

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, the bill that we have before us today would increase spending. When coupled with the supplemental bill that the President just signed a few weeks back, would increase spending in the area of homeland security by nearly 17 percent. Now, perhaps people on the ... Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, the bill that we have before us today would increase spending. When coupled with the supplemental bill that the President just signed a few weeks back, would increase spending in the area of homeland security by nearly 17 percent. Now, perhaps people on the other side of the aisle have not noticed, but we have a deficit, a very large deficit in this country. And we still are adding to that deficit every year.

Now, I think Members on the other side of the aisle have noticed this because they have talked about their PAYGO and other principles, that we won't be increasing spending without some way to pay for this. However, with this appropriations bill we are doing exactly that. We are increasing spending by billions of dollars, by 17 percent over last year's level, without paying for it in any way, without reducing spending anywhere else, which means that we are adding to the deficit because of the spending, the additional spending that is in this bill.

Let me just give you a sense of what a 17 percent increase is. If someone outside of this building in the world is making \$15 an hour, they would have to get a raise this year to \$17.55 an hour in order for their income to keep pace with the spending increase in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that most of the people out there making \$15 an hour, or any number you want, are not likely to see their bosses come in and say we want to give you a raise of 17 percent from \$15 an hour to \$17.55 an hour, not something that they are likely to see. But yet to keep and sustain this level of increase in spending, that's exactly what would have to happen or else we just take more and more and more money out of individuals' pockets so we can spend it here.

Now, I'm sure that people on the other side in support of this bill are going to start to talk about how important this bill is to homeland security. Okay. We will have that debate over the next couple of days about what is in this bill, but what this amendment does is deal purely with bureaucracy. We're not dealing here with any program. We're not dealing here with officers in the field. We're not dealing here with equipment that's being used or computers or anything else for homeland security.

What this amendment says is simply that the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management, the office of the Secretary, purely bureaucracy, gave the Secretary of Homeland Security and the people in that person's office, right now this bill gives them an 11 percent increase, when we're trying to get a deficit down, when we want to, at least some of us do, keep taxes low.

What this bill says is you ought to be able to get by on what you had last year. It is not even proposing that we cut the spending of this bureaucracy, not even proposing that we take the Secretary's office and just their bureaucracy in there and cut it, but simply saying get by on the same amount of money you did last year. Now, how many people in America do that every day but somehow the bureaucracy in Homeland Security can't do that?

And by doing that, Mr. Chairman, this amendment saves \$10 million. Now, maybe in a \$3 trillion budget it doesn't sound like much, but \$10 million is still a lot of money. It's a lot of money to everybody out there. It's lot of money to me. It's a lot of money to you. And \$10 million and \$10 million and \$10 million and we will eventually get our spending down, and that, Mr. Chairman, is how we are going to eliminate this budget deficit and that's how we're going to do it without having the largest increase in taxes in American history, which the other side has proposed to do.

And what is that tax increase for? It's for things like this, for things like taking a bureaucracy of people, sitting around doing phone calls and paper and saying we're going to give you an 11 percent raise. We should not be doing that, not in this environment and not in this bill.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully ask that Members support this amendment, not feed the bureaucracy further and save the taxpayers \$10 million.

