

offered that would do something about the deficit. He voted "no," but he comes to the floor and makes a wonderful speech that sounds good, but does nothing to deal with our Nation's fiscal problems.

The Blue Dog philosophy and the budget we will offer next week begins with a simple wisdom: when you find yourselves in a hole, the first rule is to quit digging. Stop pointing the finger at the other side of the aisle and let us see how we might work together to deal with the most serious economic problems that have faced this country, perhaps in our history.

Strong budget enforcement rules are an important component of restoring fiscal discipline and making sure the budget remains in balance once we have done the hard work necessary to bring it back into balance. The budget enforcement rules Congress enacted in 1990 with bipartisan support, and that is when we Democrats were in control, and I worked with my friends on the other side of the aisle to do something about the deficit, and we did; it was an important part of getting a handle on deficits in the early 1990s and getting the budget back into balance with discretionary spending limits.

I want to make it very clear: the Blue Dog Democrats support President Bush's spending request to this body, not one penny more. So do not talk about spending when we talk about alternatives. If you do not have one that will work, do not come to the floor and speechify, unless you are just trying to make a good impression with the folks back home.

Unless we renew our budget discipline in this body, Congress will continue to find ways to pass more legislation that puts still more red ink on the national ledger. If we are truly serious about restoring fiscal discipline, budget enforcement rules must apply to all legislation that would increase the deficit. Through increases in spending or reductions in revenue, all parts of the budget must be on the table.

It is irresponsible and politically unrealistic to propose budget rules that apply to one part of the budget, but not the other. Borrowing for tax increases that do not contribute to growth in this country are just as irresponsible as the spending the gentleman was talking about a moment ago, if one is worried about the future of this country. Those of us who want to extend expiring tax cuts or make the tax cuts permanent should be willing to put forward the spending cuts or other offsets necessary to pay for them. Similarly, those who want to spend more in certain areas need to be willing to say where they would cut or how they would raise revenue to pay for their proposals.

Let me again repeat, I am part of the Blue Dog organization that will not vote to spend one dime more than President Bush asked us to spend this year, and let that be very clear. The Blue Dogs support spending caps, lim-

iting total discretionary spending to no more than the spending levels in the President's budget. If it is the will of the majority to pass legislation that will make the budget situation worse, we should be forced to step up and take the responsibility for doing so.

Under the Blue Dog plan, a separate vote would be required to waive the pay-go requirements or increase the discretionary spending limits. Congress could pass new spending or tax cuts without the offsets, but we will be held accountable for increasing the deficit by waiving budget rules.

The recognition that budget enforcement is an issue that needs to be addressed and the announcement that the Committee on the Budget will be considering budget enforcement legislation tomorrow is a positive step forward. But I am very, very disappointed that the Committee on the Budget in their wisdom chose to leave most of the issue off the table. If we really want to do something about deficits, we have to begin to address them, yes, on the spending side, no question about that. But we cannot continue to cut taxes with borrowed money unless we are willing to say to our grandchildren, I do not give a rip about your future.

Mr. Speaker, we can continue to vote for tax cuts and have the greatest tax increase, which is exactly what the majority is doing. You are voting to have the greatest tax increase in the history of this Nation by continuing to borrow as you are now borrowing, we are borrowing. I am part of it. I am part of the Members of Congress. But we will have a constructive alternative that we will be putting forth next week, and I hope sincerely that we can find some bipartisan support to put meaningful enforcement into place, so that we do something about the deficit other than come to this floor and speechify.

DEMOCRATS PROPOSE INCREASED TAXES AND MORE WASTEFUL SPENDING

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to seeing the proposal that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) just mentioned because so far, the only proposals that have been put forward by the Democrats in committee have been billions and billions and billions of additional spending and billions of tax increases. So I am looking forward to seeing if, in fact, his proposal will be different.

Mr. Speaker, last week in the Committee on the Budget, by the way, the Democrats proposed raising taxes three times and increase spending by over \$13 billion in their first five amendments to the budget resolution. Mr. Speaker, they had only just begun.

Tonight, in the Committee on the Budget that we finished a little while

ago, they presented numerous more amendments increasing spending by billions more and increasing taxes on the hard-working American people by billions more. The final tally: stay tuned, because we will be bringing that to our colleagues in the next few days.

Now, why do Democrats want to raise, insist on raising, the American people's taxes to pay for more waste, fraud, and abuse in Washington? I say that because let me read my colleagues some examples. A recent GAO report found that bureaucrats at the Department of Agriculture were using taxpayer-funded purchase cards for premium satellite and cable TV packages, including charges for pornographic movies, thousands of dollars charged to the taxpayers. By the way, this one I could not understand: fish costumes, web of life costumes, and a hand-switched salmon tent, \$12,000 that the taxpayers paid for those. Very expensive, it must have been a really nice aquarium for \$3,000, a billiard table; and yet the Democrats insist on trying to raise the taxes of the hard-working American people in this country. And that is the difference. They insist on trying to raise taxes, and their proposals show that.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans are trying to solve this problem alone. During the last year's budget resolution, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) tried to eliminate just 1 percent of waste, fraud, and abuse by cutting spending by 1 percent. The esteemed minority whip said of that proposal that that was senseless and irresponsible to try to cut just 1 percent of waste, fraud, and abuse. What they proposed was not agreed to, but they proposed billions of dollars of tax increases and billions of dollars of more government expenditures.

President Bush is working on implementing the President's management agenda, a performance-based system that seeks to reduce waste, fraud, and abuse and has got nothing, nothing but opposition from the members of the minority party. This year, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) once again is providing an avenue in the budget to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse. Democrats will likely, unfortunately, oppose those efforts as well, and likely, once again, as they have done tonight and as they did last week, will propose billions of dollars in more spending and billions of dollars of tax increases on the hard-working Americans in this country.

While Republicans are making great strides in cleaning up wasteful spending, Mr. Speaker, Democrats continue aggressively with this love affair of trying to raise the taxes on the hard-working American taxpayer.

□ 2030

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.