

From: Gordon Wayne Watts

To: Rep. Dennis Ross (R-Fla-15th)

Select the issue your email relates to:

Issue: (Taxes, Spending, and our Economy)

Subject: ('Budget' or something like that)

[[reply-dennis-ross-via-web-form.doc –

DATE: sent via web on Thr. 25 April 2013 – G.W.]]

Rep. Ross, I got your form letter response to the email I sent you yesterday (thanks you for the fast response!), in which you said in succinct/relevant part: (*""For these reasons, I voted against the fiscal cliff Senate amendment to H.R. 8, the American Taxpayer Relief Act. As an alternative, I introduced H.R. 243, the Bowles-Simpson plan of Lowering America's Debt (BOLD) Act, and H.R. 239 the Zero-based budgeting Ensures Responsible Oversight (ZERO) Act. ""*)

Thank you for voting against the fiscal cliff vote -and for introducing the BOLD and ZERO acts; I hope they pass. (Thank you also, for voting 'no' on the 1st of your 6 appropriations votes below. You showed bravery and integrity here for 'going against the grain.')

By my count, you voted 'yes' on 4 of your 6 appropriations votes:

1 H.R. 1473, "BILL TITLE: Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011": You **bravely** voted "no" on 14-Apr-2011 it.

2 On H.R. 2055, "Latest Title: Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012," you voted "yea," and the bill passed on 14-Jun-2011.

3 On "H.R. 5856: Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2013" (19-Jul-2012) you voted "yea."

4 You supported (and presumably voted 'yes' on) the Conference Report on H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013.

5 On H.R. 5882 (8-Jun-2012), BILL TITLE: "Making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes." You voted for this bill as well.

6 The recent 'Fiscal Cliff' bill (H.R.8, American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012, was introduced 7/24/2012 and voted on and passed on January 01, 2013, in the 112th Congress -- you **bravely** voted 'nay' on it.

Comments: For reasons clarified at <http://gordonwatts.com/Twittergate.html> or <http://gordonWAYNEwatts.com/Twittergate.html> I think that you were right on your 1st and 6th vote, and wrong on your other 4 votes.

On these links, I show that one of these bills (H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013) was a really bad bill -- PROOF:

"According to the Administration, the FY2013 DOD budget request is consistent with the initial spending caps set by the BCA. However, both H.R. 4310, the version of the FY2013 National Defense Authorization passed by the House on May 18, 2012, and H.R. 5856, the companion DOD

appropriations bill for FY2013, reported by the House Appropriations Committee on May 25, 2012, would exceed the Administration request—by \$3.7 billion in the case of the authorization bill and by \$3.1 billion in the case of the appropriation bill."

* <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R42607.pdf>

* ("Defense: FY2013 Authorization and Appropriations," by Pat Towell, Specialist in U.S. Defense Policy and Budget, and Daniel H. Else, Specialist in National Defense, Congressional Research Service, September 5, 2012; paragraph 3, page 2, Summary)

Even the Conservative Tampa Tribune (normally an advocate of a strong national defense) agrees that Congress is spending too much on military. Here is a small 'Fair Use' excerpt:

"We believe those threatened cuts of \$600 billion over 10 years are too deep. They would weaken the military, including MacDill Air Force Base.

But some cuts are necessary, given the size of the budget deficit. And even with the so-called sequester cuts, military spending would remain far above pre-2001 levels.

Including the costs of current foreign engagements and adjusting for inflation, the U.S. military is spending far more than at any time since World War II, and almost as much as then. Military spending has grown 48 percent in the past 10 years.

The United States is spending about five times what China spends on its military and almost 10 times what Russia spends each year.

Let's remember Pearl Harbor, and also remember that times and threats do change."

* <http://www2.tbo.com/news/opinion/2012/dec/07/naopino1-forgetting-pearl-harbor-ar-579832>

* ("Forgetting Pearl Harbor," by Staff at the *Tampa Tribune* and TBO.com, December 07, 2012)

The conclusion of my web-posting is that you voted to spend more than we made, which is 'tax and spend' liberal, and harmful for our economy.

I appreciate your form letter response. I know that you do try to do the right thing in your representation of your constituents.

Please be assured that while I disagree with (or don't fully understand) some of your votes, I do not mean any offense by my questions here -- so I will cut right to the chase: I still don't understand exactly why you voted 'yes' on 4 of your 6 appropriations votes when these bills, in all likelihood, spent more than we took in via taxes.

Here, to further clarify my concerns, is a copy of my original email to which you graciously responded:

*"Rep. Ross and staff, sorry to bother you once again, but this is rather important -and since *many* others share this concern, I will be eloquent and express our view most accurately:*

I am concerned that you voted 'yes' on at least 4 of 6 appropriations bills under your tenure that in all likelihood spend more than we brought in via taxes. (I am quite positive, based on much research, that America's national debt has been increasing every single year since Bill Clinton and Newt Gingrich's compromise long ago. While other spending bills exist, on which you voted either 'yes' or 'no,' nonetheless, the yearly Domestic & Military appropriations bills are so large that they basically make

all other "spending votes" moot. It is for this reason that I implicate your votes here as votes that "probably" spent more than we made, e.g., deficit spending.)

The problem with spending more than we make is that dollars must be printed to make up this shortfall, which results in a devaluation of any previously-printed dollars. (This will crash the economy like "Rome Fell" in ancient past -and like Greece's more recent financial woes.) The only two "good" thing here are:

1) With hyper-inflation & printing DOLLAR\$ like they're going out of style (making the dollar worthless), debts also becomes more worthless, meaning that my \$50,000.00 college-loan debt will be easier to pay after hyper-inflation makes McDonald's pay 50Grand per hour -- I'd need work only one hour to earn enough to pay down my debt! Then, I could retire. (Slight exaggeration & humour, but you get the picture:)

*2) When (not if) the U.S. Economy crashes, there will be no enforcement of *any* debts, be they public or private (including, of course, loans by SallieMae, a private company, but backed by the taxpayers). (Lack of enforcement will result because the government will also collapse when the economy collapses.)*

Here's a huge concern: Both houses must approve any new bills, spending included, so that means both the Democrat-led SENATE and the GOP-led HOUSE are culpable for our ever-increasing National Debt. Anyhow, to conclude my one main point above... Does your math concur with mine regarding my suspicion that all of your Appropriations Bills votes spent more than we took in in each respective year? (As well, Am i correct in my assertion that the Congress (House & Senate) has spent more than we took in via taxes for close 20 years?)

Thank you, in advance, for any help you may afford me here.

Gordon"