

President's program will actually result in \$3 of spending for each new dollar of taxes raised.

It is true, debate and commentary in recent weeks have focused more on where to cut spending. This is good news for most Americans. Many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle particularly have accepted the President's challenge and proposed specific ways to cut waste and redundancy and to reprioritize our Federal spending—reducing the deficit without raising taxes on the American people.

I repeat, reducing the deficit without raising taxes on the American people is the goal of this side of the aisle. As the distinguished ranking member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), said, we have set a new standard for budget cutting specifics this year.

In this Member's book that is good. That is a change for the better—as long as we live up to the demands our constituents are making to cut wasteful spending first. First, before we raise taxes. First, before we set out on new spending adventures. There are many of us in this House—and especially among the 110 new Members—who believe a line-item veto and a balanced budget amendment are crucial to holding Congress to its pledge to cut the deficit.

As I speak, the Rules Committee is meeting to determine the structure for tomorrow's debate on specific amendments to this budget resolution, and it is my sincere hope that we will see a process that is open and fair and allows for ample opportunity to consider all legitimate amendments. After all, it is the collective wisdom of this body that should work its will on the biggest challenge of this session: If we short-change that, I dare say that we inevitably diminish our chances of fullest success.

I understand the majority is requesting something less. In fact, the majority wants only entire substitutes made in order, noting that to do so has generally been our practice in the House for many years.

Well, Mr. Speaker, dare I say that the people of our country want change. I keep hearing about it, change—and yet the majority seems to be using business-as-usual practices to justify numbing those who would add valuable amendments to the debate—which may well be the mother of all debates this year.

Certainly the American people are expecting that.

People are willing to sacrifice for the good of our country, that is clear—and that is wonderful. We cannot keep abusing that generosity by wasting tax dollars on frivolous projects, redundant programs, bureaucratic bloat, special interest rewards, and the like. We must reshape our national priorities and shape our funding fairly and prudently. Now is that time. Tax dollars are not endless and they are not forever.

Our Rules Committee has an important job to do in ensuring that this debate we begin today does not diminish the American people's right to have the whole Congress carefully consider all the legitimate options to produce the most responsible budget blueprint. Those of us in the minority of the Rules Committee are ready to debate this crucial subject for as long as it takes—but the simple math of nine-majority votes to our four means that it is up to the majority of the Rules Committee to make those responsible choices. I encourage them to rise to the challenge.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, we are here now in chapter 11.

Members of Congress are official trustees presiding over the greatest reorganization of any bankrupt entity in world history, the U.S. Government.

We are setting forth hopefully a blueprint for our future. There are some who say it is a coroner's report that will lead to our demise.

I am going to support the rule. I am not sure yet if I will support this budget. I want to hear an awful lot more, not being a member of the committee, and I am not going to vote for things I do not understand or do not like, but let there be no mistake. After 12 years of Ronald Reagan and George Bush, we are standing here.

Let me say this to the minority party. Every program that Ronald Reagan wanted in 1981, he got. Reagan got it. There was a Republican Senate majority and there were 70 Democrats in this House that might as well have been Republicans, and we have the program.

The major assumption was very simple. We are going to cut taxes, put money in the pockets of the American people, and when they spend this money our gross national product is going to rise so great that even though we reduced your tax liability on a percentage basis, we will balance the budget, quoting Ronald Reagan, in 1987. It is going to take the fall of our Congress, I think, for that to happen.

Mr. Speaker, let us give this new administration a chance. Democrats gave Ronald Reagan a chance.

But let me give one word of caution here today. America already has face wars, let us be honest about it. We already have gender wars, let us be honest about it. We already have age wars, let us be honest about it.

One thing this Congress had better not get involved in and get trapped into is a class war on money. In America, if you can not earn all that you can, there is something wrong and

there is no more a spirit of free enterprise.

I want to say this to the Members. We may talk about taxing the rich, but the rich people have already taken their companies and their jobs out of America. Be careful that the rich people do not take their money out of America, because the government already raises our kids, defends our families, educates our kids, feeds our kids, houses our kids, and the government is doing a very poor job of it. I think mom and dad would be better utilized there once again.

So I am going to listen to the debate. I do not know if I will vote for this budget.

Finally, I do not know if the budget makes one damn bit of difference, because we waive it all the time and I do not think we have ever followed it. I think we have an excellent chairman who worked hard. If we are going to have a budget, we should follow it. If not, we once again as Members waste both our time and the people's time.

Let me say this just in closing. Today is not the mother of all debates and the mother of all decisions. When that tax package comes, you will have the mother of all votes on the floor.

Let me say this, I am not for voting any more taxes on the backs of the American people, because I believe the tax of 1990 put on right here today, and I am very concerned about the tax package being discussed in this Congress.

I am one Democrat who believes we should stimulate the private sector. We already have more government jobs than factory jobs, and I think that is an indictment of our Congress.

One basic tenet to this Constitution is life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and there can be no life, liberty, or pursuit of happiness in America without job.

I would like to see the mother of all debates center around the jobs bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH), the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak, and I appreciate my friend, the gentleman from Florida, yielding me this time.

Let me say first of all, the American people apparently today and tomorrow are going to see a very, very sad spectacle of the Democratic leadership attempting to pass two rules that are as restrictive, as narrow, as tight, and deprive Members on both sides of any opportunity to offer legitimate amendments. I think that is sad. I think it is the opposite of what Ross Perot raved on. It is the opposite of openness. It is the opposite of allowing every citizen to see what is going on. I think that as a procedure is sad.

□ 1200

Second, people are going to see a choice between a \$31 billion, unpaid for deficit increase for pork barrel with