Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Missouri, Mr. EMERSON, for bringing this to the House's attention.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important day. It was not that many years ago that I left this Capitol Hill as a page in the other body. Actually, it was many years ago, 1967, about the same time the gentleman from Mississippi was leaving.

Mr. Speaker, though I learned a lot in my 4 years, I remember a lot of things: I still get lost in the Rayburn Building, moving around in my first weeks here. But I keep running into pages who keep me on the straight and narrow as I make my way about.

Mr. Speaker, pages still work many hours. I do not think people appreciate the long days that they put in. School starts at 6:30, they have to get up before that. They have long days, and longer days since the session began, sometimes into the evening. So, after getting their studies at night, a 12-hour day is not unique in the life of a page. It is very exciting, but it takes total commitment.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend their knowledge and their industry and the commitment they have shown just in the 3 weeks since I have joined this body. I think the test is going to be for them to build on the basis of knowledge that they have obtained here. They have been given an opportunity to observe and serve in a way very few ever have. It will be a defining moment in their lives.

I hope many of them will seek public service and find the same kind of commitment many of us have, but at the same time find the kinds of joys you can get from serving other people which brought many of us into public service.

I know some of these individuals will return in the future to this House. It is a sad time to see some of them go. But I know that when I left here, I had hoped to return one day. So the fact that I can make it will inspire others. It is an achievable goal.

I thank the gentleman from Missouri for bringing this to the House's attention.

Mr. EMERSON. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me wish all the pages all good things. I hope you will achieve your life's goals and ambitions and that your lives will be filled with good health and happiness and success.

Work hard, and do the very best you can. I hope that this experience has been for you everything that we hope it has been. I think as you get older and reflect back on it, you will probably find it is one of the best experiences you could ever hope for.

Mr. Speaker, I say to all the pages: ''God bless you all, God speed to you in your future endeavors.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOSS). 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.]

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

[Mr. CHAMBLISS 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 Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. VOLKMER 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 California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

MAKING TOUGH DECISIONS

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

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I first would like to associate myself with those remarks by my colleagues and congratulate the pages also. They certainly do a fine job here on the floor of the House. There were some things in my colleagues' comments that I thought were somewhat remarkable and worth mentioning and worth underscoring when they talked about the bipartisanship with which this House has, last night, passed a balanced budget amendment. Also the bipartisanship in the whole democracy, contextually, in which the gavel was passed from Mr. GEPHARDT to Mr. GINGRICH.

Certainly this is highly reflective of and symbolic of the kind of democracy that we so wonderfully enjoy here in the United States of America. Whether we like something or not, whether we voted for something or not, the majority rules, and so it goes.

Last night, Mr. Speaker, I did not support the balanced budget amendment, but, thank God, we live in a country where I can say that democracy had its will and its way. As to the reasons why I did not support it, they are precisely because it did not prohibit things like Social Security being on the chopping block. In other words, it did not take Social Security off the chopping block. So everything is on the table, Social Security and other things are on the table.

The other reason I did not support it is it allows for a three-fifths rule, which would allow for a minority to have control over whether or not you are going to expand budgetary outlays.

Certainly, from my standpoint it was unconstitutional and it provided a scenario under which you can have minority controlling a House that I believe should be controlled by a majority.

□ 1500

But nonetheless the majority did make that decision, and so the majority ruled, but it brings me to the point, Mr. Speaker, of what I would like to talk about today, and that is precisely how important it is for this House to weigh out what it does.

Last night a lot of people were happy about the balanced budget amendment passing, and to them I say, ''Congratulations.'' They certainly did a lot of hard work, persons like my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

But the rather interesting excitement and inebriation, if my colleagues will, that they experienced last night, I just hope that they continue to feel those feelings of joy after they wake up from that moment of inebriation to the sobriety of the reality of what they have done, for indeed, Mr. Speaker, we are going to make some very hard choices in the months ahead for how we balance the budget, and my reason for not supporting that amendment was precisely the same reason that I say today, that we must not balance the budget on the backs of the poor and the needy.

The balanced budget amendment is only a prelude to what we are going to be dealing with very shortly when we start talking about welfare reform. It is going to be another tough choice, another very difficult decisionmaking process through which and by which we are going to have to ask the difficult questions. How can we come up with the right solution, by the right means?

And so, Mr. Speaker, what we are saying is, ''You can have a right goal, and you can have a right objective in mind, but we can't accomplish it by the wrong means, and certainly everyone in this House talks about welfare reform and the fact that we need to overhaul the system that is arguably antiquated and that has some indicia of fraud and abuse, and we understand that, and it's not only the Members in this House that believe that, but the surveys show and are very replete with information that all of America, just about, feels that welfare is in need of an overhauling. But we have to look at some of the specific points about welfare, and we need to be very, very careful.''

Mr. Speaker, as we start reforming and retooling our welfare system so that we can be fair to the welfare recipients, and be fair to this country, and indeed be fair to the principles of democracy, let us start off, first of all,

with the aspect of who are the recipients who most, in most instances, actually benefit from welfare, Mr. Speaker, Well, a lot of people have promulgated and propagandized this notion that it is all of these lazy, shiftless welfare mothers, and they are bilking the system, and they are exercising all kinds of schemes, and fraudulent schemes, in order to sustain themselves. But the reality is, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of education and edification, that 70 percent of all recipients on welfare are children. So, when you start taking out the cleaver, and we start talking about cutting welfare, and we start talking about eliminating welfare, let us, first of all, understand that we are talking about America's children.

A lot of people think that welfare is a matter of African Americans who predominate the welfare rolls. That can be no further from the truth, Mr. Speaker. The majority of those who are recipients of welfare are actually white Americans. So, when we talk about welfare, we have to be honest, and we have to be clear about what the fact are.

Now we talk about America's children. There have been proposals that say that if a mother is under age, under the age of 18, that she should not receive any welfare benefits, or therefore her children should not receive any welfare benefits. She could be 17 years, and 11 months, and 28 days—29 days, and under the age of 18, and still she and her children will not receive any benefits. But when she becomes 18, the children still would not receive any benefits for the rest of their lives. These are the kinds of proposals that we have to be very careful about because obviously these children are the ones who bear the brunt of that kind of a policy. The children are at stake.

We have heard things like, ''Let's have orphanages because we need some type of a controlled setting by which these children can be raised,'' but, Mr. Speaker, those kinds of policies are antiquated. Those types of policies are archaic. They are outdated, and they are inefficient.

We do not need to take the baby and throw it out with the bathwater, if you will. What we need to do, Mr. Speaker, is we need to be very careful about trying to rehabilitate and trying to provide some social support for American families. We need to get away from the monikers of illegitimacy and realize, yes, that we have a high incidence of this country per capita of out-of-wedlock births, but that does not make a child illegitimate. That should not cause us, as Americans and as a country, to put some type of disparaging association on some child because that child's mother did not choose or did not happen to, for whatever reason, marry.

There are many, many outstanding leaders and citizens of our country and our communities who are products of broken homes. In fact, Mr. Speaker, as we look more and more, we realize that one out of every two American families now evidence a broken home or a single parent family, and usually that single parent is a mother.

So what we have to do is we have to start now reeducating ourselves and resensitizing ourselves to the new America. This is not the America of Wally Cleaver, and ''Leave It To Beaver,'' and Ozzie and Harriet. This is the America of the 1990's, and we have to be realistic about what family values mean these days, and family values these days to me mean that we should adopt that adage of the old African proverb that says it takes a whole village to raise a child. It does not mean that the village should be called an orphanage. I mean we should look at things like group homes, but group homes where the parents or parent in this case, a single parent, can still be with their children. We should not be trying to separate the parent from the child. We should be trying to keep them together, and if, in fact, we are going to employ the basis of a group home, then let us make sure that we do it in a way where we can give social skills to the parent as well as help to the children.

AN UNINTENTIONAL MISPRONUNCIATION OF MY FRIEND'S NAME

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOSS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, this morning I mispronounced the name of my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], in a way that sounds like a slur. Let me make this absolutely clear. The media and others are reporting this as if it were intentional, and it was not.

I repeat. This was nothing more than the unintentional mispronunciation of another person's name that sounded like something it was not.

Mr. Speaker, there is no room in public discourse for such hateful language, and I condemn the use of such slurs.

After I heard about how the story was being covered, I called the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], and I told him of my stumbling over his name, and I apologized for the perception created by the press that I would even think of such terms.

It was not an attack. It was not even a Freudian slip.

I have worked with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] in the past. I consider him a friend. I am disappointed that the media and others would take this incident and turn it into a firestorm, a firestorm. I take strong exception to the airing of the tape and even the transcribing of a stumbled word as if it were an intentional personal attack.

□ 1510

I take strong exception to the airing of the tape, and even the transcribing of a stumbled word, as if it were an intentional, personal attack.

I take strong exception to the airing of the tape, and even the transcribing of a stumbled word, as if it were an intentional, personal attack, and I take this exception especially in light of the fact that I went to the press who had the tape and explained to them in the best humor I could that I had simply mispronounced a name, and did not need any psychoanalysis about my subliminals or about my Freudian predilections, especially from people who are obviously not trained in psychological analysis.

With all of the issues the new Republican majority are bridging to the floor of this House, it is regrettable that a unintentional mispronunciation of a name in a way that would be clearly offensive had it been intentional should shift the public debate away from issues like balancing the budget, cutting taxes, and reforming our failed welfare system.

Can we not get back to real issues? Cannot the press report real events?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to for a moment thank my friend and colleague from California, Mr. BILBRAY, for allowing me to proceed ahead of him in this order. I would like to thank the indulgence of this body for allowing me these moments. I would like to thank my diligent, fair, responsible friends in the press for 10 years of what I believe to have been a good relationship with decent people doing their job.

Mr. Speaker, I have a family. I have raised five children. I spent a lifetime telling my children the rules of decent discourse, teaching them how to be respectful of other people. We have a long list of words we don't use, of names we don't call, of sentiments we don't express. We have another long list that comes under the general rule of my mother and father's precious teaching about good manners, decent discourse, real respect for other people. And to have my five children, or anybody else's five children, turn on their TV today and see a transcript of a mispronunciation on the air, as if I had no sense of decency, cordiality, respect, or even good manners, is unacceptable. It is an act in itself that is indecent. It is an act that is unkind, at least to myself, hurtful to my children, and clearly indifferent to the feelings of my friend, BARNEY FRANK. And, yes, I have a word for that act. You will find that word in the singular word to the song ''Cotton-Eyed Joe.''

GET TOUGH WITH MEXICO REGARDING CAR THEFT

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

(Mr. BILBRAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of Mexico again this week,