



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 14, 2010

No. 165

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PETERS).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
December 14, 2010.
I hereby appoint the Honorable GARY C. PETERS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Janu-

ary 6, 2009, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes and each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

NOTICE

If the 111th Congress, 2d Session, adjourns sine die on or before December 23, 2010, a final issue of the *Congressional Record* for the 111th Congress, 2d Session, will be published on Wednesday, December 29, 2010, in order to permit Members to revise and extend their remarks.

All material for insertion must be signed by the Member and delivered to the respective offices of the Official Reporters of Debates (Room HT-59 or S-123 of the Capitol), Monday through Friday, between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. through Wednesday, December 29. The final issue will be dated Wednesday, December 29, 2010, and will be delivered on Thursday, December 30, 2010.

None of the material printed in the final issue of the *Congressional Record* may contain subject matter, or relate to any event that occurred after the sine die date.

Senators' statements should also be submitted electronically, either on a disk to accompany the signed statement, or by e-mail to the Official Reporters of Debates at "Record@Sec.Senate.gov".

Members of the House of Representatives' statements may also be submitted electronically by e-mail, to accompany the signed statement, and formatted according to the instructions for the Extensions of Remarks template at <http://clerk.house.gov/forms>. The Official Reporters will transmit to GPO the template formatted electronic file only after receipt of, and authentication with, the hard copy, and signed manuscript. Deliver statements to the Official Reporters in Room HT-59.

Members of Congress desiring to purchase reprints of material submitted for inclusion in the *Congressional Record* may do so by contacting the Office of Congressional Publishing Services, at the Government Printing Office, on 512-0224, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. daily.

By order of the Joint Committee on Printing.

CHARLES E. SCHUMER, *Chairman.*

COMPROMISE TAX CUT PROPOSAL

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, the Senate has acted on the so-called tax cut proposal. They acted the way the Senate usually

acts when confronted with a problem; they added ornaments to the Christmas tree. They actually increased the cost.

This legislation will cost \$858 billion over 2 years. That is bigger than the much-reviled stimulus passed in the beginning of the Obama Presidency:

\$858 billion. That will add approximately \$430 billion a year to the deficit for the next 2 years. That is \$430 billion more borrowed, probably from China.

Now, the question is: Is this the best possible use of this money? Will this put America and Americans back to

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H8295

work and get us more firmly on the path to recovery? I think not. I think much of this money is wasted and will create zero jobs.

Now, if you think that the Bush-era tax cuts worked well—they didn't create any jobs, but if for some reason you think they worked well—then you are going to like this. In fact, it is even a bigger giveaway than the Bush-era tax cuts. Or if you think the \$300 billion of the so-called stimulus that the President gave away in tax cuts, the Larry Summers tax cuts that were so small that no one would notice and they would just spend them on consumer goods—bad politics, bad economics, didn't put anybody back to work, to get three Republican votes, that is why that \$300 billion went in there, and bumped out real investment that would have created immediate and real jobs and long-term benefits—no, instead we had ephemeral spending. That was supposed to put Americans back to work.

If you liked that, you are going to love this. It has new provisions. One, instead of President Obama's "making work pay" tax cuts, now we are going to attack Social Security. That is right, the Republicans are getting their dreams here.

We are going to give a tax holiday of 2 percent on Social Security. Isn't that great? It goes to any income level. That means Members of Congress will get a minimum of a \$2,100 tax break, as will other people who do very well in this country.

But, don't worry, that that would kind of hurt Social Security, to cut its income by \$111 billion next year. It would accelerate the point at which it couldn't pay benefits. But, don't worry, we will borrow the money from China, and we will inject it into the Social Security trust fund, tearing down the firewall between the general fund and Social Security.

Next year the Republicans are going to say to the President, Hey, you can't let that tax cut for working people, that FICA holiday, expire. And, oh, by the way, we can't afford to subsidize Social Security anymore out of the general fund.

This is a trap, and that kind of a tax cut is not going to put people back to work.

Then we have the tax cuts for the upper income, \$51 billion for incomes above \$250,000. Now, remember, up to \$250,000, everybody under what President Obama first proposed would get a tax break. It is only your income over 250 that would be taxed at the Clinton-era rates. And guess what happened during the Clinton era? We balanced the budget, and we created 23 million jobs. Not too bad. Now we have record deficits, and we are creating an anemic number of jobs.

They estimate this package might create between 1 million and 3 million jobs, or save them, or later they will say it could have been worse, just like they did with the stimulus. If we directly invested a fraction of this \$858

billion in roads, bridges, highways, sewers, water systems, building schools, things that would pass benefits to future generations, we could create millions of jobs and you would have gotten something for your money, other than current consumption.

Then, how about this new provision, estates over \$10 million? Now, the media keeps saying \$5 million. No, it is 5 and 5, husband and wife, \$10 million of an estate tax-free, and after that a lower tax break. That costs \$10 billion a year.

We are going to borrow \$10 billion a year, all the American people are going to borrow that money, to give 6,000 families a tax break, who are already doing quite well, thank you very much. How many jobs will that create? Zero. Goose egg. None. It isn't about small business anymore. We are talking estates over \$10 million.

Then we are going to continue the Bush-era reductions in capital gains and dividend taxes, which go predominantly to the highest income brackets, under the premise that those things too create jobs. If this is a job creator, it is the least efficient, lamest way to create jobs at unbelievable expense.

If we want to create jobs, there are better ways to do it; or if you want to do the tax relief, you could do it for much less. If you cut out the upper income, over \$250,000, the estates over \$10 million, look at capital gains, dividends, don't do the FICA tax, or at least cap it so people at levels of Members of Congress don't get it, we could do this for less and put more people to work.

COSTS TOO HIGH FOR WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the recent congressional elections here in the United States focused on many issues, but the war in Afghanistan was not one of them.

There is no draft in this country. We have an all-volunteer Armed Forces. Only a small percentage of our population is at risk. And no one is paying for the war. It is all going on America's credit card. We are borrowing all the money to pay for this war. So, why should anyone pay attention?

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we must pay more attention. There is absolutely no excuse for our collective indifference. At 109 months, this is the longest war in our history. Over 1,400 of our uniformed men and women have lost their lives in Afghanistan. Over 8,700 have been wounded in action.

High levels of deployment continue to strain our uniformed men and women, their families and their communities. In spite of the military's best efforts, suicide and post-traumatic stress rates continue to soar and our ability to care for the wounded is severely overburdened.

The ability of individual servicemembers and their units to rest, recuperate, retrain and reequip themselves for redeployment is stretched beyond its limits. And in Afghanistan, our so-called ally, President Hamad Karzai, is corrupt. The Afghan military and the police are not reliable partners and al Qaeda is someplace else.

A few weeks ago, President Obama told us we are in Afghanistan for at least another 4 years, maybe more. The question is, for what? Why do we need to sacrifice more precious American lives? Why do we need to continue to align ourselves with a crooked government that routinely commits fraud in elections? Why aren't we instead using all of our resources to go after the terrorists that murdered so many of our civilians on September 11?

The Republicans won back the majority of the House by promising to control spending and reducing the deficit. This war has already cost us over \$450 billion. When combined with the cost of the war in Iraq, it accounts for 23 percent of our combined deficits since 2003.

Where is the outcry from the tea partiers and the deficit hawks? Fiscal conservatives should be outraged that this war is being financed with borrowed money. And for those who support the war, you should pay for it. And where is the liberal outrage? For those of us who are tired of being told that we don't have enough money to extend unemployment benefits or invest in green jobs or new jobs, we should be yelling and screaming at the fact that when it comes to the war in Afghanistan and supporting Hamad Karzai, our Treasury is an ATM machine.

□ 1240

Let us put in perspective what this war truly costs and what we must give up in order to maintain the status quo. According to Nobel Laureate and Columbia University professor Joseph Stiglitz, testifying before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, the total cost of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, including interest payments on the money borrowed for these wars and taking care of our wounded soldiers and veterans, will likely be between \$4 trillion and \$6 trillion. Yes, Mr. Speaker, between \$4 trillion and \$6 trillion.

On Saturday, December 11, Mr. Speaker, another soldier from my district sacrificed his life in Afghanistan. Army Specialist Ethan Goncalo was just 21 years old when he died in Kabul. He is the third graduate of Durfee High School in Fall River to die in uniform this year, and the fourth servicemember from Fall River, a town of 90,000 residents. His loss is deeply felt in this tight-knit community, and my thoughts and prayers are with his parents, family, friends, and schoolmates.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the human and financial costs of this war are unacceptable and unsustainable. It is bankrupting us. We need a plan to extricate