

Union. I think it is important for that area of the world that they be admitted. It will help them economically, and they have been a longtime valuable ally of America. I hope that the President will follow through on his efforts to step up his diplomatic activities in that regard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Senate failed to do what American middle-class citizens and State legislators have had to do for some time, and that is, step up to the plate and finally have to balance their checkbooks, to take in only as much, and spend only as much, as they take in.

Unfortunately, they failed to grasp this very simple concept. It has been a quarter of a century since we balanced our Federal budgets, and yet the liberal Democrats again were afraid to restrict themselves, to live by this very simple, very American concept.

Now, earlier today we heard Democrats talking about wanting a family-friendly Congress and worrying about their children, and that is great. I have got children. I worry about my children, too.

But where were they when we were voting on the most important amendment that would have as big an impact on our children's future as anything? Well, I will tell you where some of them were a year ago. They were supporting this amendment when they knew that it did not have a chance of passing.

We had Senator TOM DASCHLE, who is now beating his chest in self-righteous indignation that anyone would dare pass a balanced budget amendment because locusts would descend from the heavens and senior citizens would die in their homes. This was the worst thing TOM DASCHLE said, and he was proud to stand up for it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OXLEY). The gentleman is admonished to not mention specific Members of the other body.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. And this Representative was quoted a year ago saying this about this balanced budget amendment, there was going to be such a scourge on humanity. February 28, 1994: "In this debate for a balanced budget amendment, we are being forced to face the consequences of our inaction. Quite simply, we are building a

legacy of debt for our children and grandchildren and hamstringing their ability to address pressing national priorities."

And what happened? Does he not care about children a year later? It does not make a lot of sense to me.

Another Senator stated a year ago, this constitutional amendment, no matter what one thinks of it, will add to the pressure that we reconcile that we spend what we raise and that we begin to assure a better economic future with economic growth and hope and opportunity for our children once again.

□ 1500

It seems he changed his mind, too. Now he is saying the same thing, bringing up this Social Security card. Frankly, I am getting a little tired of hearing Democrats come out and say how they are the protectors of Social Security, while Republicans want to steal money from our senior citizens.

Why do we not try to think back a few years ago in 1993, when their President sent a budget to the floor that increased taxes on Social Security recipients? How many Republicans voted to take more money out of senior citizens' checkbooks? Zero. Zilch. Zip. Nada. None. How do they sleep at night? I mean, how hypocritical can you be to say, "I want to protect Social Security, so I am going to make sure that we don't balance our checkbooks. I am going to save senior citizens. These bad Republicans are against senior citizens.

But he does not tell the rest of the story. He does not tell the story that it was the Republicans that stood up for senior citizens. Every single Republican in both houses stood up for senior citizens when the Democratic President, the Democratic House, and the Democratic Senate was ready to sell them down the river.

It is a disgrace. It is hypocritical. I do not know how they sleep at night. I do not know how the Senator from California, who stole her election from the California people by promising to support the balanced budget amendment and then voted against it and killed it a few months later, I do not know how she sleeps at night. And she will not allow the California people to have a chance to vote on the balanced budget amendment, only to make Congress abide by the same laws that middle-class citizens have had to abide by for too long.

I am going to be able to sleep at night. I do not know how they will.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OXLEY). The gallery is admonished there will be no demonstration.

PARTIES SHOULD AGREE ON COURSE OF ACTION TO AVOID ECONOMIC DOWNTURN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, some months ago, after having been through the election and after having campaigned to support the provisions of the Contract With America, I came to the realization that subsequent to the policies that have been prevalent during this administration that had to do with tax policy, and then with the Fed increasing interest rates along with that tax policy at the same time we had high taxes, that history would ultimately repeat itself, and that our economy could not sustain itself with relatively high taxes and with increasing interest rates. There would come a time when our economy would turn down and that things would not be as this administration and all of us would like them to be. Perhaps that is not far away.

I take this special order this afternoon to just bring light to the fact that there are clouds on the horizon, and that we as Republicans and Democrats need to agree on a course of action to avoid what could be an economic downturn, serious economic downturn.

I picked up the Wall Street Journal this morning, and as I turned through the pages and got to page 2, I found three articles that disturbed me. The headline on one was "Consumers Held Down Spending During January." In reading that article, it simply said that consumers were hesitant to spend, as perhaps they has been at some previous times recently.

I looked at another article that disturbed me along the same vein that said "Retailers See Mildly Disappointing Sales for February Amid Slowing Economy." Of course, that headline speaks for itself. Everyone can understand why we would be disappointed to see that the economy, as this headline says, is slowing.

But then I saw a headline that really disturbed me, because a very important part of the Contract With America, things that Republicans and some Democrats agree on that are part of the contract, is that we can do some things here in the House of Representatives that will help to avoid a slowdown in the economy. And this third article, which really disturbed me, has a headline which says, "Rubin Questions the Economic Impact of Capital Gains Tax Cuts, Tax Reform."

This is Secretary Rubin, President Clinton's Secretary of the Treasury, and, of course, he is a very important person when it comes to directing economic policy. And that part of this that disturbed me the most said that he is being reported to have said "No significant tax reform is likely to emerge from Congress without substantial leadership from the Treasury, and