

Mr. BROYHILL. I agree over a period of years on a couple of occasions we did decompress it somewhat but that was politically unpopular because we were granting an increase to the higher grades. I don't think I am a hostile member, as far as you folks are concerned and as far as this proposed tax increase is concerned. I have said on many previous occasions that I don't see how we can stand a \$28 to \$30 billion deficit. We have just got to do something about it. I thought the Secretary of Treasury made a very fine statement and the four points he made as to why we could not afford a \$28 to \$29 billion deficit were very sound.

I think he can add a fifth point, and that is fairness to future generations. Why should we pass on the cost of our problems today to them? But I have been somewhat alarmed, frankly, by the response of my constituents. I have received more letters, and this is only part of them, in opposition to the proposal than I believe on any other matter in my 15 years in Congress. It is spontaneous.

I directed the parliamentary inquiry at the chairman, facetiously, of course, due to the fact that we are getting some resistance from the people we represent.

Here is an excerpt from one of these letters which emphasizes what I was directing at the chairman:

DEAR MR. BROYHILL: I am glad to oppose the President's tax surcharge. I would resent paying an increased tax necessitated by an irresponsible President and irresolute Congress. While I feel that your own record is a good one, I quite frankly don't feel that I can give my support or vote to any Member of Congress who passes this tax legislation. As I understand, Congress is designed to reflect the will of the majority of the citizens. I hope it won't be necessary to elect an entirely new Congress to accomplish this.

Here is another letter signed by five different people with five different addresses. They are all in the same neighborhood. No, there are a couple in Alexandria.

We are very much opposed to the proposed tax rise. As of now we are scarcely making ends meet. Most of us work a five-day week, some of us work a six-day week. We have no extra money to rob Peter to pay Paul.

To us it is feasible to arrange for recipients of welfare checks to earn their keep. This would also tend to relieve the taxpayer. There is no excuse for the able-bodied man or woman to live off the income of others. This would serve a two-fold purpose. People who work eight hours day or night are too tired to go out looking for trouble.

These letters run right along in that line. I find that the opposition to a tax increase is not the lack of regard for the inflation problem, Mr. Surrey, and the other points that the Secretary made earlier, although that particular aspect is difficult to explain to a lot of people. They are not indifferent to fiscal responsibility.

Their resentment all through these letters is toward needless programs, what they consider are needless programs and wasteful programs.

The Secretary pointed out that there was going to be a \$7½ billion cut in expenditures along with the \$7½-billion surcharge, and this was most encouraging. But I might add the explanation Mr. Schultze has given has not been completely acceptable to members of the committee. We cannot quite gather from what you have stated, Mr. Schultze, that this does result in a direct cut in the spending that these people are talking about. They can't see that these cuts are actually being made.