

unless we act now. It is a debt that continues to grow. It is not enough to say that we would like to have a balanced budget. Were it that easy, we would have done it at least once during their lifetime.

It is clear after 25 years, that we must pass the balanced budget amendment to force this body to act.

Mr. Speaker, we must protect their future. We must take a stand here today so that the next generation will not bear the burden of our mistakes.

I urge my colleagues to support the balanced budget amendment.

DIFFERENT APPROACHES TO A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, after all of the smoke and hot air clears from the debate on the balanced budget amendment, what is the difference between the two parties on this issue?

First, we Democrats support a balanced budget, many of us a constitutional amendment, but unlike the Republicans, we want to specify where the cuts are so that the American people know and the States can plan adequately.

We Democrats support the Constitution and will oppose a supermajority that is clearly unconstitutional. The Republicans do not.

We Democrats believe Social Security should be excluded, and have an amendment clearly stating that. Republicans have an innocuous amendment that better should be known as the "Endangered Chicago Seat Protection Act."

Mr. Speaker, the President last night was bipartisan. He was positive, and we should do the same in this body.

TEN REASONS WHY THE AMERICAN PEOPLE DESERVE A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

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

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the top 10 reasons why the American people deserve a balanced budget amendment:

No. 10, fiscal discipline does not work.

No. 9, we need to make it as difficult to get into debt as it is going to be to get out of it.

No. 8, the national debt is \$4.6 trillion and climbing.

No. 7, 80 percent of the American people want it.

No. 6, since the people cannot raise their annual income just to meet their bills, Congress should not be able to either.

No. 5, contrary to Democratic rhetoric, tax increases may have never balanced the budget.

No. 4, it is in the Contract With America.

No. 3, businesses balance their budgets, families balance their budgets. Now it is time for the House of Representatives to balance the budget.

No. 2, if we do not pass a balanced budget amendment, even Big Bird will not be able to teach our young children to count as high as the debt is going.

And the No. 1 reason why the American people deserve a balanced budget amendment: Because it would protect the Social Security trust fund from tax-and-spend bureaucrats.

FEEL GOOD RESOLUTION

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting, when I reviewed this morning House Resolution 44 brought up by the Rules Committee, that I find that the first order of business is not a balanced budget amendment but it is really a fraud on the House of Representatives and the American people, which is known as House Concurrent Resolution 17. It is a feel gooder. It does not have any effect. It is not even ever going to be signed into law. It is supposedly going to tell the people, our senior citizens who receive Social Security, that they are not going to be touched. Well, folks, that is not the effect of a concurrent resolution. That basically is a fraud.

The other thing I find in this rule, this is very interesting, is that the other body, the Republican Party, the majority have now admitted that the House Committee on the Judiciary did not follow the rules when they marked up the budget resolution for a balanced budget. Right in here it says, "Points of order against consideration of the joint resolution for failure to comply with clause 2(g)(3) of rule XI are waived."

That is an admission, that is an admission that the Committee on the Judiciary did not follow the rules of the House when they marked up the balanced budget amendment.

Why should we waive that rule? Why should we say that the Committee on the Judiciary does not have to follow the rules of the House?

BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, at the end of every month Americans sit down with a checkbook in one hand and a stack of bills in the other. They realize that you cannot continue to spend what you do not have.

But Congress has never fully accepted that concept. Mr. Speaker, for decades Congress has led this Nation into a sea of red ink. Clearly a constitutional amendment is now the only way

to rescue Congress from itself, and to force it to do what 80 percent of our constituents would have us do; that is, balance the budget.

Some say we do not need an amendment to balance the budget, we just say "no" to the special interests.

□ 1120

They say just balance the budget. They are wrong, tragically wrong.

Jefferson said, "let no more be said of confidence in men but bind them down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

TWO MEN WORTHY OF PRAISE

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend two individuals who yesterday performed acts worthy of praise, one a Democrat, and one a Republican.

The first, Mr. Speaker, is President Clinton, who last night delivered a State of the Union Address in this Chamber that laid out a vision for our Nation. It is a vision in which lawmakers put aside their partisan differences and work together for the common good, for the well-being of the American people. It is a vision he calls the new covenant.

The second individual I want to commend, Mr. Speaker, is Congressman GERALD SOLOMON, the chairman of the Committee on Rules in this House. Yesterday, in the spirit of the new covenant, Mr. SOLOMON decided to remove from the wall of his committee room the portrait of Howard W. Smith, a portrait that many Members of this House felt was unworthy to hang in a place of such distinction.

I want to thank Chairman SOLOMON. He is a man of honor, integrity, and good will.

These two men, President Clinton and GERALD SOLOMON, deserve our thanks and our praise.

THE STATE OF THE UNION SPEECH

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, JOHN LEWIS, the only two in either Chamber that were there the day Martin Luther King gave his stirring speech, I hate to disagree with him on anything, but I was offended by Clinton's speech last night on 15 points.

I will do a 5-minute special order tonight I have just signed up for. I can only mention four.

The first one is new covenant. The Ark of the Covenant was the Old Covenant. The New Covenant was the Son of God, Jesus Christ. I was offended

when he used that term in New York at the Democratic Convention. He repeated it over and over and over again last night.

No. 2, to put a Medal of Honor winner in the gallery that joined the Marine Corps at 16, fudging his birth certificate, that pulled that second grenade under his stomach, miraculously surviving and saving his four friends, he did that 6 days past his 17th birthday.

Does Clinton think putting a Medal of Honor winner up there is not going to recall for most of us that he avoided the draft three times and put teenagers in his place possibly to go to Vietnam?

No. 3, the line on the cold war. . . .

By the way, Mr. Speaker, the second amendment is not for killing little ducks and leaving Huey and Dewey and Louis without an aunt and uncle. It is for hunting politicians, like Grozny, 1776, when they take your independence away.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I move the gentleman's words be taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. FAZIO of California. You cannot just do that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All Members will suspend. The Clerk will report the words spoken by the gentleman.

□ 1125

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, a number of Members were not on the floor, including myself, when the gentleman uttered his words. Is it possible to have those words read back so that we can all hear it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). The gentleman is correct.

The Clerk will report the words.

The Clerk read as follows:

Even Andrea Mitchell of NBC took note that is Ronald Reagan's prerogative, George Bush's and all of us who wore the uniform or served in a civilian capacity to crush the evil empire. Clinton gave aid and comfort to the enemy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). In the opinion of the Chair, that is not a proper reference to the President. Without objection, the words are stricken from the RECORD.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the words are stricken from the RECORD.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] owes the entire institution, the Congress, and the President an apology.

Mr. DORNAN. Hell no; hell, no.

Mr. FAZIO of California. We have a Commander in Chief. We have to have a certain decorum here and respect for the body, if not for the individual. We have a respect for the person who is our Commander in Chief.

I would like to know that the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] not only understands that but will apologize to his colleagues and to the President for his behavior.

Mr. DORNAN. Unanimous consent to proceed for 15 seconds?

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] has the floor at this moment.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I would be happy to yield to my colleague from California, since I have the time, to hear his response.

Mr. DORNAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN. To my distinguished friend and colleague, Maj. Earl Kolbille, Lt. Comdr. J.J. Connell was beaten to death in Hanoi. I have had friends beaten to death in Hanoi, tortured and beaten. You have not.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I have asked the gentleman—

Mr. DORNAN. I will not withdraw my remarks. I will not only not apologize. . . .

I will accept the discipline of the House.

Mr. VOLKMER. I ask that the words of the gentleman from California be taken down.

Mr. DORNAN. Good, I will leave the floor, no apology, and I will not speak the rest of the day. The truth is the truth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be in order. The gentleman's words have already been taken down—

Mr. VOLKMER. Those words, those words.

Mr. FAZIO of California. The gentleman is challenging the words that were uttered in response to my question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair rules that those words as follows "I believe the President did give aid and comfort to the enemy, Hanoi," were also out of order. The Chair has ruled that, based on the precedents of the House, the words of the gentleman from California were out of order, and without objection, both sets of words will be stricken from the RECORD.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object unless I do not get a satisfactory answer to my concerns, my concerns were with, frankly, more than just the words that were read. I was particularly concerned with the last sentence or two of the gentleman from California's statement, and I would like those words as well to be read to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has just ruled that those words

were the same words essentially as those earlier taken down and previously ruled out of order.

The Chair has ruled that those words were also out of order.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think the Chair misinterprets my comments, and perhaps I was not clear. The words I am referring to were the original 1-minute statement by the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], and I am particularly concerned with the last two lines of it, and I would like them read back to the House.

□ 1133

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. DUNCAN). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BONIOR. The Speaker in previous days has asked that the gentleman in question, upon words being taken down, be seated.

Would that not be a proper request to be made at this point?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct. The gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] should be seated at this point.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] did say that he understood the rules of the House, that he had been censured under the rules of the House for what he said, and he will not speak for the next 24 hours on the floor of the House, and it strikes me that we are operating under the rules.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I think the request made by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] is still a valid and much-needed request and, in addition to that, I would certainly like to hear the last two lines of the gentleman's original statement.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I have a parliamentary inquiry of the Speaker at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. FAZIO of California. When the Speaker rules that the gentleman should not be allowed to speak for 24 hours, does that encompass remarks that might be placed in the RECORD, participation in special orders, and other activities that might not involve the gentleman speaking on the floor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is the House's determination as to whether or not the Member should be allowed to proceed in order for the remainder of the day. That determination shall not be made by the Chair.

Mr. FAZIO of California. In other words, is the House required to vote on whether or not remarks should be placed in the RECORD?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Unparliamentary remarks cannot be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. FAZIO of California. But remarks that are not ruled unparliamentary may be placed in the RECORD if they are not uttered on the floor; is that the ruling of the Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Unparliamentary remarks should not be inserted in the RECORD in any manner or form.

Mr. FAZIO of California. They should not be inserted at any time, but there is a particular provision that we are dealing with here which removes the Member from the ability to communicate with his colleagues here.

Is that communication written as well as oral?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the RECORD the gentleman is correct.

Mr. FAZIO of California. So in other words, just to confirm the Speaker's ruling, we will not read or hear from the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] for the next 24 hours; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Unless the House permits him to proceed in order, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. FAZIO of California. And for the House to permit that would require a majority vote?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It would require either unanimous consent or a majority vote of the House to permit the gentleman to proceed in order.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I appreciate the Speaker clarifying the situation.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is on his feet. Is he not supposed to remain seated until the determination?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman can either be seated or leave the Chamber.

Mr. BONIOR. He chose to leave the Chamber; OK.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is it the Chair's understanding that the final words in the original 1-minute are included in the gentleman's request?

Mr. BONIOR. The Speaker is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is attempting to have them transcribed at this moment.

The Clerk will report the words in the original 1-minute.

The Clerk read as follows:

By the way, Mr. Speaker, the Second Amendment is not for killing little ducks and leaving Huey, Duey and Louie without an aunt and uncle. It is for hunting politicians, like Grozny, 1776, when they take your independence away. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair sees nothing unparliamentary about those words.

Without objection, the words already ruled out of order will be stricken from the RECORD.

There was no objection.

TAKE A LOOK UNDER THE HOOD OF THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, it is very hard to take the well after such an emotional time. I think Americans all wish we could get on with business and stop this kind of partisan fireworks, and yet today is the day where I think, if a lot of Americans knew what kind of business we were going to do, and we were really going to be giving them the business, they would want this partisan fireworks to continue.

We are going to take up a balanced budget amendment. I say to my colleagues:

"When you read the rule, you will find out that in the Judiciary Committee we didn't have proper notice. As you know, the major amendments were never dealt with. We rolled it out here to the floor, and the very first thing we are going to do today is take up a resolution saying, 'Oops. Well, we really don't mean Social Security to be included.' But if you think that resolution is going to outweigh a constitutional amendment, you're wrong. This kind of haste is going to make people very, very angry. You don't buy a car without looking under the hood, and don't buy this today. It really is not what you think it is."

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE DEMAND A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

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

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, change is scary, especially for the folks who liked things the way they were. But my job is to do the people's work.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have spoken. They want a leaner and less intrusive government. They want us to put our financial house in order. And finally, they want us to end politics as usual.

Congress has been on a spending binge that has clearly lasted too long. This binge has created a huge national debt that is costing our country \$816 million every day in interest alone.

The American people demand that we get our financial house in order. It is time to end the bickering and get down to work. It is time to show the courage needed to pass a balanced budget amendment. For too long Congress has spent and spent, passing the bill on to our children and our grandchildren. This has got to end.

I recognize that the road ahead will be tough. I also recognize there will be resistance. We must pass a balanced budget amendment.

THE GREATEST INCENTIVE TO WORK IN AMERICA IS THE ABILITY TO EARN A DECENT WAGE

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

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to say that the President got it right last night. He talked about empowering people, and critically he said, "You've got to pay a decent wage." He suggests that the greatest incentive to work in America is the ability to earn a livable wage.

Mr. Speaker, I recall commenting about a seamstress who, when told, "If you got an increase in the minimum wage, you might lose your job," told a reporter, "Look. I'll take my chances with a job. I want a better wage."

There are young people all throughout my district who say the same thing:

"Congressman, we want to work, but it's got to pay a decent wage."

The President pointed out last night that at the current minimum wage level of \$4.25 an average American makes \$8,840 a year, less than we make in 1 month. I think that is very telling because subsequent to his speech last night the American people in poll results said by a margin of 72 percent that they wanted a livable wage.

Ladies and gentlemen of America, there is a difference. The President has got it right. Let us pay a decent wage.

HAS THE PRESIDENT BECOME A REPUBLICAN?

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, "Don't get excited, everyone. I don't want to cause any parliamentary problems here today, and I certainly don't intend to impugn anyone's motives or integrity, but after listening to the President's speech last night, I have to ask the question that all of America wants to know: Has the President become a Republican?"

Mr. Speaker, some in the Chamber might not take kindly to that label, but to most of us we consider it to be a badge of honor, and I say to my colleagues, "If you've read recent polls, it appears that, as the President has, the American people are demanding the same Republican principles of smaller, less costly government, greater individual freedom based on personal responsibility."

That is exactly what the President embraced last night, and that is exactly the premise of our Republican Contract With America. Mr. Speaker, it is good to see the President has joined with a majority of the voters in supporting the Republican agenda. We are the party of forgive and forget, and we welcome him to our cause.