

President Robert Kreider, Vice President Carol Oliver, the board of directors, administration, staff, and volunteers at Devereux, all of whom provide compassion and excellence in care and advocacy for so many who may be disabled but, indeed, are very able—able to live meaningful, productive lives filled with laughter, learning, and productivity thanks in part to the good work done, day in, day out, at Devereux.

#### HOUSE WILL PROTECT TAXPAYERS AND REIN IN THE IRS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, with April 15 quickly approaching, this week the House of Representatives will be taking action and voting on a number of bills to ease the pain for American taxpayers.

Across Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District, I have heard from constituents expressing their ongoing anxieties when it comes to the complexity of our Federal Tax Code.

Mr. Speaker, there are more than 4 million words in the Tax Code and only 462 words in the Bill of Rights. This country is long overdue for a more simplified Tax Code.

This week, the House is considering legislation to ensure IRS transparency, repeal the immoral and oppressive death tax, and pass a taxpayer bill of rights. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support these commonsense measures to protect the American taxpayer.

#### CERTIFICATION OF RESCISSION OF CUBA'S DESIGNATION AS A STATE SPONSOR OF TERRORISM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-26)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TROTT) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed: *To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith a report to the Congress with respect to the proposed rescission of Cuba's designation as a state sponsor of terrorism.

BARACK OBAMA.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, April 14, 2015.

#### THE TAX CODE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity tonight to ad-

dress my colleagues, to address the American people on the eve of one of the most concerning days for many Americans, that of tax day, April 15.

My previous colleague alluded to measures that we will bring up this week on behalf of the American people, and I look forward to having an honest and constructive debate about the bills this week, our national tax policy.

But listen; this is a very human and uniquely American moment this evening, as many people are overwhelmed with the deadline that they face tomorrow to submit their taxes. I think it is safe to say that an appropriate word of many Americans this evening and into tomorrow is one of resentment.

There is resentment for many reasons. For many, it is simply the complexity of our Tax Code, that today, in 2015, our Tax Code is so complex that many people struggle with compliance or, for those with resources, have to turn around and spend their hard-earned resources to hire a professional simply to understand the laws and the Code that we have implemented here in Washington, D.C. For others, the resentment is about the amount of taxes they pay, and this is across all income spectrums. The resentment is related to the fact that they question how their taxpayer dollars ultimately are resourced, are spent, are obligated by this body.

Some studies have shown that as recently as 2012 over \$100 billion was spent in the areas of waste, fraud, and abuse—taxpayer dollars, not Washington's dollars, but taxpayer dollars that we each remit responsibly to our government, that we entrust our government to spend wisely, responsibly, to invest in the right priorities for the Nation, but also to ensure that the business of government runs exactly as that, as a business, an efficient business. So there is frustration by many people. And yet, even worse, the system is designed today to obfuscate responsibility.

Think about it. We live in a generation today where, for the majority of Americans, your taxes are withheld from your paycheck. The generation that enters the workforce today simply knows that if they are to be paid \$100, it is not really \$100, that there is money taken out of it. That wasn't always the case. Until World War II, we didn't withhold. In fact, it was in 1943 when Congress passed and the administration enacted the Current Tax Payment Act that began to withhold.

Now, there are a lot of arguments to be made for why we withhold—ensure the responsible flow of taxes to government—but understand what that very simple measure did. It began to slowly remove the American taxpayer, the American citizen, from the actual act of remitting, of paying for the government that they have. It made it slightly harder to recognize the responsibility that the money that is being sent to Washington every time there is

money withheld from your paycheck, that in fact that is the taxpayers' money.

Instead, we have generations that have come up just assuming that you are paid \$100, but you only get \$80 or \$90. Well, that is just the way the system works and there is money coming out of it, as opposed to making that \$100 and having to remit a check to your government and then hold that government responsible.

□ 1830

I know this sounds like a crazy notion in 2015, but it is an important context for the conversation we have in terms of the amount of taxes that are placed upon the American people and the expectation for the level of responsibility of our government to actually spend those resources.

This is a very real conversation. This was brought to me just last evening by a woman who owns her own firm, her own practice, and is married to a husband who likewise owns his own firm, his own practice.

Now, in that situation, this couple is responsible actually for writing that check, for paying what we call estimated taxes each quarter, and then, at the end of the year, reconciling whether they paid enough or not. For that couple, it is a very real experience.

It is very different from a majority of Americans who are employed by an employer, and, in fact, the money is withheld because, for that couple, every quarter—every quarter—they have a conversation around the kitchen table about the amount of taxes that they are sending to their government, the amount that they are resigning over to government and what they expect in services in return. That creates a certain efficiency, a certain accountability. It is a very interesting question.

Mr. Speaker, it also leads to how much should that check be that this couple writes in estimated taxes? This is an area of broad debate, and it can be a constructive debate. What is the right marginal tax rate is something that people of differing political positions obviously have deeply held convictions.

I can tell you this, though: we live in a world where the average American is subjected to multiple taxing authorities. Consider this: we often think in this body only of your Federal marginal income tax rate and the contribution that individuals make to Social Security and Medicare and other mandatory programs.

In Washington, you might have a debate that focuses solely on what is the appropriate marginal tax rate. Well, in State capitols around the country, you have State governments having that same debate, but there is a gap.

Rarely would Washington ever consider what is the State tax obligation in a specific State, and rarely would a specific State worry about what the marginal tax rate is of the Federal