

U.s government essay examples

[Government](#), [Military](#)



1) Hello, my name is Richard Burr, and I am a Republican senator representing the state of North Carolina. I was elected in 2004, and am on my second term currently, which will expire in 2016. I was born November 30, 1955 in Charlottesville, Virginia, and grew up in Winston-Salem. I received my BA in 1978, and I am married with children. Before my career in the Senate, I worked as a national sales manager for Carswell Distributing from 1978-1994, at which time I was elected to the US House of Representatives. I remained in that position until 2004, when I was elected to the Senate.

In my time in the Senate, I have been assigned to a number of committees, including the Finance, Health, Education, Labor & Pensions: Children & Families Committee, The Committee of Primary Health and Aging, and the Intelligence and Veterans' Affairs Committees.

In terms of my relationships with interest groups, I am very poorly regarded by the ACLU, the ADA, the AFS, and the LCV, though the ACU, the CFG, the FRC, NTU and COC regard me highly. I have also been heavily favored by the National Right to Life Committee, The National Journal (as Conservative on Social Policy), Americans for Tax Reform, and more. All of these rankings indicate heavily my leaning toward conservative cultural and economic issues, and so I tend to vote along those lines, particularly due to my campaign donors.

In the past, I have voted in a number of key issues. I voted against passing a \$787 billion stimulus, voted to repeal DC gun laws, and voted against the PPACA. I voted against passing tax cuts for some, legalizing the children of illegal immigrants, and the ratification of the New START program. However,

I did vote for the repeal of DADT, though I did also vote to stop climate regulations on big business by the EPA. I have voted largely conservative in terms of cultural issues, but in terms of foreign policy have remained largely centrist. I am fairly staunch in my advocacy for veterans' rights, voting for cost-of-living adjustments to be made to veterans with disabilities relating to their service; I also voted for greater initiatives to improve the quality of life of children or parents of military personnel. I voted for the Tax Hike Prevention Act of 2012, against the Middle Class Tax Cut Act and the Bring Jobs Home Act

In total, I have raised approximately \$9.7 million in campaign contributions, with some of my top contributors being retirees, health professionals, lobbyists, banking and investment interests, and finance. Much of this is due to my work with veterans and military retirees, as well as my work with healthcare and biomedical regulation and interests.

2) a) Senator Richard Burr would not vote to increase the income tax on those making more than \$200,000 a year. This initiative would tax high income earners more in order to bring in more tax revenue, since they would be more equipped to afford it. However, conservatives like Richard Burr would see this as punishing the upper classes and the rich - many of whom provide large campaign contributions to Senators to run their re-election campaigns.

Richard Burr's voting record would lend itself to voting this measure down. In 2008, he voted no on increasing the tax rates for people who earn more than \$1 million a year. He also voted to repeal the Alternative Minimum Tax, which further helped the rich with tax relief. He is a strong supporter of

capital gains and estate tax cuts, as he persistently votes in favor of those every time. He voted to keep the Bush tax cuts permanent, and voted for \$99 billion of income tax and capital gains tax cuts. With this voting record in mind, he would vote against increasing taxes, as he would perceive them to be antithetical to the running of business. His voting record has been unerring in the pursuit of tax cuts and diminishing the burden on the upper class; to that end, he would not change his record for this particular deficit reduction method. One of Burr's biggest issues currently is fiscal responsibility and balancing the budget, but also believes that high-income earners are "job creators" who need those tax cuts to stimulate the economy.

b) Senator Richard Burr would vote to increase the gas tax to 30 cents a gallon. This measure would make getting fuel more expensive, and therefore would ideally be an incentive to place more resources on alternative energy. This would help to reduce the deficit while allowing for greener initiatives in energy consumption and conservation.

Despite being a relatively strong fiscal conservative, Burr is dedicated to the issue of alternative energy and energy independence. He was, at one point, a member of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, working on energy efficient policies and the development of alternative energy sources like biofuels, wind and water. To that end, he is not as invested in the continuance of the existing oil and gas industry as other conservative senators; he would vote for this tax hike on fuel.

Burr's voting record also reflects this; despite voting for less oversight on business by the EPA, he also wishes to reform the EPA into an agency that

would streamline energy conservation and connect it to environmental conservation as well. His introduction of the Next Generation Energy Security Act in 2010 further indicates this dedication to alternative energy. At the same time, he has voted against the cap-and-trade method for energy conservation, so he would be at least morally opposed to increasing energy prices. He has made statements in the past that allude to this, and has voted against implementing the Kyoto Protocol, and voted against a national energy tax for middle-class taxpayers. However, despite his desire to not increase prices for families, he would be forced to pick this selection instead of the others he would say no to in this particular budget simulation, as it is the issue he would be most willing to live with.

c) Senator Richard Burr would vote against reducing military spending by 10%. This measure would take a substantial amount out of the deficit by cutting the defense budget, which is one of the biggest allocations for American taxpayer money. It is argued that the military is bigger than it needs to be, and that cutting it would not unduly sacrifice our defensive position. However, Richard Burr's position is as a staunch advocate for veterans and military personnel, and so he would not do anything that would reduce the military's capacity to support itself and to wage war. He voted no on the 2007 initiative to re-deploy US troops out of Iraq in 9 months, and several other times the opportunity to roll back troops has arisen. He voted to approve the removal of Saddam Hussein and military force in Iraq. He often wishes for the increase of military hardware budgets and salary/benefits for active duty personnel, and he wishes weapons, troop retention and defense budgets to remain at the same rate. To that end, he

would not vote to lower them in any way.

One of Richard Burr's biggest issues is supporting the military families of American troops, both living and dead; he would not vote down the reduction in military budget, as that would sacrifice benefits and salaries given to those families. It would also affect retirees and veterans' pensions dramatically, leaving them less able to take care of themselves (or contribute back to Burr's campaign, since they are his largest individual contributors).

d) Senator Richard Burr would vote to eliminate subsidies for AMTRAK. The initiative to eliminate subsidies for AMTRAK comes from the notion that the federal government does not need to be in the business of supplementing what are normally for-profit initiatives. While AMTRAK is a for-profit company, they also depend heavily on government support. If federal subsidies would be eliminated, that could cut down on the deficit. The overall idea is to cut down on extraneous programs that might still thrive without the federal government, at least in theory; while the military must depend primarily on government support, government subsidization of private enterprises may be seen as optional by conservatives.

Richard Burr, having no specific ties to AMTRAK in particular, would vote to eliminate their subsidies. He is, again, dedicated to the issue of fiscal responsibility, both for the public and private sectors. He would be dedicated to reducing government spending wherever it could be cut, and it is possible he believes the free market would pick up the slack where AMTRAK funding and transportation is concerned. He has no vested interest in its continued funding, and this decision would allow him to stand his ground on other

issues like the military spending and upper-class tax cuts. While he voted to increase Amtrak's funding in 2007 by \$550 million dollars, if forced to he would cut that funding to appease his other supporters, all of whom he has specifically cited as being key issues (fiscal responsibility, energy, the military) and who provide him with campaign finances. In other words, the AMTRAK scenario would permit him to take a stand on this issue without sacrificing goodwill from other special interests.

e) Senator Richard Burr would vote to decrease price supports for agriculture by 20%. This measure seeks to reduce the deficit by not paying farmers as much money in subsidies, which they use to supplement their businesses and their farms. With this federal funding diminished, they would have less money to work with, and they would have as much freedom to hire workers and stimulate the economy. Despite this dedication to fiscal responsibility and the free market, Burr would have no choice but to reluctantly cut these price supports for the sake of reducing the deficit.

Richard Burr's own voting record says that he actually has a past of supporting price supports for agriculture - he voted no on limiting farm subsidies to lower-income farmers in 2007, and he voted yes in 2001 to provide 10 years of farm price supports totaling \$167 billion. He also voted to overturn President Bush's veto of the Farm Bill, so his voting history is fairly well cemented towards the welfare of farmers and the agriculture business.

However, despite this level of support, having to pick three options, Burr would likely also choose this option. He has vested interests and substantial numbers of supporters in the military lobby, as well as pharmaceutical

interests and high-income earners; he could not vote to reduce their spending or raise their taxes. To that end, he would simply have no choice but to cut these farm price supports, as he has no specific agricultural interests to speak of. His energies are geared much more toward maintaining the status quo with the military, and not permitting high-income earners to be taxed any more than they already are.