security.

Social Security is a covenant the U.S. Government has made with its citizens, a promise to support working Americans when they are retired and living on fixed incomes.

The working families of the Nation, and of New York, want straight talk, and they deserve to know whether or not Social Security is on the table.

In the only opportunity we had to exempt Social Security in the 104th Congress, every Republican but one voted against an amendment to exempt Social Security during markup of the balanced budget amendment in the Judiciary Committee.

Simply put, we cannot afford to balance the budget on the backs of working Americans who are living on fixed incomes.

These are difficult economic times for the people of New York's southern tier and the Nation. Senior citizens should know for certain that their benefits are not in danger.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas). The Chair would like to remind all Members that there is a limitation of 20 1-minutes. There have been 16 on each side to this point. The Chair will recognize Members in order. The Chair would ask Members to adjust their ranking so that we can get on with the business of the morning. Those who were here first, I presume, will be recognized.

#### DEMOCRATS, NOT REPUBLICANS, RAISED TAXES ON SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, all right, let us talk about Social Security. In 1993, the first year your Democrat President was in office, the Democrat Party, without one vote from the Republican side, raised taxes on Social Security.

Then in the same legislation, the Democrat Party voted to put that money, the new proceeds, not in the Social Security trust fund but in the general fund. Why? Probably so your Democrat President could have more money to pass out as largess when he needs one of the bits and pieces of his legislation passed.

For example, your President, when NAFTA comes, he is so offended by \$20 presents from lobbyists, teeshirts from school groups, and baseball caps from veterans' organizations; he comes into the House,

If you will want to help pass NAFTA, I will give you a million dollars here. You want to save your helium reserve plant? Let me give

you a couple of million. Let me give you a couple of million for your dam back home. We want your vote.

You do not want a balanced budget amendment because you want to protect Social Security; the fact is you do not want a balanced budget amendment because you do not want a balanced budget; not to protect Social Security but protect your largess when you need votes passed, and your President uses it the most.

#### HIGHER MINIMUM WAGE PRODUCES ADDITIONAL JOBS

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

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as a strong supporter of the proposal put forth by President Clinton to increase the minimum wage, I would like to share with my colleagues the findings of a survey in my home State of New Jersey. Despite dire predictions by some of gloom and doom, our New Jersey businesses report that they actually added jobs to their payrolls after the minimum wage was raised in our State.

As Governor Christine Todd Whitman acknowledged in an interview following President Clinton's State of the union Address, New Jersey workers could not make ends meet on the national minimum wage of \$4.25. Our State of New Jersey has a \$5.05 minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the fact that our State has led the Nation in providing workers with the decent living wage they deserve.

I support extending the increase in the minimum wage to every worker in our Nation. Let me point out that the value of the current Federal minimum wage, adjusted for inflation, has fallen by about 50 cents an hour since 1991.

□ 0950

It is about 27 percent lower than it was in 1979. Let us make sure that the economic recovery reaches all Americans, and let us support President Clinton's minimum wage increase.

#### A SPECIAL CHALLENGE TO THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SIXTH DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

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

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday evening the President stood in this Chamber and called on the American people to join him in reforming our Government. More importantly, he issued a challenge to Members of Congress to voluntarily refrain from taking lobbyists' gifts.

I am proud to say that I rise to the President's challenge and will no longer accept gifts from lobbyists. From now on this sign will grace the door of my office, and any Member who

signs this pledge sheet will also get a sign to hang on their door.

Mr. Speaker, I issue a special challenge to my colleague from the Sixth District of Georgia to take this pledge and illustrate his commitment to a gift ban by abandoning, and I will have to say it in piglet Latin, his ook-bay eal-day.

All of us have accepted one gift or another from lobbyists. However, as the President reminded us, we cannot change our yesterdays, but our todays and tomorrows we can.

#### SUPPORT THE THREE-FIFTHS AMENDMENT

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

Mr. HEINEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the balanced budget amendment with its three-fifths supermajority. If we in this Congress are sincere in voting for a meaningful amendment, then we must put a clutch on our ability to raise taxes to pay for our inability to do our jobs.

People across this country are constantly in a process of balancing their personal budgets. The States and municipalities across this country are balancing their budgets. Private enterprise is constantly trying to balance their budgets. I ask, "Why can't we climb aboard by balancing our budget without whimsically overtaxing the people to do this?"

We should be leaders. We should be the generals who lead the parade, not those who march behind it. Let us get out front and demonstrate that we can make tough decisions to keep our house in order. We do not need to be the parent who constantly raids the children's piggy bank to pay our way.

Support the three-fifths amendment. Vote for the Barton amendment.

#### THE CONSTITUTION SHOULD NOT ALLOW A MINORITY TO CONTROL THE BUDGET PROCESS

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, we need to pass a balanced budget amendment, but amending the Constitution really cannot be taken lightly. Our Constitution has only been amended 17 times in over 200 years since the Bill of Rights. Our Constitution is based on majority rule, and we should not vote to put budget control in the hands of a minority of Members.

In all the instances that are written into the Constitution of a supermajority, all of those are instances are where the legislative branch must approve or must override the action of another coequal branch: The affirmative vote to override a veto by the President, the Executive, the