

Automatic cuts a better option?

Chris Woodward 11/10/11

Time is running out for the 12-member super committee to find a minimum of \$1.2 trillion to cut in federal spending, and one advocate for less government hopes no agreement is reached.

The bipartisan super committee, which one Cato Institute spokesman says was formed to do Congress' job ([see earlier story](#)), has until November 23 to agree on what to cut and how much. Earlier this month, Democrats on the committee [rejected a proposal](#) to extend the deadline. Meanwhile, some Republicans want the committee to reach an agreement to avoid [automatic cuts](#) to defense and security programs. But [Americans for Limited Government](#) President Bill Wilson hopes for the latter outcome.

"Success in their terms and in terms of the mainstream media will mean tax increases now, maybe spending cuts ten years from now -- and we know from experience those cuts never happen," he notes.

Having grown up in a military family, Wilson says he has great confidence that the Pentagon can find a way to absorb the roughly seven-percent cut without a negative impact.

"The thing to remember here is that even if they put those automatic cuts into effect, and if they were actually allowed to happen, we would still be racking up another \$8.5 trillion debt over those ten years," the ALG president points out.

But he suggests that lawmakers could take a common-sense approach to spending and entitlements, if someone had the political will to speak the truth. However, he says, "what we're getting is a lot of diversionary talk."