

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