Subject: Another Bush victory....
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Wed, 10 May 2006 12:34:06 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

It really must burn the liberals that Bush gets almost everything he wants. Not all but almost. I mean, after all, according to the liberals, Bush is a bumbling idiot. This one was important for the Republicans and the country. From the link below: The bill would hand President Bush one of his top tax priorities, a two-year extension of the reduced 15 percent tax rate for capital gains and dividends, currently set to expire at the end of 2008. Republicans credit the tax cuts, enacted in 2003, with boosting economic growth and creating many jobs. They have a long way to go to correct the liberals tax and spend policies but every little bit helps.
http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,194811,00.html

Subject: Re: You Forgot to Mention The Continuation Of The Reduction Of The AMT
Posted by Manualblock on Wed, 10 May 2006 13:15:40 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

He absolutely did not want that so it's a draw. And the new jobs report shows all the activity is in the service sector; waiters/waitresses/busboys/landscapers.We actually lost jobs in High Tech/Manufacturing and other good paying jobs.

Subject: Yes, Republicans were able to get that in as well, thanks.
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Wed, 10 May 2006 13:46:33 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I beg to differ. If Bush didn't want it in there the Republicans wouldn't have put it in. Keep fooling yourself on the economy. It keeps getting better and better proving that tax cuts work better than anything else. Reagan and now Bush have proved this point. Remember the phase "it's the economy stupid!" That's not my words. It's a Democrat talking point if a Republican happens to be in office during a downturn. Not many Demorcrats using it now though. I wonder why??

Subject: Re: Yes, Republicans were able to get that in as well, thanks.
Posted by Manualblock on Wed, 10 May 2006 13:49:46 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Better check those facts; he threatened a veto if they put that in the bill.

Subject: Can't find that anywhere...
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Wed, 10 May 2006 14:02:06 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Here is an article about the tax cuts from the liberal leaning CNN. I'm sure they would have mentioned your point if it were true. Notice the article linked only mentions the Republicans debating among themselves about what to put in or leave out of the tax bill. The only thing mentioned about the Democrats is that they didn't want the cuts because they are "supposedly" for the wealthy. Some old rehashed rhetoric that never works. Nothing mentioned about any other complaints by the Democrats. If you can show me where it says Bush would veto a bill because of the AMT part I would be happy to admit I'm wrong. However I believe everyone (or mostly) both Democrats and Republicans were for this measure.
http://www.cnn.com/2006/POLITICS/05/10/congress.taxes.ap/index.html

Subject: Re: Front Sheet of The Google News Roundup last week.
Posted by Manualblock on Wed, 10 May 2006 14:06:35 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

My accountant also told me while doing my taxes.

Subject: oh your accountant told you....
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Wed, 10 May 2006 14:17:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Let me ask you a question. Why do you bother to post on a "discussion group" if your not willing to support anything you say? Other than the fact that what you say is usually not correct. Do you do it just to hear yourself talk? Ask yourself this question "If I can't prove or even support what I post then could it be the other side is right?"If what you say is true the Democrats would be trumpeting it all over the news. It would be a victory for them that is very rare these days.Now I have to leave for awhile. Don't worry I'll be back when I can. No I'm not dodging any of your posts. I'm just very busy during the day. I will try to check in from time to time.

Subject: Re: oh your accountant told you....
Posted by Manualblock on Wed, 10 May 2006 16:05:16 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Well; the truth is most of this stuff is very prominently displayed in all the newspapers and on

television news as well as all of the Newsweek and other periodicals. About the most boring thing I can think of for me to be doing is cutting and pasteing news articles into forums.I am more interested in talking with people about how they percieve events and what implications those events have for them and their communities. Repeating news briefs just doesn't do that for me. You need to start thinking for yourself instead of letting others do it for you. I would not and will not use tons of bandwidth to paste stuff that anyone who wants to can read in their own newspapers. I would rather read from someone who takes the time to think carefully about what it means and then post their thoughts on a forum.This bill is slanted to the 10% of the wealthiest individuals. What does that mean to me? Thats the interesting part.

Subject: Re:Forgot Something
Posted by Manualblock on Wed, 10 May 2006 16:23:30 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

About my accountant; very sharp guy. If you saw his house you might change your tune. You should see my tax rebate. If you want to know about taxes; look to the guys who study them.

Subject: Yes, you forgot to answer my post...
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Wed, 10 May 2006 17:11:29 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

That's ok. We both know why. I mean of course you can't substantiate anything you say. Because it's not true. Bush never threaten to veto the tax bill if the AMT was in it. This is so true of almost every Liberal argument. Based not in facts but in how they "think" the world is. Or wish it too be. This is why liberal solutions to problems (mostly tax and spend) never work. The problem is I think they know their "solutions" don't work. They don't care. It's sounds good and to hell with the consequences. Thankfully people are catching on thanks to the internet, cable and talk radio. Oh, the Democrats will still win one every now and then but these wins are becoming fewer and farer between.

Subject: Re: Yes, you forgot to answer my post...
Posted by Leland Crooks on Wed, 10 May 2006 17:24:35 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I don't usually weigh in when you two go at it, but I have to this time. I cannot believe you have trotted out "tax and spend". Which would you rather, tax and spend, or borrow and spend. Let's see, when the last democrat left the White House we were running a budget surplus. When you look at a chart for the budget over the 20th century, the deficit declined with democrats, increased

with every republican, including Ronald Reagan. The annual deficit is now at record levels. And don't trot out the "war" as an excuse, the spending on it is a drop in the bucket compared to what the deficit is annually. I'm all for real conservative spending and control, but these guys ain't it.

Subject: I would rather tax less and spend less...
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Wed, 10 May 2006 18:12:13 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Let's look at some things here. First the Republicans are always trying to cut taxes. The Democrats are trying to raise taxes. Who do you think has spending more money on their minds? Why do you supposed that the Democrats never cut taxes when they are in office? Now let's look at a simple fact. Ready for reality? Ok here it is. The President of the United States has almost nothing to do with the economy. WOW! That's hard to believe huh? The better the economy the lower the debt goes. If you think the President does effect the economy, could you please tell me what Clinton did to improve the economy? Or any other President for that matter? There is only one thing that a president can do (with the help of congress) is give tax breaks which has been proven to help under Reagan and Bush. This unfortunately is only a short term solution. The economy goes up and down and there is not much anyone can do about it. If you're lucky to be in office when there is an upturn (AKA Clinton) than you reap the benefits. Keeping in mind that the economy was already on a downturn by the end of Clinton's Presidency. If he did something to improve the economy why didn't it continue? BTW it's congress that does all the spending. The President only signs or doesn't sign the bills. Who was running congress under Clinton? I don't remember. One could also argue that it was Reagan and Bush Sr. that caused the good economy during the Clinton presidency. I won't. The problem is everytime the Republicans try to cut or even maintain the spending on anything the Democrats start crying about starving the elderly or not educating our children. So with the help of the liberal media machine they successfully scare off any attempt. Or get it cut back to almost nothing. So what do you do?Let's make it simple. If your daughter kept running up huge bills on your credit card. What would you do? If she kept promising to stop spending but time and time again she went over the limit. What would you do? You would take the credit card away. Wouldn't you? Or would you keep giving her more money until you were broke? So what can we do to stop congress from spending our money year after year? The same solution applies - take the money away. Only way to do this is lower taxes revenue to the gov. Republicans have been trying to do this for years through tax cuts. Bush is succeeding. Granted it's not very much. But it's a start.

Subject: Re: I would rather tax less and spend less...
Posted by Manualblock on Wed, 10 May 2006 18:31:41 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The President signe the budget; or not depending on whether his party gets what it wants. The threat of the veto followed by the power of the presidency which is one-third of the govt dictates

the course of spending during his administration.He appoints the cabinet and they decide on the programs that need funding. The congress then tries to cobble together a budget that includes all of the initiatives proposed by the president's agenda.Thats how it works. Clinton sought to keep the military costs in line and make the big companies pay their fair share of taxes. Geuss what? That worked and as a result the deficit declined to almost nothing.Leland is on track here and you are spouting the usual right-wing excoriating and villifying propoganda.

Subject: I prefer to let Leland speak for himself..(NT)
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Wed, 10 May 2006 18:41:52 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

NT

Subject: Re:I'm Sure He Will When He Gets Ready; I'm Just Responding To The Inacurracies
Posted by Manualblock on Wed, 10 May 2006 18:59:40 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

xxx

Subject: Now that's funny (NT)
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Wed, 10 May 2006 19:04:32 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

nt

Subject: Re: I would rather tax less and spend less...
Posted by Leland Crooks on Wed, 10 May 2006 19:25:02 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Let's make it simple. If your daughter kept running up huge bills on your credit card. What would you do? If she kept promising to stop spending but time and time again she went over the limit. What would you do? You would take the credit card away. Wouldn't you? Or would you keep giving her more money until you were broke?"This President won't take the credit card away. Not

one single veto in 5 years. Not one single spending cut worth it's salt. Only cutting taxes. So he not only didn't take the credit card away, he also took a pay cut.You are absolutely correct. The President has absolutely nothing to do with the economy. But fortuitous circumstance is a little cicumspect when the declines took place under Kennedy, Johnson, Carter, and Clinton. Increases took place under Nixon, Reagan and both Bushes. Blaming the huge deficits on the democrats is a specious argument. They have had no power, been a completely helpless minority for 5 years. They've been a whipped puppy since GW took office. The current Congress has passed out money like a drunken sailor, in the form of tax cuts and outright spending. Why have "bridge to nowhere" amendments doubled in the last 5 years? Where are the real conservatives? The guys who want to cut spending, cut government, cut waste? This Congress and Administration has overseen the largest growth in the federal government in history. They talk the talk and that's all. They're worse than the democrats were in 92. Got to give them credit however, they did in 12 years of control what it took the democrats 40yrs in the house.

Subject: Re: I would rather tax less and spend less...
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Wed, 10 May 2006 19:52:55 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Ok look you want it both ways. You tell me not to use the war as an excuse for the deficit but then you use the tax cuts as a reason for it. The war cost billions more than the tiny tax cuts Bush and congress has enacted. So let's keep it real ok?Your argument that declines took place under Kennedy, Johnson and Carter is misleading. Look at the actual numbers of the national debt in my post above. You also have to add in the fact that the economy has also grown greatly. Under Reagan and every president after. So you have to factor in the percentage of the GNP. Things are much more proportional. I never blamed the huge deficits on the Democrats. Where did I say that? I said that the Democrats solution to problems is to spend more money. Tax more and spend more. I agree with you that congress is spending too much money. What's the biggest expense the government has? The military. Then entitlements. I'm all for increasing money on the military. It's the one thing the gov. should be spending our money on. So let's cut entitlements! That's fine with me.So let me clarify because we went off on a different tangent from my original post. I am all for cutting spending except for on the military and security of our country where I think it should increase. I am not happy with the spending going on in congress. And I partly blame Republicans for this too. But the Republicans have but a slim majority in the senate. There hands are pretty much tied. But it's no where near as bad as you make it out to be. As far as Bush's numbers on concerned it will have to wait till a year or two after he's out of office. I don't like dealing with projected numbers. Let's see what really happens. In the mean time, I think the tax cuts are great. Keep them coming! If we take away enough money then maybe the congress will stop spending. Maybe but I doubt it.

Subject: More
Posted by Leland Crooks on Wed, 10 May 2006 19:53:37 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Since 1946 the Democratic Presidents increased the national debt an average of only 3.7% per year when they were in office. The Republican Presidents stay at an average increase of 9.3% per year. Over the last 59 years Republican Presidents have out borrowed Democratic Presidents by almost a three to one ratio. That is, for every dollar a Democratic President has raised the national debt in the past 59 years Republican Presidents have raised the debt by $2.87."From data gleaned from Encarta. I cannot find the chart comparing annual deficits to each administration. I came across it a couple of weeks ago and was stunned. I did however find this which compares Clinton (OMG CLINTON!) to Bush. I don't want to get in an argument about Clinton. My main point is that Bush/Republican congress have not done a damn thing a real conservative would. If they had, I'd vote for them in a heartbeat. At least the democrats tell you they're going to waste your money.
http://www.ppionline.org/ppi_ci.cfm?knlgAreaID=107&subsecID=295&contentID=252964

Subject: Re: I would rather tax less and spend less...
Posted by Leland Crooks on Wed, 10 May 2006 20:28:04 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Oddly enough, I think we are coming to an agreement here. My choice of language in the earlier post was misleading. I should have specified annual deficit, and rereading my post it implies overall government deficit. None of them have done anything to reduce it. Merely slowed it's growth, but the point is, it has seen less growth with the Dems than with Republicans. Partly due to the fact that Democrats will tax to finance programs and spending, and Republicans cut taxes and borrow to do the same thing. In an earlier debate with mb, which I neglected to get back to, I argued also that entitlements should be whacked. Why is social security tax capped? (Huge tax break for the wealthy) Why is retirement age 62-65 when lifespan has increased by 10-15 yrs since the thirties? When the bboomers retire, the party's over. Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid must be addressed. All the other programs, except for the military, are spit in the ocean. They are the 600lb gorilla. As to control of the houses, Senate and Congress, it's been a lockstep. The democrats have been locked out of committees, agendas, and legislation. The republicans were a far more effective minority party than the democrats. I like split control. Republican president, democratic houses, Democratic president, republican houses. Everybody has to compromise.

Subject: Re: I would rather tax less and spend less...
Posted by Manualblock on Wed, 10 May 2006 21:06:11 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

You have to check the deficit as it stood before Clinton; then look at it the year he left office then the deficit as it stands now. One of the reasons I don't get involved in dueling links is becuase something as plain as what has happened to the deficit is common knowledge and avialable to

anyone who is interested. Mr Vinyl uses a little slieght of hand in posting the national public debt which reflects all debt's both public and private held by individuals as well as the government; such as mortgages and such. Very tricky.The issue of the entitlements goes pretty deep in our country. To be fair it would require a complete overhaul of all subsidy programs. The majority of the funds earmarcked for entitlements go to corporate and business wealth.

Subject: Re: I would rather tax less and spend less...
Posted by Leland Crooks on Wed, 10 May 2006 21:31:22 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Did you know that McDonald's gets an advertising subsidy for their overseas ads? Designed for growing an export business with tax breaks. The complete overhaul is what's needed, and no one in our government is willing to tackle it. GW's PSA's were a band aid, and an pinky size one at that. Personally I have no intention to retire. I have the advantage of owning my own business. (Yes, oxymoron, business owner that's not republican). Social Security won't and cannot exist as we know it 20-25 years from now. I'll just cut to a couple of days a week, and hire and pay good people to help me in with my walker.

Subject: Re: I would rather tax less and spend less...
Posted by Manualblock on Wed, 10 May 2006 21:40:32 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

What's your business LC if I may ask?And as far as the non-republican thing I know of quite a few business owners who dislike this administration. They would prefer a true conservative government as would I. I follow the old saying;Those who are not liberal when they are young have no heart.Those who are not conservative when they are old have no mind.

Subject: Re: I would rather tax less and spend less...
Posted by Leland Crooks on Wed, 10 May 2006 23:26:04 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I had been a member of the NFIB(the largest small business lobby) for over 25 years. I dropped my membership this year because of the candidates they support. Yes, they were good for business, but disasters in every other respect. I got the distinct impression after I gave my rep a diatribe that I was not the first business owner he'd heard it from. As I was counting the drawer tonite I was reminded of when I was working in my Dad's hdwe store. I gave a man his change, and he said "Give me two nickels for that dime, I won't carry Roosevelt in my pocket". I thought that was odd, but now I understand how you can dislike an administration so much. I'm in the

equipment and party rental business. Construction, tents, tables, chairs. Babybeds to backhoes.

Subject: Re: I would rather tax less and spend less...
Posted by Manualblock on Thu, 11 May 2006 00:44:35 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yeah; I have a friend that does that. He only has to work through the summer to make his nut for the year.It's nice to get another point of view here. We used to have Charlie who had a good sense of reason but he lived in New Orleans and Katrina (And of course the total neglect by Bush) wiped him out and we haven't heard from him. He was the only guy who would take my side sometimes.

Subject: Re: I would rather tax less and spend less...
Posted by Leland Crooks on Thu, 11 May 2006 10:24:40 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"He only has to work through the summer to make his nut for the year."I wish. You know how they talk about retailers making their year in December, that's us in apr, may, june. Covering up the red ink from Dec, Jan, Feb. But in a little over a year the bank no longer owns me. There's gonna be a big party. It's been 50-70 hour weeks for 12 yrs. Should have been 9, but the late 2000 tank really crimped business up until the middle of last year. Maybe that's why I don't believe they're pro business, at least small business. I've been through 4 administrations in business for myself. Reagan, Bush (Hardware Store),Clinton (Rental Store and Hardware Store), BushII. I made money with Clinton, added 2 locations and paid debt. Under the others I struggled like hell just to pay the debt and keep the doors open. Mr. Vinyl is correct that the president does not directly affect the economy, but what he does with the pulpit influences it. I have a relative who has made a fortune in the market. He learned very quickly to short the market whenever George gave a speech. EVERY time until last fall, whenever George spoke, the market dropped. The results are statisically significant. The graph is pretty funny actually.

Subject: Re: I would rather tax less and spend less...
Posted by Manualblock on Thu, 11 May 2006 11:10:02 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Congratulations on the freedom at last! Nice to hear a success story.You know it's not just the pulpit. Remmember the pres appoints the cabinet; thats Sec. Of/Education/State/Labor/Defense/Interior blah blah. They are all appointed by him and they all

submitt budgetary requests that reflect his wishes. Thats why you always hear of the veto if the Congress doesn't pass the funding programs he wants. Take the No Child Left Behind Act. Thats his baby and it cost us taxpayers a lot of money.He is not the passive actor that Mr V says; he is the man who sets the budgetary priorities and they had better follow his wishes. Ask any Poly-Sci major who is most responsible for determining spending in the govt.Hardware; boy I miss the local hardware guys. I hate Home Depot.

Subject: Re: I would rather tax less and spend less...
Posted by Leland Crooks on Thu, 11 May 2006 11:26:30 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I love my current business, but I miss the hardware store. My Dad started it in 58, I bought it from him in 85, and closed it to open more rental stores in 95. The profit was gone. HD, Lowes, WalMart, had driven it out. There were also massive shifts going on in wholesale and suppliers. I should have just put the key in the door and kept the inventory. It really pisses me off to go buy a bolt for .50 when I know the cost is .05. We were an old time store. Wood floors, antique ceiling fans, grumpy old guys who knew everything, relic of a bygone high service age. I have made it a point not to shop the big boxes. We have another really good hdwe store here, he's too high, but I don't care. I refuse to shop at the boxes unless there's no choice.

Subject: Re: I would rather tax less and spend less...
Posted by Manualblock on Thu, 11 May 2006 13:05:04 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

You know if you will allow me a little leeway here. Obviously people made a conscious descision that saving a couple dollars here and there is very important to them. So they frequent the boxes. But I went through the whole process of buying deck screws with a couple friends one night. We started out with getting into our cars and ended at home with a box of No 8 3" screws. The difference in price between the last privately owned HD and the Depot was about 40c. For that we had to stand on long lines; get no help with locating the screws and no freindly faces in the store.On the opposing side we were in and out of the local HD; got some good advice and were home twenty minutes sooner. Thats a simple errand. The difficult ones are more demanding and distastefull. The moral of this storey is people are easily convinced about things that many times are either completely wrong or bad for them.There are no bargains in life or commerce.

Subject: No, this is!
Posted by Damir on Thu, 11 May 2006 15:47:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

http://news.yahoo.com/fc/World/Espionage_and_Intelligence/

Subject: Re: Why bother; they love the bush
Posted by Manualblock on Thu, 11 May 2006 22:08:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Didn't you read this nonsense; bush is a "Visionary" like Abraham Lincoln.

Subject: Hey, I love the bush, too - call me conservative...
Posted by Damir on Fri, 12 May 2006 17:37:12 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

...but this "all shaved" fashion doesn`t work for me - too much pedophile elements...