Despite the best efforts of the White House to make more government spending look like a good idea, the American people aren't buying it. That's why Republicans are continuing to stand with the overwhelming majority of America on the issue of so-called economic stimulus. The choice remains as clear today as it was when President Clinton introduced his $19 billion spending spree at the expense of the taxpayers and future generations of Americans -- it's a fundamental difference, the White House still wants to spend money we don't have, and Republicans want to cut spending.

The American people are hoping that the Democrats will finally get the message -- it's time to cut up Uncle Sam's credit card once and for all. The Republican alternative is paid for, and gives them that simple choice.

False Beltway Advertising vs. Real World Message

During this debate, we've heard all kinds of false advertising about the President's spending plan, and all kinds of reckless innuendo about Senate Republicans. Of course, all this hype is coming from inside the Beltway, from professional politicians and their spin doctors. But, meanwhile, out in the real world, the spin is a lot different. Let me share with the Senate a few comments I've received from real people sending real telegrams:

-- "The stimulus package is another tax and spend hoax."
-- "43% is no mandate for tax and spend."
-- "Curtail the wasteful legislation in the Senate."
-- "Hold fast. Cut the budget."
-- "Kill the pork. Hang tough."
-- And "my wife an I want to surrender to you and the Republican party any connection we have ever had with the Democratic party. Keep up the good work."

So, let's take a moment to review where we are. The President proposed adding $19.5 Billion to established and previously-funded programs for the purpose of creating jobs and stimulating the economy. The proposal by the President contained no provision to pay for this nearly $20 billion in increased spending, it would merely have been charged to the deficit, added to the national debt and sent to our children and grandchildren for payment.

The Republican Approach: Cut & Pay for New Spending

The Republican response was two-fold: first, we doubted whether spending $20 billion in a six trillion dollar economy would do much to stimulate economic growth. Second, we demanded the package be reduced to programs that would create jobs in the near term -- after all, that's why we were told this was an "emergency" in the first place. And third, and most importantly, we asked that everything other than unemployment insurance be paid for. That should be paid for, too, but we have already had that battle.

The President responded with a proposal that trimmed some of the spending, but not a single penny of the President's revised package was paid for. Apparently, the White House hadn't gotten the message all of us have been hearing loud and clear in our home states the past two weeks -- cut spending first, and if we can't cut it, pay for new programs with offsetting cuts in other programs.

(more)
Oval Office Gridlock vs. Republican Good Government

The American people know that gridlock starts in the Oval Office. By absolutely refusing to pay for billions and billions of dollars in new spending, the White House has turned its back on the millions of Americans who thought they were voting for change. Meanwhile, Republicans have been offering constructive opposition -- good government -- to protect the taxpayers and promote reasonable alternatives.

The GOP Alternative

Therefore, we reviewed the President's requests and did what we had asked the administration to do in the first place, and what the American people have been demanding. To start, we propose to cut spending drastically. Our alternative would spend a total of $2 billion in only five programs -- interstate maintenance in the highway program, immunization, summer jobs, small business administration loans and natural resource protection. All but immunization are job creating programs.

This Republican alternative package, we believe, is far more appropriate to our immediate needs than throwing $15.5 billion at the more than 60 programs contained in the President's original bill.

But the biggest difference between our plan and the President's proposal is we propose paying for our package with spending cuts.

It's a clear choice. You can vote to increase the deficit for a big spending bill that represents everything the American people voted against last November. Or, you can vote to create jobs without threatening the economy and future generations of Americans with another increase in the deficit.
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