

Feb 3, 2006 PRESS RELEASE

**PORTER CALLS ENGLISH REMARKS NAUSEATINGLY HYPOCRITICAL**

In a statement released today, Democratic candidate for Congress in the 3<sup>rd</sup> District of Pennsylvania, Dr. Steven Porter, labeled the remarks of his Republican opponent and six-term incumbent, Phil English, on President Bush's State of the Union Message as "nauseatingly hypocritical."

"I waited to comment on Mr. English's remarks until after Roll Call Vote 4 in which the House passed the Republican Budget Reconciliation Bill," said Porter. "The bill passed by the narrowest of majorities: 216-214. Just as he did with the House bills on prescription drugs and CAFTA, Mr. English cast the deciding vote thereby approving harmful cuts in important social programs in order to pay for hefty tax breaks for the very wealthy.

"I wasn't surprised that Bush's speech called for policies like medical savings accounts and making permanent his obscene tax breaks for the very rich. That's what Bush stands for. And it's what Mr. English stands for—and votes for, as well. What does surprise me is the spin Mr. English puts on his votes in a desperate attempt to distance himself from Bush's failed policies. And what surprises me even more is how every two years at election time Mr. English contradicts his own voting record with phony rhetoric about how much he cares for his constituents."

Porter went on to cite some of the things that the Republican Budget Reconciliation Bill will do. "It cuts \$50 billion from programs that are important to the average person and the average family, programs like children's health care, college loans, education, and housing. If Mr. English is really concerned about the people of his district, why does he continue to vote to cut programs which serve ordinary people while voting for huge tax breaks for families with million-dollar-plus incomes? The average Bush tax benefit for these wealthy households is \$32,000 per year.

"If Mr. English really wants to stop the exodus of jobs from his district, why did he vote for CAFTA, for the renewal of WTO regulations, and for Most-Favored-Nation status for Communist China? How long are the people of the 3<sup>rd</sup> District going to let him talk out of both sides of his mouth? With much fanfare, Mr. English promised in 1995 to voluntarily abide by a twelve-year term limit. That went down the drain when he recently announced for re-election. In 2000 Mr. English promised to fight for cheaper prescription drugs from Canada. That went down the drain when he cast the deciding vote for HR 1. Recently, Mr. English promised labor that he would vote against CAFTA. That went down the drain when the Republican leadership, knowing that there would be a close vote, got him to change his mind—just as the heat of public criticism got him to change his mind about giving back a "small potatoes" \$5,000 political donation from one of Jack Abramoff's clients. Promises made; promises broken. There's a pattern here, folks.

“And what about all those paid private trips that Mr. English took--\$160,000 worth? How much good have they done the people of the district? Wasn't one of these junkets to Saipan, a trip that resulted in the defeat of legislation to clean up the sweatshops of the Saipan textile industries which pay way below minimum wage but get to sew “Made in America” on the labels of their products? Saipan was one of Mr. DeLay's destinations, too. You know, Tom DeLay-- the sleazy Congressman whose PAC gave thousands of dollars to Mr. English?

“Isn't it time this district had a Congressman who won't resort to false rhetoric to get elected, who won't take money from lobbyists or corporate PACs, who won't go on those paid junkets, and who values telling the truth and only the truth to his constituents? I hope that next November, the ordinary people of this district, for whom \$5,000 is anything but “small potatoes,” show Mr. English that his hypocrisy, like crime, doesn't pay.”