

public objection to Dayton, Ohio being known as the birthplace of aviation.

No one disputes the fact that Kittyhawk in North Carolina was the site of the first successful controlled power flight in history. However, Dayton, Ohio's claim to be the birthplace of aviation is based upon much more than just the first limited flight.

As a new historical work on the lives of the Wright brothers states, "The four short flights in North Carolina showed that their math was close enough; Heavier than air flight was possible. The practicality of the Wright Flyer was achieved in 1904 and 1905 in a little-known place of great consequence, Huffman Prairie, an 85-acre cow pasture 10 miles east of Dayton.

Huffman Prairie Flying Field, which is in the Seventh Congressional District, which just happens to be my district, is located on the grounds of Wright Patterson Air Force Base. The flying field, which is undergoing a restoration to its 1905 appearance, has recently been opened to the general public, complete with a new interpretive center so visitors can understand the importance of the early flight testing and aircraft development that occurred there.

Even the press at the time did not grasp the significance of what had occurred at Kitty Hawk. It took several years of additional flights, I might say at Huffman Prairie, before the public finally acknowledged that the Wright brothers had invented a workable aircraft. If the Wright Brothers had not continued their history-altering work in Ohio, it is quite possible that the North Carolina exploits would have been lost in history.

As I have said before, North Carolina can always claim the location of the first flight by the Wright brothers, but it is their hometown that saw the laborious construction and endless testing that was required to allow it to take to the sky and mature as a reliable form of transportation that we all now enjoy.

North Carolina has the sand dunes where the first flight occurred, but Dayton, Ohio has the Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park, encompassing the Wright Cycle Shop, Huffman Prairie Flying Field, the John W. Berry, Sr. Wright Brothers Aviation Center, and the Paul Laurence Dunbar State Memorial.

Dayton also has the National Aviation Hall of Fame, Wright Patterson Air Force Base, the U.S. Air Force Museum, and the final resting place of the Wright brothers. It is based upon all of these important sites and the local life experiences of the Wright brothers that Dayton should be known as the "birthplace of aviation."

As an Ohioan, I am proud to reside in the same State as the two Wright brothers whose invention changed the world; and more importantly, the fact that they were also in Ohio's Seventh Congressional District, which I now represent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WHERE IS THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT CALLED FOR IN 1974 BY THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on March 17, 1994, then a Member of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) came to the floor and said, "Clearly, our Nation's monstrous \$4.3 trillion Federal deficit, until it is eliminated, interest payments will continue to eat away the important incentives which the government must fund. I will not stand by and watch Congress recklessly squander the future of our children and grandchildren."

Later in that same day he said, "In light of Congress' exhibited inability to control spending and vote for real fiscal responsibility, it is imperative that we have a balanced budget amendment to compel Congress to end its siege on our financial future." That was on March 17, 1994.

As most of us are aware, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) has been the Speaker now for about 1,613 days. In that 1,613 days, he who controls every single amendment that comes to this House floor, when we start, when we stop, every bill that comes to the floor, he who appoints the members of the Committee on Rules that decide which amendments are germane, those that can be offered, has not allowed a vote on a balanced budget amendment.

We would think there were a couple of things that would come to his mind, since in 1994 he spoke so strongly of the need for a balanced budget. I would like to ask Max, Trevor, Sarah, and Krystle-Joy to come to the floor.

See, in the time that the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) has been Speaker, and they can stand in front of me, it is their big moment in the sun, in the 1,613 days the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) has been Speaker, we would think the gentleman who cares that much about the national debt would maybe let the debt go up by, say, \$914. But that is not the case.

Now I need Michael, Bryan, and Taylor to join us, because the Speaker has

had 1,613 days. I guess I can take 5 minutes.

Now, in the time that the Speaker has been for a balanced budget, he says, we would think the debt might grow by \$914,878. That is not the case.

I need Amanda, Mark, and Robin to join us.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BUYER. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FEENEY). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know whether or not this fits the proper decorum of the House and whether this is a proper utilization of a prop. My question is whether this meets the decorum of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A question has been raised about decorum under the rules of the House.

The Chair would rule that it maybe appropriate to use the exhibits that are presented, but it is inappropriate to refer to individual House pages by name. As long as otherwise that the exhibits are used in appropriate decorum and pages are not referenced by name, then the gentleman can proceed.

Mr. BUYER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Again, Mr. Speaker, in that 1,613 days since the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) way back when told us he was for a balanced budget, we would think that the debt would have grown by only 914,878.72, with a couple of commas thrown in, but it is not the case.

I regret to do this, but I have been told by the Chair that I cannot call the pages by their first names, so I am going to have to ask page 11, 12, and 13 to come forward, under the Rules of the House.

Again, since the Speaker told us way back when how adamantly he was for a balanced budget, we would have thought that by now, and since I am losing track with a couple of commas in there, that he would have said, enough, it is time for a balanced budget amendment. Time to let Members at least vote on it. Now, 1,613 days later, it still has not happened.

Now I have to ask pages 14, 15, and 16, and I practiced saying your names, so I apologize. Now, if the camera can get all of this, we can let some Members have some idea, not of the national debt, but of how much the debt has grown in 2 years and 1 week since the passage of the Bush tax cuts and the Bush budget.

The first \$2 trillion spending bill passed by this Congress did not come from a Democratic President, it came from a Republican President. The tax cuts, they increased spending, decreased revenues, and this is the difference.

I think it is particularly appropriate that these fine young people from all parts of our country are holding the

sign. The lobbyists who benefited from this and the fat cats who are having big dinners tonight who benefited from this, they are not going to pay this bill. These kids are. These kids and their kids and their kids.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. KINGSTON. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman cannot use pages as props for his speech. They can be of assistance in holding the sign, but they cannot be referred to as props in the manner in which my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi, has just done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's inquiry of the Chair is appropriate. At this point the Chair would remind the gentleman not to refer to the pages by name or by their presence. The exhibits themselves may be an appropriate use at this time, but the gentleman whose time it is will decline to reference pages individually or collectively.

□ 1700

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. To the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), if I had voted to stick these children with that bill, I would be as ashamed to look at their faces as the gentleman is.

I did not vote to stick these kids with that bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FEENEY). The gentleman is out of order. He has referred to pages as props when the Chair has ruled that their presence on the floor cannot be mentioned.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is not referring to the pages themselves as pages. He is referring to the pages that the pages are holding, the 914, 878, 724. This is a parliamentary inquiry for clarification, Mr. Speaker. He was referring to the pages that the pages are holding.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is right. He is using the pages in an incorrect manner.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I have not yielded my time. Under the House rules, the pages are allowed to hold these pages, and as long as the gentleman does not refer to the pages by name, he can refer to the pages.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct, that the pages are permitted to facilitate the presentation of exhibits, but any reference in any speech to the pages or to visually suggest that they are part of the exhibits themselves or any suggestion that the debate should involve the pages individually or collectively, is not in order.

The exhibits themselves may be referred to. The pages may not be referred to.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) has 30 seconds to not refer to the pages but to refer to the exhibits.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I know that most Americans are at work right now. Some of you are watching. If you care about your country, you have got to be upset that in almost a little over 2 years almost \$1 trillion has been added to the national debt. To make a reference from that, we went all the way from 1775 to 1975 and did not borrow that much money.

The next time one of my Republican colleagues looks you in the eye and tells you he is a fiscal conservative, ask him about that trillion dollars and the \$1 billion a day that we will pay in interest on that money and will pay for the rest of my lifetime, your lifetime, and, God bless them, Mr. Speaker, these kids' lifetime.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is advised that in addition to the admonitions, that Members must decline to address the television audience. In addition, the Speaker is taking under advisement the future use and appropriateness of using pages.

CONGRESS SHOULD DO WHAT IS RIGHT FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate our friend, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), for advancing the cause of fiscal restraint, something that we do need to do in this House. And it is interesting, particularly since the Democrats are right now promoting an expansion of welfare in an unfunded way, and proposing to increase spending on welfare \$3.5 billion, and that is to give a tax rebate to people who have not paid taxes.

It is an idea that is ironic since 197 of them voted against it originally in May 2001, but they all seem to want to spend more regardless of what our budgets are doing.

I have just come from an appropriations meeting. And what is interesting about that is that on the appropriations bills, we have 13 of them, I believe, Mr. Speaker, every bill, it is particularly interesting since every one of our 13 appropriations bills, no matter what we propose in the Republican Party, the Democrats make a counterproposal to spend more. And I realize that my friend, the gentleman of Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), is in the minority of the Democratic Party where they do wake up in the morning and worry about spending. And I am glad that he does because I share his con-

cerns about it. But I just point out that the majority of his party, when it comes to spending bills, wants to spend more. And no matter what it is, we are not spending enough for this cause; we are not spending enough for that cause.

I want to also point out, sometimes it is easy when you are in the minority and you do not have to necessarily make the vote for war, but we are in a situation after 9-11 where America was under attack. Americans were hurt, injured, and killed in their workplace. And while some on the left sat around and said what did we do wrong or why do they hate us, others in the greater majority, not just the Republican Party but in America as a whole, said, look, we are going to defend our borders. We are going to defend our domestic areas. We are going to just defend our homeland. And to do that, unfortunately, you do have to spend money because it costs money to go to Afghanistan, to send helicopters and tanks over there. It costs money to send troops to the Middle East. And that does add up to some deficit spending.

It is something we do want to get under control. But I would certainly hope that the gentleman and others were not suggesting that the war for the liberation of Iraq was wrong, the war to find bin Laden was wrong, the war to liberate Afghanistan from Taliban rule was wrong. Because I believe most Americans support those actions and most Americans are glad that we are taking these steps.

When people say to you things like, how can you look the children in the eye, well, to me how could you not look the children in the eye and say, you know what, we are going to defend our homeland and we are going to secure our borders.

There is an international war on terrorism and America seems to be leading the way. America has also been the victim of it, but we are going to win that battle.

And if the gentleman and others would look at the budget, they can see that that is where the majority of our spending went and it is going to continue to go. But we want to work with the Democrats to get spending under control. My concern of it is not in just dollars and cents, but my concern is the encroachment of the government on the private sector. Every dollar we put in the government, that is more freedom we lose, particularly in the private sector.

So I hope as we begin the appropriations process this year that we can have a lot of amendments from our Democrat friends that actually reduce spending so that when we run the legislative branch bill out here, when we run military construction out here, when we run the education bill out here, if they have ideas for saving money, I want to do everything I can to make those amendments offered by my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), or anybody else over there, the so-called Blue Dog Caucus, I want their amendments to be in