

incomplete because of lags in reporting.

One thousand seven hundred and eighty servicemen and women, Madam Speaker. Husbands and fathers, wives and mothers, sons and daughters, brothers and sisters—holes created in families and communities that can never be filled, losses that will be felt for a generation or more.

Saturday began a new fiscal year, Madam Speaker, fiscal year 2012. According to the Congressional Research Service, the estimated war funding for Iraq and Afghanistan since 2001 through fiscal year 2011 is \$1.283 trillion; \$443 billion of that has been spent in Afghanistan.

For fiscal year 2012, which began on Saturday, we will spend another \$113.7 billion in Afghanistan. By this time next year, our total spending in Afghanistan will be \$557.1 billion, or over half a trillion dollars.

And when I say “spend,” Madam Speaker, I really mean “borrow,” because from day one of the Afghanistan war—and the Iraq war, for that matter—we have not paid for these wars. We have borrowed nearly every single penny of that money, put it on the national credit card, let it rack up over a quarter of our cumulative deficit, helped explode our debt year after year for a decade.

There has only been one other time in the history of the United States that a war was financed entirely through borrowing, Madam Speaker, without raising taxes, and that was when the colonies borrowed from France during the Revolutionary War.

I know lots of Members in this House believe in the Tea Party, but that’s just stupid economics.

Even if we were to leave Afghanistan and Iraq tomorrow, our war debt will continue for decades. Future bills will include such things as caring for our military veterans and providing them the benefits they have earned through their services. It will require replacing military equipment, rebuilding our Armed Forces and paying interest on the trillions we have borrowed for these wars. These costs are significant.

Madam Speaker, this Friday, October 7, marks the 10th anniversary of U.S. military operations in Afghanistan. Ten years, Madam Speaker. Ten years of support for a corrupt government. Ten years of sacrificing our brave uniformed men and women. Ten years of borrowing money we never had.

This war is no longer about going after al Qaeda, which I voted to do. Osama bin Laden is dead. Instead, we’re now bogged down in a seemingly endless occupation in support of a corrupt, incompetent Karzai government. This is not what I voted for.

And the human and financial costs of the war in Afghanistan go on and on and on, not just on the battlefields of Afghanistan, but in veterans hospitals and counseling clinics around the country. Another \$8.4 billion to care for our veterans wounded in both body and soul.

□ 1010

We continue to struggle with soaring posttraumatic stress and suicide rates among our soldiers and our veterans. Their impacts are devastating on families, friends, colleagues, and military buddies.

It is hard to explain how we could borrow and spend so freely, so casually, while our men and women bled in the plains and mountains of Afghanistan, but now we have to face the consequences of that lack of accountability, that lack of responsible governance.

When the supercommittee makes its decisions on how to handle the deficit and the debt, I say ending the wars as rapidly as possible must be the first item on the table. I also say that, from this point forward, the wars must be paid for. No more emergency funding. No more overseas contingency funds that get a free pass from responsible budgeting. I believe President Obama has to bring this to the negotiations, and the House and Senate members of the supercommittee have to step up to the plate and end these wars. End these wars now. They have undermined our economy, and they have undermined our security.

Ten years into the Afghanistan war, the violence shows no signs of abating; the Karzai government shows little interest in cleaning up corruption; and no one is interested in the kind of region-wide negotiations required to bring stability and security to all parties.

So I say enough is enough. Get out of Afghanistan. The costs in blood and treasure have been too high. Ten years is more than enough. After 10 years, it’s time to come home.

#### THE IMPACT OF REGULATIONS ON BUSINESS

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

Mr. BONNER. Madam Speaker, while long-term unemployment is now worse than at any time since the Great Depression and while Americans in growing numbers are becoming more and more concerned about the direction their country is heading, the one thing that is uniting Americans is the realization that their Federal Government is unnecessarily getting in the way of job creators, of both small and large businesses alike, by tying the hands of employers with bureaucratic redtape and over-the-top, unnecessary and often duplicative regulation.

A recent Tarrance Group survey found that three-quarters of the American people believe that businesses and consumers are overregulated. Another two-thirds believe that regulations have increased over the past few years. Americans, understandably so, are concerned that regulations will create a hindrance to job creation, and most believe that new regulation will either

bring more job losses or increased prices.

Madam Speaker, the American people have good reason to be concerned. From higher taxes on workers and businesses to the greater intrusion by the Federal Government into personal health care decisions, there has been plenty of evidence that this administration wants to grow the size and reach and scope of government in ways that we have never before seen in the history of America. At any time, the heavy hand of Big Government regulation is bad news for jobs, but during the middle of the worst recession since the Great Depression, it defies common sense for government to place even more roadblocks in front of struggling businesses.

While largely unseen by the public and, more times than not, not even debated here on the floor of Congress, Federal regulations directly impact jobs and job creation. A Small Business Administration report released just last September, in September of 2010, noted that Federal regulations cost businesses \$1.7 trillion each year and that small businesses, in particular, bear a disproportionate share of these costs, averaging over \$10,000 for each employee.

Along America’s gulf coast, we have recently experienced the direct impact of Federal Government overreach in the oil production industry. The administration’s de facto moratorium on new oil drilling has cost our region of the country tens of thousands of jobs—some say as few as 30,000, others as many as 70,000 jobs that have been lost—at a time when the gulf coast is still struggling to recover from the worst manmade disaster in American history.

Just last week, I visited several large and small manufacturers in south Alabama, in Alabama’s First Congressional District, that are doing their very best to turn a profit under the mantle of increased Federal regulation.

In one case, a small manufacturer with 28 employees related how they cannot expand their production due to new Federal regulations. In fact, they are now being forced to downsize. Incredibly, when EPA visits companies to perform audits, oftentimes they take away whole file drawers or cabinets full of records. The small business owners pay taxes on company profits from their personal income taxes, and they have to keep a consultant on retainer just to stay in compliance with all of the regulations. A medium-sized manufacturer we visited last week told me—and they’ve got plants in other States as well, not just in Alabama—that the new proposed regulations that they are looking at would cost their company alone over \$100 million in new regulation.

During his jobs speech to Congress, in this very Chamber just last month, the President admitted that government regulations on businesses serve to dampen job creation. He even suggested that he would be willing to work

with Congress to review such actions. But in the following weeks, there has been little evidence to suggest that the President is serious.

Let me be clear: Federal regulations do have their place in ensuring the safety of both workers and consumers. Federal laws have contributed greatly to maintaining our clean air and water as well as the safety of our transportation system, our food and consumer products, to name but just a few. No one is saying we shouldn't have any regulation. But for all the good that a responsible government can provide with reasonable oversight, make no mistake that overzealous regulation can stifle our economy and contribute to a reduced quality of life for all Americans. That is why House Republicans are working to pass legislation to rein in out-of-control Federal regulations that strangle job creation.

Last week, the House passed the TRAIN Act. If enacted into law, this one bill would prevent the administration from imposing some of the most controversial new EPA rules, which further threaten job creation and the economy. It would also force the administration to review the impact of new regulations before they're applied. Today, the House is considering two additional significant regulatory reform bills—the Cement Sector Regulatory Relief Act of 2011 and the EPA Regulatory Relief Act of 2011.

I urge that Congress pass this and help put the government on the side of the American workers and job creators, not against them.

#### THE AMERICAN AWAKENING

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Three years ago, after a decade of deregulation, the repeal of Glass-Steagall, which was the deregulation of derivatives, Wall Street—the “job creators”—gambled our economy into oblivion, but they never paid the price.

Remember George Bush and Hank Paulson, who was the Secretary of the Treasury? Well, he was kind of a stand-in, because, actually, he was the former chairman of Goldman Sachs, pretending to be Secretary of the Treasury. He took care of his buddies on Wall Street, but he was aided and abetted by none other than Tim Geithner, the chairman of the New York Fed. In fact, in one of the most outrageous moments of this whole scenario, Tim Geithner, now Secretary of the Treasury—although he wasn't chairman of Goldman Sachs, but it's probably in his future—decided to pay off the gamblers 100 cents on the dollar when the government had to do the biggest bailout in history of AIG. Now, that was incredible—100 cents on the dollar.

At the time, I proposed that, in fact, Wall Street should pay for its own bailout—that is, a tax on speculators and

reinstating a tax we had from 1916 to 1966 while we built the greatest industrial Nation on Earth. It didn't hurt investment in capitalism then. It wouldn't hurt it now. In fact, if we reined in some of the speculators, our real economy would be better off for it.

But now there's sort of been this amazing political jujitsu where somehow the Republicans, aided by the Koch Brothers, who have also subsidized the Tea Party, have changed the narrative. It was the government. It was overregulation. Overregulation? Oh, come on, guys. There were no rules. They gambled our economy into oblivion. You cannot pretend that this wasn't wild and reckless, but you've changed the narrative. You took over the House.

Now, this fall, something is happening. Something in this land is happening. I call it the American awakening—the occupation of Wall Street, which is now spreading to other cities across this country.

□ 1020

They make fun of these young people because they are not totally focused on what they want, but what's happened is their future has been stolen from them. I saw some Fox commentators yesterday morning making fun of them saying, Oh, do you think they got time off from work? Oh, well, they don't have jobs, do they?

No, they don't have jobs. What are we doing to create jobs and give these kids a future in this country and rein in the gamblers on Wall Street and restore the real economy, the productive economy of this country? Nothing. In fact, you want to go back to 2008. That was your dream.

It is time to begin to deal meaningfully with these problems in this country and that we have the greatest disparity of wealth in our history. Corporate profits are up; jobs are down. CEO pay up; jobs are down. Bonuses on Wall Street, whoa, six figures, up. Jobs, down.

It's time to rectify this, and I think the young people and the others who are joining them on Wall Street get it. They may not be totally focused, but they know that this isn't a country that gives them a fair shot at the American Dream anymore. It's a stacked deck, and it's time for a new deck and a new order.

Reregulate the reckless gamblers on Wall Street. Rein them in, take steps to rebuild our real economy, give people a future, invest in education, invest in the basics of this country, transportation, infrastructure; and we can be a great Nation again. But if we continue down this path, or even if they accelerate us down this path with helping the job creators destroy the economy again, there's no hope.

10TH ANNIVERSARY OF OUR SEEMINGLY ENDLESS WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise along with others this morning to note the 10th anniversary of our seemingly endless war in Afghanistan. This is a war that long ago became much more about money for the Pentagon and defense contractors than about any real threat to the American people.

And, unfortunately, just yesterday we authorized spending at a level of \$118.7 billion for the coming year in Iraq and Afghanistan. Madam Speaker, we have turned the Defense Department into the Department of Foreign Aid, and the American people are tired of it. They want us to stop rebuilding Iraq and Afghanistan and start taking care of our own people.

We have spent and are spending billions and billions, hundreds of billions that we do not have, that we are having to borrow on people who do not appreciate it unless they are on our payroll.

I know last year, Hamid Karzai, the leader of Afghanistan, told ABCNews that he wanted us to stay there another 15 or 20 years. Well, he wants our money; but we don't have enough of it, and we can't afford this.

Alfred Regnery, the publisher of the conservative *The American Spectator* magazine wrote last October that “Afghanistan has little strategic value” and “the war is one of choice rather than necessity.” He added that it has been a wasteful and frustrating decade.

General Petraeus testified in front of one of the congressional committees several months ago that we should never forget that Afghanistan has become “the graveyard of empires.”

The American people do not want, nor can we afford, endless, permanent wars; nor do they want 11- or 12-year wars that last about three times as long as World War II.

Charlie Reese was a columnist for the Orlando newspaper, and a few years ago, probably in the mid- or late 1990s, he was voted the most popular columnist by C-SPAN viewers. Over 25,000 people, I think, participated in that poll.

But he was very much opposed to these wars, and he wrote this about the Iraq war, but it applies equally well to Afghanistan: He said this war was “against a country that was not attacking us, did not have the means to attack us, and had never expressed any intention of attacking us. And for whatever real reason we attacked, it was not to save America from any danger, imminent or otherwise.”

William F. Buckley, Jr., the conservative icon, wrote this a few years ago: He said, “A respect for the power of the United States is engendered by our success in engagements in which we take part. A point is reached when tenacity