

VISUALS	AUDIO	BACKUP
<p><i>Simple, clean ALLEN graphic</i></p> <p><i>Text: With George Allen In Washington</i></p>	<p>With George Allen in Washington...</p>	
<p><i>Simple, clean ALLEN graphic</i></p> <p><i>Text: Who Really Wins ?</i></p>	<p>...here’s who <u>really</u> wins:</p>	
<p><i>Split Screen</i> <i>Text Left Side: Tax breaks To Ship Jobs Overseas</i> <i>Right Screen: Shipyard Footage</i></p>	<p>Companies getting tax breaks to ship American jobs overseas;</p>	<p>Allen voted against amendment repealing tax breaks for companies that ship jobs overseas. Allen voted against an amendment sponsored by Sen. Byron Dorgan that would “repeal the tax subsidy for certain domestic companies which move manufacturing operations and American jobs offshore.” [Senate Vote 63, 3/17/05]</p> <p>Allen voted to keep \$39 billion in tax breaks for companies that move jobs overseas. In May 2004, Allen voted against an amendment that would strike \$39 billion in tax breaks on overseas income and provided a 9 percent tax deduction for domestic manufacturers. The St. Petersburg Times reported of the amendment: “The Senate voted to keep changes to international tax rules, overcoming objections of some senators who said they encouraged companies to move jobs overseas. One of those provisions temporarily cuts taxes on income held abroad when it is brought back to the United States. A set of revised tax rules for multinational corporations has been a major obstacle to progress in the House. Sen. Ernest Hollings, D-S.C., lost a bid to shift money devoted to the international revisions into more tax cuts for American manufacturers.” Progressive Punch similarly noted: “Hollings' manufacturing tax deduction amendment would strike \$39 billion in tax breaks on overseas income from the bill, and would have provided for an immediate nine percent tax deduction for domestic manufacturers. U.S. companies which move offshore ‘get some tax breaks over the period of the bill covering some 39, almost 40 billion bucks,’ Hollings said. ‘Can you imagine that? Here is a bill entitled ... the Jump-Start Our Business Strength, JOBS, Act. It jump-starts the jobs in Shanghai and Guadalajara and not in Philadelphia, Pa., I can tell you that right now,’ Hollings said. Progressives argued that Holling's amendment provides the right incentives for corporations to set up shop in America, eliminates the tax breaks for corporations that have moved American jobs offshore and gives those tax breaks to the employers of jobs in America today.” [Senate Vote 90, 5/11/04; St. Petersburg Times,</p>

5/12/04; [Progressive Punch Vote Summary](#)]

Allen voted to protect low tax rate for companies that use offshore plants “as export platforms to the United States.” According to National Journal, “Also up for votes by this afternoon are an amendment from Sen. Bob Graham, D-Fla., to strike tax breaks in the FSC/ETI bill for multinational companies and use the proceeds for a payroll tax cut, and a proposal from Sens. Byron Dorgan, D-N.D., and Barbara Mikulski, D-Md., to require the taxation of overseas income of multinational companies that use offshore plants as export platforms to the United States.” The amendment would require those companies to pay federal income taxes on foreign factories when goods are reimported back into the United States. Employers also would be required to notify employees and the Labor Department when jobs will be moved offshore, including the number of jobs affected, the relocation destination of those jobs and the reason for the relocation. Allen voted to kill the amendment. [[Senate Vote 83](#), 5/5/04; National Journal, 5/5/04]

- **Allen voted against requiring overseas income be used for job creation and investment to qualify for lower tax rate.** According to National Journal, “The Senate will turn first today to an amendment from Sen. John Breaux, D-La., on the repatriation of overseas profits. Breaux’s amendment would put limits on the uses of overseas income repatriated at a temporary, lower tax rate, to ensure the funds are used for job creation or investment.” [[Senate Vote 81](#), 5/5/04; National Journal, 5/5/04]

Allen voted for a steep tax cut on income earned overseas. On May 15, 2003, Allen voted for an overseas tax provision, which would allow companies to repatriate earnings from overseas at a tax rate of 5.25 percent, instead of the regular U.S. corporate tax rate of 35 percent. Proponents said the cut, which would apply only this year, could bring as much as \$135 billion back to the United States that could be used for investment to jump-start the ailing economy. However, many economists said the plan was simply charity for tech and other firms and would not necessarily stimulate the economy. They argued that companies continually move funds between the United States and their overseas divisions, and make investment decisions based on many factors beyond the cost of moving that money around. The amendment, which was sponsored by Sen. John Ensign, passed, by a

		<p>vote of 75-25. [Senate Vote 165, 3/15/03; Washington Post, 5/16/03]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economists said the plan would turn tax deferral into a significant tax break; would cost \$4 billion over 10 years. The Ensign overseas income tax cut would change the current tax deferral into a “significant tax break,” according to economists. Critics also said there were not sufficient restrictions on how the money could be allocated by companies to ensure it would be used to stimulate growth. A preliminary report on the proposal by the Joint Committee on Taxation said it would cost the Treasury \$ 4 billion over 10 years. [Washington Post, 5/16/03]
<p><i>Split Screen</i> <i>Text Left Side: Tax Breaks for Big Oil</i> <i>Right Screen: Gas Pump</i></p>	<p>Millionaires and Big Oil Companies <i>already</i> getting billions in tax breaks.</p>	<p>Allen signed “Cut, Cap and Balance” pledge. [CutCapAndBalanceAct.com, Accessed 10/24/12]</p> <p>Cut, Cap, Balance would “erect a constitutional firewall to safeguard tax cuts and tax breaks for the most well-off Americans.” According to an analysis of the Cut, Cap and Balance Act by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, the legislation “seeks to erect a constitutional firewall to safeguard tax cuts and tax breaks for the most well-off Americans. Thus, an impoverished elderly widow living on Supplemental Security Income — which provides benefits that lift people to just 75 percent of the poverty line — could have her assistance cut back under the measure’s across-the-board budget cuts even as millionaire hedge-fund managers retained their lucrative carried-interest tax breaks.” [Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 7/15/11]</p> <p>Allen supports extending the Bush tax cuts for the wealthy. According to the Ashburn Patch, “Allen said he opposed ending Bush-era tax cuts for wealthy Americans, saying, ‘That will cause even more job losses.’” [Ashburn Patch, 8/29/12]</p> <p>Allen criticized bill to repeal oil industry tax breaks as a “Washington approach that picks winners and losers.” An entry on the Richmond Times-Dispatch’s Virginia Politics Blog reported: “Allen also ended his silence on the [oil subsidies] issue Thursday. ‘When the government raises taxes on any enterprise or business, it is the consumers who ultimately foot the bill for the added costs imposed by the government,’ said campaign spokeswoman Katie Wright. ‘Tim Kaine and his allies are pushing for the same Washington approach that picks winners and losers, just</p>

like they did with Solyndra,’ she added.” [[Richmond Times-Dispatch](#), 3/29/12].

Wash. Post: Allen “voted for tax breaks to oil and coal companies.” The Washington Post reported: “As governor, Allen appointed the president of a concrete block company as head of the Department of Environmental Quality and cut agency staff by 100 people in an attempt to streamline government. As senator, he voted for tax breaks to oil and coal companies and against fostering alternative sources, including solar and wind, because he said they were not dependable.” [[Washington Post](#), 9/24/11]

Allen voted for 2005 Bush energy bill that contained \$6 billion in tax breaks for oil and gas companies. In June of 2005, Allen voted for the Energy Policy Act of 2005, a bill that included \$6 billion in subsidies for the oil and gas industry, according to Public Citizen. These subsidies included a provision that “Allows ‘geological and geophysical’ costs associated with oil exploration to be written off faster than present law, costing taxpayers over \$1.266 billion from 2007-2015,” and another that “Allows owners of oil refineries to expense 50% of the costs of equipment used to increase the refinery’s capacity by at least 5%, costing taxpayers \$842 million from 2006-11.” [[HR 6](#), [Senate Vote 158](#), 6/28/05; [Public Citizen](#)]

Allen voted for 2003 Bush energy bill that included \$13 Billion in tax breaks for energy companies. Allen voted for a motion to invoke cloture on the conference report on the bill that would implement a comprehensive national policy for energy conservation, research and development. The Associated Press reported that the bill included “Tax breaks of \$13 billion for oil, gas and coal industries.” [[HR 6](#), [Senate Vote 456](#), 11/21/03; [Associated Press](#), 11/21/03]

Allen voted against eliminating a tax credit allowing oil companies to expense costs associated with exploration and development. The tax break was estimated to cost taxpayers \$2.4 billion over 5 years. [[S2020](#), [Senate Vote 332](#), 11/17/05]

In 2006, Allen supported a tax bill containing more than \$5 billion in tax breaks for oil companies. In May 2006, the Senate adopted the final version of a \$70 billion tax cut package that included benefits for big oil. According to the Boston Globe, “Big oil companies won their push to keep intact accounting changes that stand to net them

		<p>\$5.1 billion.” [HR4297,Senate Vote 118, 5/11/06; Boston Globe, 5/12/06; Washington Post, 4/26/06]</p>
<p>Simple, clean ALLEN graphic</p> <p>Text: Who Loses ?</p>	<p>And with George Allen in Washington, here’s who loses:</p>	
<p>Split Screen</p> <p>Text Right Side: Allen Cuts Medicare and Social Security</p> <p>Left Screen: Seniors/HC Images</p>	<p>Families relying on Medicare and Social Security</p>	<p>Allen signed “Cut, Cap and Balance” pledge. [CutCapAndBalanceAct.com, Accessed 10/24/12]</p> <p>Allen Signed The “Cut, Cap And Balance” Pledge. According to the Roanoke Times, “Former Sen. George Allen, who would also like to be future Sen. George Allen, says he has signed a ‘cut, cap and balance’ pledge.” [Roanoke Times, 6/20/11]</p> <p>Center on Budget and Policy Priorities: Cut, Cap, and Balance would “inexorably subject Social Security and Medicare to deep reductions.” According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, “Talking points that the [Cut, Cap, and Balance Act’s] proponents circulated on July 15 seek to foster an impression that the measure would protect Social Security and Medicare. Such an impression would not be accurate. The legislation would inexorably subject Social Security and Medicare to deep reductions... Reaching and maintaining a balanced budget in the decade ahead while barring any tax increases would necessitate deep cuts in Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.” [Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 7/16/11]</p> <p>AARP President: Balanced Budget Amendment “would result in forced cuts to Social Security and Medicare.” During a congressional hearing on discussing a balanced budget amendment, AARP President-Elect Robert Romasco said, “A balanced budget amendment would result in forced cuts to Social Security and Medicare, rather than informed decision-making about the future of our nation.” [Romasco Testimony, Senate Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Human Rights, 11/30/11]</p> <p>National Committee to Preserve Social Security & Medicare: Cut, Cap and Balance plan would “force cuts” to Social Security and Medicare. According to an NCPSSM release, “On behalf of the millions of members and supporters of the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, I am writing to express our strong opposition to two proposals that would establish a</p>

		<p>balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. H.R. 2560, the Cuts, Cap, and Balance Act of 2011, and H.J. Res 1, recently reported out of the Committee on the Judiciary ... A constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget, especially one with an unrealistic and harsh spending cap, is fiscally irresponsible and forces cuts in important social insurance programs such as Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid.” [NCPSSM Release, 7/18/11]</p> <p>Allen voted against protecting Medicare beneficiaries from paying higher premiums. According to the Palm Beach Post, “Senate Democrats called Wednesday for a measure to protect Medicare beneficiaries from paying higher premiums in 2007 if Congress increases payments to doctors next year... As part of the budget bill, the Senate appears poised to approve a 1 percent increase in Medicare doctor payments instead of a 4.3 percent across-the-board reduction that had been scheduled. Because Medicare premiums are based on 25 percent of Medicare’s spending for doctors and related services, the fee increase for physicians would have resulted in higher premiums in 2007. Nelson’s bill would eliminate the physician increase from premium calculations for 2007.” Allen voted against the measure and it failed by one vote. [Senate Vote 287, 11/3/05; Palm Beach Post, 11/3/05]</p>
<p><i>Split Screen</i> Text Right Side: Allen Plan Cuts 700,000 Jobs Left Screen: Workers Leaving plant/Workers face</p>	<p>Workers fighting to keep their jobs.</p>	<p>Allen signed “Cut, Cap and Balance” pledge. [CutCapAndBalanceAct.com, Accessed 10/24/12]</p> <p>Center on Budget and Policy Priorities: Cut, Cap, & Balance would cost 700,000 jobs. According to a 2011 analysis by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, the Cut, Cap and Balance bill’s immediate spending cuts would “cause the loss of roughly 700,000 jobs in the current weak economy, relative to what the number of jobs otherwise would be.” [Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 7/15/11]</p>
<p><i>Split Screen</i> Text Right Side: Small Businesses Lose Left Screen: Small Business Footage</p>	<p>And small businesses struggling to get by.</p>	<p>Allen voted against rolling back Bush tax cuts to pay for small business tax credits. In 2004, Allen voted against an amendment that would roll back the Bush tax cuts for millionaires in order to pay for tax credits for small businesses. According to Congressional Quarterly, the amendment “would create a reserve fund that would allow increases of up to \$24 billion for fiscal 2005 through 2009 for employment initiatives including tax credits for companies that create new U.S.-based manufacturing jobs and small businesses that provide health care coverage. ... The spending would be offset by reducing tax breaks for taxpayers with incomes of more than \$1 million per year.”</p>

		<p>[Senate Vote 41, 3/11/04; CQ Floor Votes]</p> <p>Allen voted against restricting offshore tax shelters to pay for small business initiatives. Allen voted against an amendment that would support small businesses and restrict offshore tax shelters. According to Congressional Quarterly, the amendment “would create a wage credit of up to \$765 per worker or \$1,530 per working couple while giving an equivalent tax credit to employers. It would provide \$52 billion in fiscal relief to states, accelerate reductions in the so-called marriage penalty, increase the child tax credit to \$1,000 by 2006, allow businesses to write off \$100,000 in investment for one year, create a 50 percent tax credit for small business health care expenses, create wage credits for employers in Renewal Communities, create a 50 percent tax credit for companies with employees in the National Guard and Reserves and extend unemployment benefits by 13 weeks. It would be offset by restrictions on corporate use of off-shore tax shelters and an increase in customs user fees.” [Senate Vote 162, 5/15/03; CQ Floor Votes]</p>
<p><i>Simple, clean ALLEN graphic</i></p> <p><i>Text: Winners and Losers: It’s always been that way with George Allen</i></p>	<p>Winners and Losers: It’s always been that way with George Allen</p>	
<p>Paid for by League of Conservation Voters, www.lcv.org, and Majority PAC, www.majority2012.com, and not authorized by any candidate or candidate’s committee. League of Conservation Voters and Majority PAC are responsible for the content of this advertising.</p>	<p><i>LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS AND MAJORITY PAC ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE CONTENT OF THIS ADVERTISING.</i></p>	