

This is the total budget. Look, we are borrowing from China and other places around the world almost half of what we're spending. We are borrowing \$1.6 trillion, and the Federal tax revenue is \$2.2 billion. Those are just extraordinary numbers. Now, they say they'll fix that by cutting. Well, here we go. Here we go again with the budget at \$3.8 trillion and the deficit at \$1.6 trillion.

They said, Well, wait a minute. You can't increase revenues. No. You could decrease revenues. They say that wouldn't count. Then, Oh, well. The Department of Defense is off limits. Entitlements are all off limits. Mandatory spending, meaning agriculture subsidies and other egregious things, are all off limits. We will balance the budget by going after non-defense discretionary spending.

There seems to be a little bit of a problem here.

Here is the deficit of \$1.6 trillion. Now, if we eliminated all non-defense discretionary spending, which would mean basically the daily operations of the Government of the United States outside the Defense Department, it would be all gone; close the door; open the Federal prisons, and let the prisoners out. There would be no more Justice Department, no more FBI, no more Border Patrol, none of those things. Just get rid of all that stuff—the IRS, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Education, health education, the Centers for Disease Control. All gone.

Well, you would still have a \$1 trillion deficit. But don't worry, they're going to get us there by cutting.

You can't get there simply by cutting. Yes, you need to cut. You need to reduce and eliminate wasteful programs, but you can't pretend that you can cut revenues or that you can maintain tax loopholes for companies that move their headquarters to post office boxes in the Bahamas, like Carnival Cruise Lines—excuse me, their post office box is in Panama—which operate out of the U.S., get their customers in the U.S., use the ports of the U.S., use the U.S. Coast Guard, and whose executives live in the U.S. but they don't pay taxes here.

There is ExxonMobil, which doesn't pay taxes in the United States, but pays in other places around the world. We borrow money to give a subsidy to ExxonMobil. Yet in the last quarter of last year, they had the largest single corporate profit in the history of the world, and we're going to borrow money to give them tax rebates for taxes they didn't pay in the United States of America but that they paid elsewhere.

That system can't be fixed, the Republicans say. Those will be tax increases. You can't plug those tax loopholes. The agriculture subsidies pay people \$20 billion not to grow things. No, can't go there. We're going to balance the budget by hacking away at non-defense discretionary spending.

Unfortunately, physics and reality don't work for them here, nor does the math because it's a tiny fraction of the deficit if we totally eliminate those programs instead of just hack away at them.

So let's get real. Let's get together here. The country is confronted with a serious long-term debt problem. As everybody said yesterday, everything is on the table. Well, it's not, but everything should be on the table.

THE ASSAULT ON THE VOICE OF AMERICA—PUBLIC BROADCASTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, the next few days on the floor of the House will be critical for the future of public broadcasting.

With the new Republican majority, people here are hoping for saving less than one cent per day on this ideological assault—on what?—public broadcasting, for 170 million Americans, their Voice of America and their window to the world.

In an era when local papers and radio stations are being gobbled up by large conglomerates, public broadcasting's 1,300 stations around the country are increasingly the only source of locally owned, locally controlled content.

Now, there is a lot of attention appropriately given to the major stations in America's large cities. We've all seen and heard programming from stations in Boston and San Francisco, New York, even in Portland, Oregon, as Oregon Public Broadcasting is recognized as one of these national leaders. For much of America outside the major metropolitan areas, public broadcasting actually plays an even more important role.

In the Rockies, the Pacific Northwest, rural areas, and the upper Midwest, often public broadcasting is not just the best local source. It is the only source of information that relates directly to their communities. The big stations in the large communities are going to be harmed by this assault on public broadcasting.

□ 1030

My own public broadcasting in Oregon will lose \$2.4 million. It will really harm the quality of their effort. But it is in rural and small town America that the greatest damage will be done. For example, in eastern Oregon, it costs 11 times as much to get a signal to Burns as it does in the more populist Willamette Valley, and there simply isn't the base of population to make up for the difference with local contributions.

It's ironic that these partisans are attacking one of America's best public-private partnerships. It's not uncommon for the public investment to leverage \$6 or more of private investment to make this high quality programming possible.

Now, there are some who claim that in an era of 500 cable and satellite stations that we don't need another source of information. Well, those people fail to grasp the power of non-commercial, public broadcasting, how it is unique today. There are countless shows that are directed towards America's kids, but public broadcasting provides the only children's programming that is trying to educate and entertain our children, not sell them something.

The public supports public broadcasting, not just in opinion polls, but with tens of millions of dollars of voluntary contributions that they make every year to provide the quality programming.

I fear that this reckless partisan assault on public broadcasting is actually going to hurt our long-term efforts to tame the budget deficit. Trading a savings of less than one-half cent per day per American won't offset the damage to public confidence by eliminating what so many people believe in and count upon.

More important, it will be a loss of a valuable tool to educate and inform the public from a respected nonpartisan source, exactly how we're going to need to get information to Americans to deal with this massive deficit problem that we face.

For those of us working to meet America's challenges, public broadcasting is an essential ally; but I will say that with the tremendous outpouring of support that we are now seeing, people calling and writing Members of Congress, stopping them on the street, I think there is a good chance that those 1,300 public broadcasting stations will still be here in the future helping inform the debates of today, if all of us do our job, listen to the public, and do what is in the best long-term interests of this country.

ON EXTENDING THE PATRIOT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, last year I voted to extend the Patriot Act for 1 year. I regret that vote and was glad to have been able to correct it, although I'm pained that the House voted otherwise yesterday.

During this past year, I have become convinced that the provisions of the so-called Patriot Act are an affront to the Bill of Rights and a serious threat to our fundamental liberty as Americans.

The Fourth Amendment arises from the abuses of the British Crown that allowed roving searches by revenue agents under the guise of what were called "writs of assistance" or "general warrants." Instead of following specific allegations against specific individuals, the Crown's revenue agents were given free rein to search indiscriminately.

In 1761, the famous colonial leader James Otis challenged these writs, arguing that "a man's house is his castle;