

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.

(Mr. TURNER of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ADDING TO THE NATIONAL DEBT

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

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, that great country singer and philosopher Merle Haggard has this wonderful song called "Rainbow Stew." And the words go something like this: "When a President goes through the White House door and does what he says he will do, we will all be drinking that free Bubble Up and eating that rainbow stew."

Now, there must be a barrel of Bubble Up in the Republican cloakroom tonight because, if I did not know better, the last two speakers on the Republican side, I would suspect that they might have gotten here by falling off a turnip truck on Independence Avenue. I have never heard such ridiculous goings on in all of my days.

Now, I know that they have not been here very long, and I understand that. What we need is a little bit of sanity. This would be hysterically funny if it was not so painful for the next generation. What we need is a little credibility. What we need is a little honesty from the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle that just voted today to support a budget that will raise the debt ceiling over \$8 trillion. And then they come down here and talk about some ridiculous deal that they do not even know what they are talking about and blame the Democrats for it.

The Republicans have been in charge since 1995 in this place. And it is the Democrats' fault? Some of these fraud cases that they are talking about were contracts that were administered by the current administration. You have got to wonder when the turnip truck got through the barricades out here.

When the President came in this January of 2001, the Blue Dogs went to him, we said, We want to work with you. We will work with you to cut taxes. That is all we ask. But if you are going to cut taxes, cut spending. Let us agree on that. Let us work together, and we will do it. And we will all be proud of our work when we get through.

They sent Vice President CHENEY down here in room 122, downstairs. I will never forget it. And he said this: "We think you all are nice people, but we do not need you and we are going to do what we are going to do." And they can.

Now, look what we got, a budget that was voted for by the gentleman from Texas this afternoon that is going to borrow another \$700 billion from our children and grandchildren. Now, you talk about waste, fraud, and abuse, that is it. There is not any proposal in there to cut spending in a responsible way.

The Blue Dog Coalition has worked and worked and worked to try to get

the other side to sit down with us and let us do the responsible thing. We have proposed raising taxes. We have proposed balancing the budget in a responsible way. Then they sent Mitch Daniels, the head of the Office of Management and Budget, and he told us, "Do not worry, we are going to have so much money after we cut taxes we are going to pay off all the debt. The biggest problem we are going to have is you will not be able to buy any U.S. Treasury bonds; they will not be a safe investment." They did just about fix it with the U.S. Treasury bonds; they are not a safe investment anymore. I just wonder what in the Sam Hill these people are thinking about.

But I can tell you this: you can keep trying to fool the American people which will not be successful. You can keep doing what you are doing which is add to the debt load of our children and grandchildren in such an irresponsible way that it will be a horrendous day when the payday comes. And you will be the one that suffers, because I am so old I will probably be dead when it happens. But the young man from Texas over there that is sitting there smiling in such a cute way, he is going to still be around. And he is going to have to pay this tax.

The one tax that you cannot repeal is the interest on the national debt. Now, they want to raise that one as much as they can. And, boy, they are doing it great.

I just cannot imagine why. That is the great mystery to me. Why would you want to do such a ridiculous but, more importantly, irresponsible thing to our children and grandchildren.

TERRORIST ATROCITIES IN SPAIN

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises today to fervently condemn the terrorist bombings in Madrid on March 11 and to express his strong and unwavering support for the Spanish people in their fight against terrorism.

As all of our colleagues surely know, last Thursday at the height of the morning rush hour, terrorists detonated 10 bombs on commuter trains in the Spanish capital of Madrid. These synchronized attacks blew up four different trains. Several of them were in station at the time, increasing the carnage. At last count 201 people were killed in these attacks and almost 1,500 people were injured. These attacks were the worst terrorist atrocity in Spanish history and maybe the most terrible on the European continent in modern history.

Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, the French newspaper *Le Monde*, often a font of anti-American sentiment, declared that "We Are All Americans."

Now we are all Spaniards united in solidarity and resolve with our friends and our allies.

To compare terrorist atrocities is in some ways to minimize the importance of each human life that was so brutally and pointlessly extinguished by those who exalt in the murder and maiming of their fellow men, women, and, yes, children too. But I sense that most Americans saw the slaughter in Madrid on March 11 through the prism of our own experience on September 11. Even the dates mirrored each other with 3/11 coming exactly 2½ years after 9/11.

For those of us who evacuated our offices on 9/11, watched the smoke from the burning Pentagon, and heard the sirens of emergency vehicles, we could not help but identify with the scenes of killing and bloodshed that we all repeatedly saw on our television screens last week.

Sadly, last week's attacks marked not a new phenomenon in Spanish life, only a new magnitude of suffering.

For more than 30 years, Spaniards have endured a vicious terrorist campaign by the fringe, Basque-separatist ETA organization. Given this bloody history, it was no surprise when Spanish officials first blamed ETA for the March 11 train bombings.

Since then we learned that these reprehensible attacks are more likely the work of the Islamic terrorists linked to al Qaeda. A clear determination is not yet possible. We often speak of the global war on terrorism. Last week we were reminded just how global the threat of terrorism really is. Al Qaeda has already struck in Africa, Asia, and North America. Now nearly all relevant authorities are tentatively concluding that these terrorists have struck in Europe as well.

In conjunction with these attacks, Spanish authorities have arrested five suspects, three Moroccans and two Indians, who are believed to be al Qaeda loyalists. Authorities are seeking other suspects in conjunction with the bombings. The bombings in Spain demonstrate that Europe is indeed a target of al Qaeda and the brand of Islamic extremism that it espouses. It is a terrible shock, but it comes as no surprise to European terrorism experts. Europol, which helps coordinate police activity among nations, warned in December that al Qaeda was still active in Europe and remained a threat there. However, if there was still any thought among Europeans that they were somehow immune from al Qaeda attacks, these bombings proved them wrong.

An additional concern in this case is the obvious, and apparently successful, effort by terrorists to influence a democratic election. Many analysts have attributed the unexpected victory of the Socialist Party in Sunday's national elections to voters' reactions to the terrorist attacks. Spain's participation in military action against Iraq was unpopular among the electorate. Some post-election reports indicate that a large number of Spanish voters