manager will certainly have large shoes to fill.

In Mr. Hanson's next move, he will become the executive director for the Georgia Municipal Association, overseeing 500 Georgia cities, which I am sure will benefit from his assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Larry on his years of public service, and best wishes for his future endeavors.

NATIONAL DAY OF GIVING

(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, today is Giving Tuesday, a global day dedicated to giving back.

Last week, we celebrated Thanksgiving, and families across the country gathered to celebrate and give thanks for all their blessings.

Today, on the National Day of Giving, many come together for a common purpose: to celebrate generosity and to give.

Giving Tuesday kicks off the charitable season when many focus on their holiday and end-of-year giving to worthy causes. Charitable giving is a force for good, which is why the tax reform package, approved by the House, maintains this important deduction.

Charities, families, businesses, community centers, and people around the world will lend their time or their personal resources to philanthropic efforts across the Nation.

Giving Tuesday also brings together the collective power of a unique blend of partners—nonprofits, civic organizations, businesses and corporations, as well as families and individuals—to encourage and amplify small acts of kindness.

As a global movement, Giving Tuesday unites countries around the world by sharing our capacity to care for and empower one another. That is something we can all celebrate.

RECOGNIZING ERIN HAMLIN

(Ms. TENNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Erin Hamlin, a hardworking and outstanding constituent of the 22nd Congressional District, who has just qualified for her fourth consecutive Winter Olympic Games.

Erin hails from a beautiful hamlet in Oneida County, known as Remsen, New York.

Erin started her career in luge in 2005. Her first major international victory was achieved in 2009, in Lake Placid, at the World Luge Championships, where Erin earned a remarkable gold medal.

At the 2014 Sochi Winter Olympics, Erin became the first American ever—both male and female—to medal in a singles luge competition when she brought home the bronze for Team USA.

Next year, Erin will represent Team USA in South Korea by again competing in the singles luge competition.

Please join me in wishing the best of luck to our hometown rock star Erin Hamlin and all of Team USA in next year's Winter Olympic Games in Pyeongchang, South Korea.

TAX REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMUCKER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to talk about a bill that poses a great danger to our country and a great danger to our people, particularly our people who are struggling, who are living from paycheck to paycheck, because this bill, contrary to the assertion of our Republican colleagues, will not help them, and we are going to talk about that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee, and my friend.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank our whip for trying to whip some common sense into this debate.

I want to focus on the claims of the Republicans that this is a middle class tax cut. Halloween is over, but the masks of the Republican are still on. I think the largest and the most dangerous one is the claim that this is a middle class tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, I want to quote the President: ''It is a tax bill for middle class.''

Again, the President: ''We will cut taxes tremendously for the middle class—not just a little bit, but tremendously.''

The Speaker: ''The focus is on middle class tax relief.''

The chairman of the committee: ''The truth is this is whole tax reform is designed for the middle class family that is working so hard or that Main Street business that is working so hard.''

The majority leader in the Senate:

> To keep growing again, like we need this code to do, to get new jobs, opportunity, and significant tax relief for the middle class.

Mr. Mnuchin: ''On the personal tax side, middle-income people are getting cuts and rich people are getting very little cuts or, in certain cases, increases under the Republican bills.''

Mr. Mnuchin again: ''Any reductions we have in upper income taxes will be offset by less deductions, so there will be no absolute tax cut for the upper class.''

Senator HATCH: ''Tax reform will provide relief and bigger paychecks to low- and middle-income families, make America a better place to start and grow a business, and allow American businesses to compete in the global marketplace.''

The Joint Tax Committee and other entities have shown that this is not at all a middle class tax cut. The main beneficiaries are the very, very wealthy.

Also, in terms of passthrough, there is so much talk that this will help the small-business person. The truth of the matter is that the vast majority of the benefit for passthroughs is going to go to the very wealthy.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. HOYER has been taking the lead on this and I salute him.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to close by saying one thing about the deficits. You know, I don't think they called Mr. HOYER a deficit hawk because he always wanted a balance, and he always said: ''Look, deficits by themselves aren't the only issue, but they are deeply relevant.''

Mr. HOYER and I have stood together with others. When bills came up, which seemed so attractive, but were unpaid for, hundreds of billions of dollars, we said to the Republicans and anyone who voted with them: ''You are increasing the deficit, and it is very risky.''

Mr. Speaker, as true as that may have been—and Mr. HOYER and I thought it was some years ago, or last year included—it is now even more relevant and more dangerous because here we have a proposal in the House and it is going to be duplicated in the Senate. It is going to increase the deficit at least $1.5 trillion, and the notion is it will be taking care of growth.

Mr. Speaker, I close by saying maybe that is the second biggest Halloween mask on the bill here and in the Senate. The notion of ''Don't worry about tax losses all of a sudden, don't worry about the deficit increasing, because growth will take care of it,'' we have seen that mask before.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to join Mr. HOYER, but also to salute him for his dedicated and endless determination to really talk sense and talk the truth.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HOYER for yielding to me.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind comments and for the information he gave. As a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee he is, I think, as knowledgeable about the history of these tax cuts as anyone can be, so I thank the gentleman for joining us in this effort to educate our friends and colleagues and the American public on the consequences of this bill.

Mr. LEVIN. And I will keep doing it.

And now Mr. HOYER is going to yield to another champion who has worked how many years on these issues?

Don't say it is a long time.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Several.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), one of the senior members of the Ways and Means Committee, who has been very focused on sound tax policy, on policy to save Social Security for generations yet to come, who is one of the more responsible leaders in this House, and my friend.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Democratic leader for yielding, and I thank the gentleman from Michigan for joining us here.

As Mr. HOYER stated at the outset, this is a very dangerous bill and a very dangerous precedent for this body and the other body and for Congress in general.

It was Lincoln who said: ''A House divided cannot stand.''

And in this bill, when you pit the sick against the well, the poor against the wealthiest 1 percent, blue State against red State, small business against large corporation, you begin to see the inequity in the bill.

RICH NEAL, the lead Democrat on the Ways and Means Committee, lamented that this was a lost opportunity—a lost opportunity because there was ample time to come together both in the committee and here on the floor to do something constructive for the country, put the Nation back to work, and resolve issues that President Obama had put forward that I know have been on the front burners of everyone's concern to get lower taxes, and greater fairness in equity across the board, but that didn't happen.

Now, much is said about process, and people pooh-pooh that, but here are the facts:

It was Ronald Reagan who said: ''The facts are a stubborn thing.''

Back in 1986, the last time we impacted policy of this nature, the Ways and Means Committee, in fact, had 30 hearings in the committee, 12 subcommittee hearings, 450 expert witnesses, and 26 days of markup before it came to the floor for debate.

□ 1930

It was done bipartisanly, in fact, done between Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill because they knew that this would be the best way to get cohesive, comprehensive tax reform.

That is not what happened here. There were zero hearings in the committee on this bill, zero subcommittee hearings, no expert witnesses, not a single person from the State of Maryland or Connecticut.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Commissioner of Revenue Services from the State of Connecticut that details factually, not based on averages, what happens to people in States who use itemized deductions like the State and local property tax deduction, like medical deductions, et cetera, all of which have a direct impact on them, all of which are going to find our citizens paying more money, in fact, not getting a tax cut, getting a tax increase so they can pay for lowering the rate of an individual who is already receiving $11 million from an estate tax gift.

NOVEMBER 8, 2017.

Hon. JOHN B. LARSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LARSON: Thank you for opportunity to comment on the federal tax changes being considered in H.R. 1. We appreciate your leadership in trying to set the record straight as this partisan effort is rushed to judgment with no real input and much fiscal uncertainty.

Unfortunately, what we see so far from a national and state perspective is very troubling. Some of the proposals to reduce taxes on corporate and pass-through business income could provide needed economic stimulus nationally and for states like Connecticut. Unfortunately, on balance, H R. 1 is fundamentally flawed:

Even the low estimate of a $1.5 trillion cost is not paid for and is really massive federal tax deficit spending. The nation has been down this road before and surely we should have learned something from the worst economic recession in modern times.

Otherwise unaffordable tax cuts have long been part of a political strategy to ''starve the beast.'' Due to its long term unfunded cost, this Republican tax plan will compel big cuts in federal funding, such as Medicaid, that are important to states like Connecticut.

Contrary to all the talk of a ''middle income tax cut,'' the plan actually represents a huge windfall to the very wealthiest federal taxpayers and is truly regressive. For our own state of Connecticut, over 75% of the tax cut goes to the top 1% who would pay 8.5% less on average. Everyone else would see a trivial 1.2% reduction in federal tax liability and many will actually owe much more in federal income taxes.

As discussed more specifically below, the proposed plan shifts most of the tax cost and the least of any tax benefit to states in the Northeast, Great Lakes and West Coast regions of the country. Thus, Connecticut and similar states will even more disproportionately pay in federal taxes far more than is received in federal benefits—further subsidizing regions of the country where states make far less of a state and local tax effort.

Drilling down a bit further, several aspects of this partisan plan will hit especially hard:

Eliminating deductibility of state income tax paid is worth an estimated $8.7 billion to mostly 1 middle income Connecticut taxpayers

Capping deductibility of local property tax paid at $10,000 will increase federal income taxes for a significant proportion of Connecticut taxpayers who claim $4.9 billion.

Any benefit to lower and lower moderate income taxpayers from higher standard deductions and child care credits will likely be more than offset by the shell game of imposing a higher lowest rate bracket of 12% and replacing the current $4,050 personal exemption with a $300 deduction that is proposed to end in 5 years.

Eliminating deductibility of medical/dental expenses will be $1.6 billion hardship for Connecticut taxpayers at all levels who are out of work and have catastrophic medical costs.

Eliminating deductibility of student loan interest only adds a further financial burden for primarily younger taxpayers and their families already struggling with educational indebtedness.

Sadly, these and many other significant issues of fiscal irresponsibility and tax unfairness seem to be of no concern in the partisan rush to pass legislation before taxpayers see through the slogans and realize the costs. Indeed, glimpses of what may be in the Republican Senate version suggests that it will only get worse. Thank you for your efforts to speak out for our Connecticut taxpayers and set the record straight.

Sincerely,

KEVIN B. SULLIVAN,
Commissioner.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you, if that weren't the cruelest cut, what is built into this legislation, and it is why process matters, because of the way this bill came to the floor through budget reconciliation primarily so the other body can get around their other arcane rule of cloture, but so that they could pass something with the minimal amount of votes.

So no hearings, no expert witnesses, and only a minimal amount of votes—51 in the Senate—to pass a bill.

I say that because there is a trigger mechanism here that the gentleman from Maryland knows better than anyone else in either Chamber called PAYGO, PAYGO provisions that he fought for to make sure were in the bill because of our ongoing concern about staggering deficits. It is why most people call for this bill minimally, including most Republican economists, to be revenue neutral. We would add that it be distributionally neutral as well so that it doesn't impact the middle and the lower classes.

But this bill here, the cruelest cut of all is that it triggers an automatic response that will result in a $25 billion cut to Medicare. Nobody at home recognized this. Many people in this Chamber didn't even know that it existed because there were no public hearings, there were no expert witnesses. This was jammed through so that people could achieve a political win.

How about we focus on the American people winning for a change and doing something that is not going to put them in jeopardy?

I wondered why so many on the other side had professed to be concerned about the deficit but turned a blind eye as we passed what amounts to be $2.3 trillion in new deficits. Then it dawned on me. This provision that is in there would allow sequestration to go forward without a vote and would cut Medicare by $25 billion. I have asked people when we have held forums back in our district. People are writing, people are calling, people are calling their Senators in an effort to stop what is a blind, dangerous precedent that would take $25 billion out of a program that desperately needs this.

I know the gentleman from Maryland knows this better than most. I know the State of Maryland, like the State of Connecticut, also itemizes deductions, and I believe it leads the country in that because, as they noted back in 1913, it would otherwise be double taxation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for allowing us the opportunity to come down here and speak to the dastardly nature of this bill and what lies ahead, and I thank him for his continued leadership in making sure that we wage this fight in every way to the end until we are able to stop that.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for his comments and particularly highlighting how the majority party, in considering this legislation, cut out the public entirely.

Speaker RYAN, when he took the speakership, talked about transparency. He talked about regular order. He talked about doing things so that the people would know what we are doing.

Not only were there no hearings in the House, not only were there no witnesses in the House, as the gentleman knows, there were no hearings in the Senate, there were no witnesses in the Senate.

In a short timeframe, the Republicans are trying to pass a massive increase in the national debt so that, in effect, as the gentleman knows, they say they are cutting taxes. I am going to talk about how that is not really true. Particularly for the middle class it is not true. But they are substantially raising taxes on every one of the children in this country who will become more indebted and in their time will have to pay back the money that is borrowed to give this tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for highlighting those very important facts and I thank him for his service on the Ways and Means Committee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the subject of my Special Order, as we have seen, is the very dangerous tax bill that this House passed and that the Senate is now considering. In fact, of course, the Senate bill is worse than the House bill, if one can imagine that.

On November 16, the Republican majority in this House passed a bill to raise taxes on 36 million middle class households and place our country another $1.7 trillion in debt.

Now, you will hear $1.5 trillion and you will hear $1.7 trillion.

What is the difference?

The difference is about $200 billion that we will pay in interest to others to effect this tax cut. So not only is it going to be the $1.5 trillion immediately impacted by the tax cut itself, it will be the $200 billion additional that we will have to pay to borrow the money to give the tax cut and, as I am going to point out, give that tax cut essentially, for the most part, to the wealthiest enterprises in America.

227 Republicans voted to do that to their constituents. Every single Democratic representative who was present, joined by 13 Republicans, did what, in my opinion, many of their colleagues wanted to do, but for political reasons, not policy reasons, chose not to do.

They did so, Mr. Speaker, following impassioned remarks by Majority Leader MCCARTHY and by Speaker RYAN. Both addressed this House and the American people and claimed to be pushing these tax bills in order to help the working people of our country, a worthy objective, an important objective.

Perhaps one could justify this extraordinary escalation of the national debt, probably the largest increase in the national debt of any single bill that has been passed. They cited struggling families and the need to provide a leg up to those in our middle class. Those, of course, are very resonant messages, very important messages. Frankly, we ought to be talking about how we create jobs, not debt. They are being employed to sell a tax plan that would do exactly the opposite of what they say.

In his speech on the floor, Speaker RYAN lamented: ‘‘Seventy-eight percent of our workers in this country today are living paycheck to paycheck. . . . Instead of thinking about getting ahead, families are struggling just to get by.’’

He is right about that and he is right to be concerned about that. What he is wrong in is his response.

Those living paycheck to paycheck will be the ones hurt the most by this tax scam. Let me repeat that. The Speaker talks about those living paycheck to paycheck. That concern is an absolute legitimate concern for every one of us in this House and every Member of the Senate.

Unfortunately, he has offered a bill, however, that will hurt the very ones he says that he wants to protect. They will see their taxes go up over the next decade. In that same period, as middle class families are struggling to get by, they will watch the wealthiest get farther and farther ahead.

This is not about class warfare. This is about a judgment of who needs help, who needs lifting up.

He talked about the people who need lifting up. The problem is that he didn’t lift them up. They will watch the wealthy be lifted up, and they are very high right now. God bless them.

Why, I ask, would the Republican tax plan take $1.7 trillion away from our children and grandchildren and give 62 percent of it to the top 1 percent?

Mr. Speaker, the people get it. The people think this bill is not going to help them. That is what polls show, and they are right.

Under the Republicans’ plan, it is wealthy individuals like Donald Trump who win, and regular working Americans and our middle class who are trying to get ahead who lose.

House Republican leaders cajoled their members. Cajoled is a very polite word. They pressured and they scared their members. They said: If you don’t pass this bill, you are going to lose the election not because the people are for it, but because, as one Member said from New York, their donors demanded it.

They urged their members to vote for a flawed bill many of them did not want and that none of them believed would become law. They did that so they could hand the reins to the Senate to send back a version no one had yet read or contemplated. They put their House majority on the hook to accept whatever the Senate would pass word for word. We will see whether they do that.

That Senate bill that is now being considered would deeply harm middle class families, particularly those in congressional districts across the country where more taxpayers choose to deduct their State and local taxes, like my State and other States.

Dozens of House Republicans from such districts voted enthusiastically to move the process along. In other words, they voted against their taxpayers and for their party—party above people—to move it along by supporting the House tax bill with the promise that it would be improved in the Senate.

These members would be asked to make further concessions against the interests of their constituents to vote for the Senate bill, were it to come to this floor, because it is worse for their constituents, not better.

That is not how Congress is supposed to work, Mr. Speaker. That is not regular order.

The American taxpayers and American businesses seeking to grow in our economy have been asking Congress to enact tax reform that is bipartisan and permanent.

You heard Mr. LARSON talking about the 1986 bill. It was a bill that was worked out between President Reagan; Speaker Tip O’Neill; Chairman Dan Rostenkowski, a Member from the Democratic Party from Illinois; and the gentleman from Oregon, the chairman of the Finance Committee, a Republican.

The Republican bills in the House and the Senate can be called neither bipartisan nor permanent.

So what can we call them?

In his floor remarks before the vote on their House bill, Speaker RYAN called it: ‘‘The single biggest thing we can do to grow the economy, to restore opportunity, and to help middle-income families that are struggling.’’

That is not true, Mr. Speaker. However, it is the single biggest thing we can do to put our children and grandchildren further into debt. I have heard so many of my Republican colleagues stand on this floor and say that we cannot spend this money because our children will have to pay the bill, and they are right.

□ 1945

We have a pay-for problem, Mr. Speaker. We ought to be paying for what we buy. Here, we are not paying, we are borrowing $1.5 trillion, as I said earlier, to give to some of our wealthiest citizens; for that is what their plan would do, raise taxes on the middle class today, and on our children and grandchildren tomorrow, to pay for the wealthiest few to get tax cuts that they don't need and that won't grow our economy.

Let me stress, I think everybody in this room, everybody in the country, would like to be wealthy. This is not talking about penalizing the wealthy. It is simply to say: God bless you. You have done well, but we need to make sure that others do well as well.

The University of Chicago's Booth School of Business released a survey, Mr. Speaker, on November 21, just a few days ago, in which 42 expert economists were asked whether the Republican tax bill would produce the higher economic growth promised by its authors; 42 of the most prominent economists. Only one—only one—said that it would do so and, ironically, later admitted he had misread the question.

None of the 42, not one, agreed that the tax cuts for the very wealthy included in the Republican bill would eventually pay for themselves; and that is why we say, it is one of the greatest debt-creating pieces of legislation that any of us have considered.

Former Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin, who presided over the basis for 4 years of balanced budgets, so he has some real credibility on how to bring balance to our fiscal posture in America—he served at the time of historic budget surpluses. He pointed out this fallacy in his op-ed in The Washington Post on November 15. He said this: "The tax cuts," he wrote, "will not increase growth and, given their fiscal effects, would likely have a significant and increasing negative impact."

He went on to make several compelling arguments about the dangers of the Republican tax proposals. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a copy of his op-ed piece.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 15]

OP-ED: THE REPUBLICAN TAX PLAN'S FIVE WORST DANGERS

(By Robert E. Rubin)

The deficit-funded tax cuts advancing through Congress are a fiscal tragedy for which our country will pay a huge price over time. While the details of the tax plan remain in flux, its fundamental contours will not change. Nor will its $1.5 trillion of deficit funding, the amount stipulated in the recently passed budget resolution.

Perhaps it's hopeless to expect those in Congress who have long bemoaned deficits and the debt to oppose the plan. If, however, as a matter of conscience or renewed reflection they decide to take heed, here are the fiscal dangers posed by the plan.

To start, the tax cuts will not increase growth and, given their fiscal effects, would likely have a significant and increasingly negative impact. The nonpartisan Tax Policy Center's latest report estimated that, over 10 years, the average increase in our growth rate would be roughly zero, counting the crowding out of private investment by increasing deficits but not counting other adverse effects of worsening our fiscal outlook. The Penn Wharton Budget Model, using the same approach, estimates virtually no increase in long-term growth. Goldman Sachs projects an increase of 0.1 percent to 0.2 percent in the first couple of years and an average increase over 10 years of just 0.05 percent per year, not counting any of the adverse fiscal effects.

These estimates reflect three underlying views held by mainstream economists. First, individual tax cuts will not materially induce people to work more. Second, corporate tax cuts will likely have limited effect on investment or decisions about where to locate business activity, given the many other variables at play. Third, deficit-funded tax cuts will have little short-term effect on growth, except perhaps for some temporary overheating, because we are at roughly full employment.

With no additional revenue from increased growth to offset the tax cuts' cost, the publicly held debt of the federal government would increase by $1.5 trillion. An additional danger is that the actual deficit impact would be increased by abandoning the Congressional Budget Office's nonpartisan evaluation that has been used for decades by both parties in favor of partisan calculations by those pushing the tax cuts.

Adding $1.5 trillion or more to the federal debt would make an already bad situation worse. A useful measure of our fiscal position is the ratio of publicly held government debt to economic output or gross domestic product, called the debt/GDP ratio. In 2000, the debt/GDP ratio was 32 percent. The ratio is now 77 percent. Looking forward, the CBO projects the debt/GDP ratio to be 91 percent in 2027 and 150 percent in 2047. After $1.5 trillion of deficit-funded tax cuts, those future ratios have been estimated to increase to roughly 97 percent in 2027 and 160 percent in 2047. These estimates likely substantially understate the worsening of our fiscal trajectory. That's because they do not account for the increasingly adverse effect on growth of the difficult-to-quantify effects of fiscal deterioration.

Exacerbating our already unsustainable fiscal trajectory with these tax cuts would threaten growth in five respects. These are highly likely to be substantial and to increase over time.

First, business confidence would likely be negatively affected by creating uncertainty about future policy and heightening concern about our political system's ability to meet our economic policy challenges.

Second, our country's resilience to deal with inevitable future economic and geopolitical emergencies, including the effects of climate change, would continue to decline.

Third, funds available for public investment, national security and defense spending—a professed concern of many tax-cut proponents—would continue to decline as debt rises, because of rising interest costs and the increased risk of borrowing to fund government activities.

Fourth, Treasury bond interest rates would be highly likely to increase over time because of increased demand for the supply of savings and increased concern about future imbalances. That, in turn, would raise private-sector interest rates, which could also increase due to widening spreads vs. Treasuries, further reflecting increased concern about future conditions. And even a limited increase in the debt/GDP ratio could focus attention on our fiscal trajectory's long-ignored risks and trigger outsize increases in Treasury and private-sector interest rates. The ability to borrow in our own currency, and to print it through the Federal Reserve, may diminish these risks for a while, as might capital inflows from abroad. But these mitigating factors have their limits; at some point, unsound fiscal conditions almost surely would undermine our currency and debt markets.

Finally, at some unpredictable point, fiscal conditions—and these market dynamics—would likely be seen as sufficiently serious to cause severe market and economic destabilization.

We have an imperative need to address our unsustainable longer-term fiscal trajectory with sound economic policies. Few elected officials want to face this fact, but, at the very least, they should not make matters worse. We can only hope that responsible elected officials will prevent this irresponsible tax plan from being adopted.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, furthermore, according to the Joint Committee on Taxation, a nonpartisan group, Speaker RYAN was flat wrong, flat out wrong, to say that their plan would ensure that "the average family at every income level gets a tax cut." The Joint Committee on Taxation says that is not true.

I presume the Speaker was misinformed, because taxes would go up on all income groups below $50,000. Perhaps the Speaker misspoke.

Speaker RYAN said: "I am a chart guy."

Well, I like charts myself, Mr. Speaker, and I want to bring up this first chart. I will bring this a little closer so I can explain this.

The Speaker claimed that a family of four making $59,000 would get a "$1,182 tax cut in the first year alone." Well, now if you hear that, that sounds, I suppose, like a pretty good deal.

Unfortunately, for that family, their cut would shrink every year. This is the shrinkage. And then it would drop precipitously. By 2024, it would become a tax increase, increase, increase, increase. And, as you see, that increase escalates the 4 years: 2024, 2025, 2026, and 2027. So starting in the seventh year of this program, middle America, $50,000, you get a tax increase.

But guess what? That is not what happens to the wealthiest in America.

It is even worse. The Speaker mentioned the family making $59,000 a year, and what he said is: They get $1,182 a year in a tax cut. What he didn't say is what the upper 1 percent get. They get $1,198 per week—52 times more than the middle class families that the Speaker spoke about and lamented the fact that they needed more dollars in their pocket.

He didn't talk about the wealthiest. He didn't say what they got. I don't blame him because, in his bill, he decided to give $1,198.52 a week to the wealthiest, and $1,182 a year to that middle class family he says is struggling and living paycheck to paycheck.

What kind of fairness is that? What kind of rationale is that? What kind of real help to the middle class is that?

That is about, by the way, $25 per week versus $1,198.52 per week.

Speaker RYAN showed us a chart that highlighted how, under the House bill, those middle class families promised a tax increase get to see an extra $1,182 in savings the first year. We put it down, and then we put 52 layers above that for the people in the upper 1 percent.

Under that same plan, as their cut shrinks—you saw that in the last chart—the wealthiest taxpayers would see an average tax cut of $1,198 every week. And it is even a wider disparity under the Senate bill. Now, that is a gulf of disparity, a gulf of unfairness, a gulf of not helping the average working person in America. But the Senate bill—the Senate bill—is even worse.

The Senate GOP tax scam would increase taxes on 82 million—remember I said in the House bill, 36 million middle class taxpayers got an increase? Well, the Senate has doubled that, actually more than doubled that. Eighty-two million middle class households will get a tax increase under the Senate tax bill.

And with substantial tax increases on 36 million middle class households over the next decade in the House bill, it is hard to imagine a worse plan, yet, somehow, Senate Republicans achieved it.

The Tax Policy Center, another nonpartisan analytic group, found that, under the perverse structure of the Senate bill, sunsetting individual benefits in a few short years, even as it offers permanent—get this, follow this. We are talking about—Speaker RYAN spoke from that rostrum, talked about these struggling Americans living paycheck to paycheck. He offered a bill, and the Senate is now doubling down on the proposal of making sure those struggling Americans got, over the life of this bill, less and less and less, and then finally, paid more and more and more, while the wealthiest had no cut.

The Tax Policy Center said that the sunsetting individual benefits in a few short years, even as it offers permanent corporate tax cuts, 82 million middle class individuals and households will pay more in taxes than they would under the current system.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make that point again. The Tax Policy Center says people are going to pay more under this tax bill, some 82 million of them, than they would under the current system.

On top of that, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has pointed out that, under the Senate bill, undermining the Affordable Care Act—so not only will their taxes be increased over the life of this bill, but 13 million Americans would lose their healthcare under the Senate bill—not the House bill, but under the Senate bill. And that is what the House is going to be asked to vote on. I hope the Senate doesn't pass that.

Mr. LARSON talked about sequester and the PAYGO Act requiring a $25 billion cut in Medicare as a result of this bill. The Senate has added in there legislation to adversely affect the Affordable Care Act, which will adversely affect 13 million Americans; some of them may be the same people who get the tax increase, some may not. They would kick 13 million off healthcare.

So the Republican tax plan is not bipartisan, and it is not permanent tax reform. The way you achieve those, as I said at the beginning, is through bipartisan cooperation. But, as Mr. LARSON pointed out, there was no intention to do that, no intention to include the public, no intention to have markups over a period of time. They did have markups, but they were very short in duration, and no American had the opportunity to weigh in and give their opinion. There were no hearings, and there were less than zero witnesses. I guess there can't be less than zero. There were zero witnesses.

So the bill is not a tax cut. Speaker RYAN has also tried to describe it as a job-creator. Now, again, we are talking about, correctly, the folks in this country who are living paycheck to paycheck and having a hard time, and we need to help them. We need to work on creating them jobs.

By the way, there is no jobs bill that has been sent down here from the President, but they claim this is a jobs bill. As a matter of fact, they claim that it not only explodes the debt, costs taxpayers $1.9 trillion, but it would create, they say, 890,000 new jobs.

Now, in order to create what they say are 890,000 new jobs—and, by the way, going back to Secretary Rubin, he does not believe that will happen. He is the one that led us to balanced budgets.

In fact, every one of those jobs, every single job is going to cost $1.9 million to create. That is what the Speaker said. This is going to create 879 million, we are going to borrow $1.7 trillion to do it. By golly, you could give everybody 100,000 bucks, and you would be way ahead of the game. But that is not what was done.

We are creating large, large debt, and we will not create the jobs the Speaker said. And if we did, they would cost $1.9 million per job.

According to the conservative Tax Foundation, using the most optimistic model projecting economic growth so far presented, that may be technically true, over 10 years now.

But with a price tag of $1.7 trillion in added debt over the same period, that means that each job would cost $1.9 million, while 82 million working Americans, those struggling Americans of which PAUL RYAN spoke, would get a tax increase under the Senate bill—nearly $2 million of added debt to create a single job. Nearly $2 million of added debt to create a single job. So this clearly isn't a jobs bill either.

□ 2000

This has already been discussed, but let me reiterate the key point I made earlier.

It can't be called bipartisan. Republican leader after Republican leader after Republican leader has lamented the fact that we passed the Affordable Care Act without it being bipartisan. The difference, of course, was we had literally thousands of meetings, scores—well over 60—of hearings, amendments offered by Republicans and Democrats. It took over a year of consideration by the country, well vetted—controversial, but well vetted. This bill has been rushed through without hearings, without any kind of consideration and input from the public—in 1986, 30 hearings; in 2017, zero hearings.

I am repeating what Mr. LARSON said, but it is important to understand the dramatic difference: a bipartisan bill with President Ronald Reagan and Speaker Tip O'Neill leading the way for bipartisanship and agreement on a bill that, by the way, was revenue neutral, it did not create any new debt, as opposed to the $1.7 trillion—that is with a T, trillion—that will put every child in America deeply in debt for decades to come.

In 1986, 450 witnesses; in 2017, zero.

Bipartisan support, yes; bipartisan support, no.

Markup, I mentioned markup. That is when you put the bill together, when you give it thoughtful consideration. You offer amendments. You try to perfect it. Twenty-six days in 1986; 4 days in 2017.

This is a bill of over 600 pages. I remember everybody saying how long the Affordable Care Act was and you possibly couldn't do it. Again, over a year and a half of consideration of that bill; 4 days, introduced, the next week markup, 4 days, on the floor.

I was here in 1986, Mr. Speaker, the last time we rewrote our Tax Code. That was a truly bipartisan process. I hope everybody read the remarks of Senator JOHN MCCAIN when he came back to the Senate and voted to move the process forward on the Affordable Care Act but then voted against the final product.

He voted, and he gave a speech in which he said, speaking to the president of the Senate:

> Mr. President, I have been here for some period of time, and my experience has essentially been that, when we did things in a partisan way, they were neither lasting nor very good. But when we do things in a bipartisan way, they are much better and they are much more permanent. There is much more competence in that product that was reached in a bipartisan way.

Speaker RYAN made a point in his remarks about how long overdue we are for a tax overhaul, and he said it has been 31 years since we last did this. Now, of course, he didn't say: I was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee for 11 months and didn't report out a single tax bill.

I am not sure why, but that was the case.

We did bipartisan in 1986. We did permanent tax reform. We did it together, and we did it in a way that was paid for. That is not what this is. Neither the House bill nor the Senate bill achieves those key aims.

The Republican tax overhaul process is dangerously flawed precisely because it is partisan, because it rejects the benefits of compromise in favor of the pitfalls of expediency.

I called it, in my speech in opposition to its adoption, ''reckless and feckless.'' It was reckless because it would heap that $1.7 trillion with a T, $1.7 trillion of additional debt on our party, on our country, on our children, on our people. Bob Rubin, in that column which I referred to, said that that debt would undermine expansion because it would rob the capital markets of money that could be used to build small businesses and to build medium-sized businesses and invest in large businesses to create and keep jobs.

It is feckless because the same people who used to call themselves fiscally responsible—Senator MCCONNELL, Speaker RYAN, Senator HATCH, others whom I could name—have all stood on the floor of the House or in a press conference and said we need to have the debt reduced, and yet they offer a bill that adds $1.7 trillion to the debt; feckless because the same people who used to call themselves fiscally responsible are now choosing to ignore fiscal sustainability in favor of a short-lived political win.

This is not about policy. It is about politics. It is about appealing to a relatively small group of very, very connected people, but it is our country that will lose.

I told people during that speech that I have been in office for some time. I served in the State senate and now in the House. It takes no courage—no courage—to vote for a tax cut. What takes courage is to pay for what you buy, whether it is national security, which I support, whether it is education, which, if we don't invest in, our country will not be great. It is great in part because we have invested in our education system.

Unless we invest in the health of our people, which is the health of our society, we will not be great, and unless we invest in the security of our people domestically, in law, in order, enforcement, in protection for our people.

It will not be great unless we invest in basic biomedical research to make sure that the diseases that exist now and that may exist in the future can be met with medical cures and palliatives.

We will not be great if we sink our country deeply, deeply, deeply into debt and do not have the courage to say, in this generation, we will pay for what we need and not simply buy and pass the debt along to our children and to our grandchildren, because that is what we are doing in this tax bill.

It is not only an intellectually bankrupt policy, it is an immoral policy that we pursue. As the Senate version takes shape, Mr. Speaker, Republicans who voted grudgingly for the House bill ought to be deeply concerned; and I hope, for the sake of their country, they are good people.

There are good people on both sides of this aisle. There are conscientious people on both sides of this aisle. There are Americans on both sides of this aisle, Americans who have sworn to protect and defend the Constitution of our country and have, as well, sworn to protect the people of this country.

There ought to be deep concern among people of good conscience, concern that it does not meet the very same criteria that Speaker RYAN set forth in laying out what tax reform ought to achieve and what he claimed their House bill achieved. Neither does it adhere to the Speaker's clear promise not to package together separate matters into the same legislation.

Make no mistake, the Senate bill House Republicans will be asked to vote for isn't just a tax hike for the middle class, although that it is. It is also a repeal of a significant component of the Affordable Care Act, which will hurt that same middle class. It may have been difficult for Republicans to cast their votes for vague promises on November 16, but I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, it will be even more difficult to do so for a legislative product that puts their constituents, those the Speaker talked about struggling just to get by, people who, if they have a $500 debt, are not sure they can pay it, it will affect those folks and put them in even greater danger should the Senate bill make it back to the House.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to reject this bill. I urge my colleagues in the House to look deeply into their souls and not at their polls and reflect upon what they are doing to their country by perpetuating the fiscally irresponsible policies of borrowing, of borrowing, of borrowing and not having the courage to pay this generation's bills now and not pass them along to our children and to our grandchildren.

Every Member of this House and of the Senate, Mr. Speaker, ought to look themselves in the mirror and say: When I gave those speeches, when I referenced that to the press, was I being honest? Am I following a policy today that is consistent with that assertion? I think they will come to the inexorable answer: No. If I vote for this tax bill, I am not.

Therefore, I hope that all of us will reject this partisan piece of legislation that vastly increases our debt, increases the taxes on middle class workers, threatens Social Security with a $25 billion cut, and threatens our economy.

Let us have the courage to serve our people honestly and take the tough vote and then come together in a bipartisan fashion and do what we showed we could do in 1986: pass a bipartisan bill that, yes, makes our corporations competitive internationally and, yes, gives the bulk of the tax cuts to those who the Speaker referred to as struggling. They are the ones who need relief, and we could do that in a bipartisan fashion, and we can pay for it.

David Camp showed us the way. I didn't agree with all of his bill, but he showed the courage—a Republican from Michigan who was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee—and put up a bill on tax reform that was paid for. The Republicans were in charge of this House and they dismissed it out of hand, too tough.

Mr. Speaker, let's do the right thing. Let's reject this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2015

ISSUES OF THE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we had a lot to be thankful for this Thanksgiving. Anybody who was in America, in the United States, has a lot to be thankful for. People are counting on us across the country to make sure we don't mess the country up because we have done a great deal of damage from Washington, much of it done by bureaucrats.

But the only way they can do it is when Congress relegates and delegates obligations that we should have to bureaucrats, especially unaccountable bureaucrats like those at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

It is time to get power back to where there is accountability. And there is a better chance of having accountability right here in Congress than there is in some agency, some bureau that thumbs its nose at the executive, legislative, and judicial branches and says: We are above the Constitution. We are above everything else in the country. We do what we want to, and nobody can say otherwise.

Well, they are finding out at the CFPB that that is not the case. Everybody in America has some accountability somewhere.

It makes me smile to hear friends from across the aisle talking about running up a deficit because I remember that talk in 2006, and we were properly excoriated on the Republican side of the aisle for running up a deficit of around $160 billion more than we brought in. We were castigated. We were beat up in all kinds of ways, and Democrats were right.

Who would have ever dreamed that the people who were belittling Republicans for allowing a $160 billion deficit would soon be so very proud since they had the majority in the House, the Senate, the Presidency, just a couple of short years later, they would have a $1.5 trillion to $1.6 trillion deficit?

We would be treated to the first 4 and the first 8 years in our Nation's history under a President during which the economy never grew up to 3 percent. It never grew up to 3 percent. It did not, the whole time the Democrats had the majority in the House and the Senate, those 4 years they had the majority in the House and Senate.

That time when they had the House, the Senate, and the White House, they managed to run up the debt higher than anyone has ever come close to before. But the good news for those who have forgotten that the talk of $160 billion deficit being so outrageous before