

this is the opposite of pro-family policy.

Let's look at this example. He works as a freight mover at a lumber warehouse, and she works as a cashier. They both work and live full time in Live Oak, FL. Their average combined income is about \$28,650. Under the current Tax Code, the way the law is today, if they have two kids, their tax cut would be \$2,776. That is what they would save. Under the current bill, their tax cut would be \$2,656. So, in essence, under the way the bill is structured now, they would be getting \$120 less—or keeping \$120 less—than what they would under the law today, for a family making \$28,000 a year.

We can fix it, because under the proposal Senator LEE and I will have, they are going to see a tax cut of \$4,000 for having that additional child. That is \$1,200 greater than the current law. That is a raise of \$1,300 more than would happen under the bill as it is currently structured.

I don't think this is an intended consequence. But this is a working family. They work. They pay payroll tax. They make \$28,000, \$29,000 a year. Trust me when I tell you this money will matter. It won't solve all of their problems, but it will help. It is a pay raise.

Last but not least, I live in West Miami, FL. I have lived there since 1985. It is a working-class neighborhood. According to the census, the average family income in West Miami, where I live, is \$38,000—let's say \$39,000. That doesn't mean that West Miami is poor. I know the people there. They work hard. They pay their taxes. They raise their children well. They go to work 5 days a week for 8 or 9 hours a day, sometimes on the weekends. But because it is a working-class town, the nonrefundable increase we put in for the child tax credit doesn't do much.

As an example, based on the census data for West Miami, for that ZIP Code that I live in, more than 2,500 children in this ZIP Code—meaning more than half of the total number of children living in that area—would be receiving less than the full credit than they would otherwise be eligible for. Why? Because for their parents, their primary tax liability is the payroll tax. And you cannot help working families with a tax cut if you do not allow the cut to apply to the payroll tax. It is as simple as that.

We have to do that. If we want to help people in this country, if we really want to help them have a little bit more in their pocket, then let's implement the proposal that Senator LEE and I have put forward.

By the way, I hear these economists and other people say: Well, it won't do anything for growth.

You really don't understand how working Americans live. Someone who makes \$38,000 a year or \$35,000 a year basically spends every penny they make. They have to. If you make \$38,000 a year, with two kids, you are spending every penny you make and

then probably having to put the extra on your credit card, unfortunately. This proposal will drive consumer spending. It will allow them to pay for some things they can't buy now. These kids outgrow their shoes so fast. The bookbags don't make it through a year. There are so many things we could be helping families with, and our tax reforms should do that.

Everybody in this town has a trade association, has a lobbyist, has newspapers that write about them. Who writes about them? Who writes about these working Americans—working Americans, not people asking for anything from the government. They go to work. They work hard. They work every day. Who fights for them? Who talks about them? Who represents them? That is supposed to be us.

If we are serious about representing them, then let's prove it. Let's amend this bill and change it so we can give working Americans the raise they deserve, and that they need, to strengthen our country and strengthen our families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Katsas nomination?

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 283 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Alexander	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sasse
Cochran	Inhofe	Scott
Collins	Isakson	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson	Strange
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Crapo	Lee	Thune
Cruz	Manchin	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Toomey
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Paul	

NAYS—48

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Bennet	Harris	Nelson
Blumenthal	Hassan	Peters
Booker	Heinrich	Reed
Brown	Heitkamp	Sanders
Cantwell	Hirono	Schatz
Cardin	Kaine	Schumer
Carper	Kennedy	Shaheen
Casey	King	Stabenow
Coons	Klobuchar	Tester
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Udall
Donnelly	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Franken	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Corker

McCain

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that with respect to the Katsas nomination, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to S. 1519.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 165, S. 1519, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

TAX REFORM

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the tax relief bill, which the Senate is working very hard to try to pass. I brought some charts with me to show the impact this bill will have in terms of reducing the tax burden for hard-working American taxpayers and also helping to grow our economy.

It is important to understand this is not just about making sure American taxpayers can keep more of their hard-earned wages and income but also this is about making sure we have a growing economy, that we have more jobs, and that we have rising wages and rising income for American workers. Here are just some of the statistics that show that. These statistics are according to the nonpartisan Tax Foundation and also the Council of Economic Advisers. What you see from this first chart is, this tax relief package is about real economic growth, not just making sure our taxpayers get a tax cut but about growing our economy. This top number, which comes from the Council of Economic Advisers, is \$4,000 that workers, on average, would receive from the economic growth created by the combination of reducing the regulatory burden, which is something we have been working on all year with the administration—reducing that regulatory burden—and combining that then with tax relief to generate more

economic growth. As I said, according to the Council of Economic Advisers and the nonpartisan Tax Foundation, it also generates almost 4 percent in terms of a larger economy.

So this is about reducing the tax rates but growing the base and making sure, as I said, there are not only more jobs but also rising wages and income from that demand for labor that comes with a growing economy, that comes with investment, and that comes with job creation. For an average family of four, the tax cut is about \$2,200 under the Senate bill. It generates about 925,000 new jobs over the scoring period and, as I said, almost a 4-percent larger economy.

This next chart shows that across all income groups, across every income group, you see tax relief, and that is because we start by reducing the tax rates. So across the board, we work to make sure you are applying a lower tax rate to whatever income cohort you are talking about. So new rates are 10 percent, 12 percent, 22 percent, 24 percent, 23, 35, and a 38.5-percent top rate, but when you combine the lower rates along with an increased standard deduction—we increase the standard deduction. We about double it, from around \$6,000 to about \$12,000 and \$24,000 for married filers, \$18,000 for a single filer with a dependent. The result is, across every income group, we reduce the amount of tax they have to pay.

At the same time, we preserve and expand many of the current tax provisions that are important to our American families. For example, the child tax credit, which is something the Presiding Officer has worked on very diligently, would be doubled. We double the child tax credit from \$1,000 to \$2,000. More family-owned small businesses and family farms will be protected from the death tax because we double the exemption amount. Right now, the unified credit is about \$5.5 million, and we double that to more than \$11 million so that if you have a small business or a farm, you are able to pass that from one generation to the next without being forced to sell it. To help save for college, expecting parents will be able to open a 529 savings account, again, helping families with children. Businesses will be encouraged to provide paid family and medical leave by giving them a tax credit to partially offset an employee's pay while caring for their child or for a family member.

We do all of this while maintaining tax deductions that are important to many Americans. These include continuing the mortgage interest deduction—very important for homeowners—continuing the deductibility of charitable contributions to ensure that charities continue to receive contributions that are so important to them, continuing the child and dependent care tax credits, the adoption tax credit, the earned income tax credit, and the deferred treatment for 401(k)s and

individual retirement accounts. That was something that came up earlier. There was some concern about reducing the limits on what could be contributed to retirement accounts on a tax-deferred basis, and we continue those levels so individuals can continue to save for retirement. We also continue the medical expense deduction, which is important to seniors who have significant medical expenses.

The resulting increase in aftertax income will allow families more financial freedom and empower them to save for their retirement or perhaps for their children's education. Considering 50 percent of Americans are living paycheck to paycheck and over one-third of all families are just \$400 away from serious financial difficulty, this is much needed relief, and it is certainly overdue.

This tax relief is also very important for small businesses, so our third chart really goes to small business, which of course is the backbone of our economy. In my State, farming and ranching is incredibly important, but across the country, the backbone of our economy is small businesses. Ninety percent of the businesses in America are small businesses, and what this chart shows is that for passthroughs, which typically small businesses are passthroughs, that there is income relief again at all income levels. Remember how these passthrough small businesses work. Whether you have a sub S corporation, a limited liability corporation, a limited liability partnership, or a regular partnership, all these different types of small businesses are passthroughs, meaning the income flows through the business entity and is taxed at the individual level. That is why it is very important that we show that across the board, at all different income levels, small businesses benefit from this tax reduction.

By reducing the maximum tax rate for sole proprietorships, partnerships, S corporations, and all the other passthrough entities I just mentioned, we are creating greater economic growth and opportunities as small businesses reinvest in their companies, reinvest in their employees, and reinvest in their communities. For many small businesses, equipment, business supplies, and other capital expenditures are very costly, and it cuts into their profit margin. So this is about helping them make those investments that enable them to grow their businesses, increase wages, and hire more employees.

Our tax bill also allows businesses to immediately expense or write off the cost of new investments, effectively reinvesting in our small businesses and driving economic growth, job creation, and higher wages for American workers.

We increase the amount allowed under section 179, something very important to small businesses, which essentially allows them to expense or write off their investments. This is a hugely important expensing provision

for farmers, for ranchers, and really for small businesses across the board, and we enhance that section 179 expensing.

All the while, we work to make sure we have stable government revenues through a broader tax base, a growing economy, and a more efficient tax system. That means we encourage investment, and it means the revenues that come to government come from a larger tax base and lower rates. So, individually, the hard-working citizens pay less of their earnings and businesses pay less as a percentage of their revenues, but because you have that economic growth—you have that rising tide that lifts all boats—government actually has more and stable revenues from economic growth not from higher taxes. That is some of what I showed in that first slide; that this is about growing our economy and driving that economic growth.

The bill ensures that we are competitive in the global economy. In fact, as a result of the tax relief and tax reform we are undertaking, there is something like \$2.5 trillion that is currently overseas that now has an incentive to come home and is invested here at home in our businesses, creating jobs in America and expansion of America's economy rather than having that money parked overseas or invested overseas.

So, for all these reasons, I urge our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to work to pass this tax relief, this tax reform. This really is about making sure hard-working American taxpayers decide what to do with their hard-earned dollars. Again, I ask that all of us work together, pass this bill through the Senate, get it into conference with the House, and get the very best tax relief product we can for the American people and that we get it done before the end of the year.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, in this season of Thanksgiving, let me say that I am thankful, as I rise for my 187th "Time to Wake Up" address, for the spirit of commitment and innovation that this great Nation devotes to tackling the challenge of climate change, even with this President.

The United States now is alone in the world as the only Nation not committed to the historic Paris Agreement, but at the U.N. Climate Change Conference in Germany, I saw firsthand that Americans are still committed to climate action. Corporate leaders like Mars, Microsoft, Facebook, and Walmart were there to discuss the role American corporations can take on climate change. American Governors, mayors, universities, and many other corporations all brought the same message to Bonn; that notwithstanding the corrupted Trump administration, America is still in.

Senators CARDIN, MARKEY, SCHATZ, MERKLEY, and I sent the message that most of our constituents and the majority of the American people believe

that climate change is a serious threat to our country and the planet and that American action and leadership is necessary.

An entire day was dedicated to the changes we are seeing in the world's oceans. This is where the industry liars and climate deniers get stumped. The oceans bear the brunt of our carbon pollution. Sea levels are rising, waters are warming, and seas are acidifying. These undeniable measurements have no answer from the climate denial apparatus, so the denial apparatus just chooses to ignore the oceans, but we can't ignore the oceans, certainly not in coastal States.

The reality of ocean climate change hits home along our coasts: Warming waters move our fisheries around, sea level rise erodes our shores, and we must prepare for more frequent and intense hurricanes and storms.

The Trump administration is more or less completely crooked on this subject, but even they had to throw in the towel and release without amendment the recent U.S. "Climate Science Special Report." They had no scientific rebuttal—none—to the dozen Federal Agencies and Departments that assembled the latest and best understanding of the effects of climate change on the United States. They couldn't rebut it. They chose to ignore it.

Will that report affect this administration's industry-paid climate policies? Of course not. Those policies are bought and paid for. But it is worth looking at the "Climate Science Special Report." This report gave special attention to storms. The report says:

For Atlantic—

That is, the ocean off my home State of Rhode Island—
and eastern North Pacific—

That is, the ocean off our western coast—

and eastern North Pacific typhoons, increases are projected in precipitation rates and intensity. The frequency of the most intense of these storms is projected to increase.

The report continues:

Assuming storm characteristics do not change, sea level rise will increase the frequency and extent of extreme flooding associated with coastal storms, such as hurricanes and nor'easters.

Extreme flooding matters quite a lot in Rhode Island.

The report continues:

A projected increase in the intensity of hurricanes in the North Atlantic could increase the probability of extreme flooding along most of the U.S. Atlantic and Gulf Coast states beyond what would be projected based solely on relative sea level rise.

It is going to happen just from projected sea level rise. This means that extreme flooding could exceed those predictions because of storm activity.

Humans are driving these changes, the report says, not the alternative explanation for these changes offered by the climate deniers. Oh, wait; that is right. They have no alternative explanation. They have nothing. They have

nothing but industry-funded denial. There is no alternative explanation to what the scientists say, which is actually consistent with the finding of the "Climate Science Special Report" that there is "no convincing alternative explanation."

That is not the only report. Last year, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office released a report titled "Effects of Climate Change and Coastal Development on U.S. Hurricane Damage: Implications for the Federal Budget." That report projected that by 2075, annual damage from hurricanes will increase by \$120 billion as coastal populations increase, sea levels rise, and U.S. landfalls of strong hurricanes become more frequent. That is the prediction. Of that increase, around 45 percent can already be clearly attributed to climate change.

In a presentation from early November, CBO summarized:

Expected damage from hurricanes will grow more quickly than GDP.

The share of the population facing substantial damage will grow fivefold by 2075.

On the basis of past patterns, Federal spending on hurricanes will also grow more quickly than GDP.

The World Meteorological Organization has also released a report connecting "extraordinary weather" to man-made climate change. Warmer temperatures spur increased precipitation, the report says, and higher sea levels amplify storm surge as driven by hurricanes and other coastal storms. This is not new. It is just being frequently and constantly reported with no convincing alternative explanation.

During the typical Atlantic hurricane season, storms develop in the warm, tropical waters off the western coast of Africa. These storms gather heat and energy as they pass over this band of warm seawater across the Atlantic known as the hurricane highway. This is the west coast of Africa. Here is South America. Here is the United States. There is Florida. And here is the hurricane highway leading to the Caribbean. Whether these storms become devastating category 4 and 5 hurricanes or weaken and disperse along the way depends on atmospheric conditions and on this ocean heat that powers up those hurricanes.

A typical Atlantic hurricane season used to generate roughly six hurricanes, three of which reached category 3 or higher. That was then. Typical is no longer typical. During August of 2017, this hurricane highway that I showed you reached 9 degrees Fahrenheit hotter than the 30-year average. This exceptional warming supercharged storms into hurricanes bearing catastrophic damage.

The superheated 2017 hurricane highway fueled not 6 but 10 named hurricanes, and 6—not 3—reached category 3 strength or higher, including Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, Jose, and Maria. What is more, all 10 of the season's hurricanes occurred in a row—the greatest number of consecutive hurricanes in the satellite era.

Typically, what happens is that a storm will churn up cooler water in its wake. So during typical years, a following storm will weaken over the cooler waters left in a preceding storm's wake. That is the way it ordinarily works. This should have been the case for Hurricane Irma as it charged northwest through the Caribbean just days after Harvey. But as I said, hurricanes are powered up by sea surface temperatures, particularly sea surface temperatures above 82 degrees Fahrenheit. And by September 7, as Irma moved over the coast of Cuba and up into the Bahamas and Florida, the hurricane highway surface temperature Harvey had left behind measured up to 87 degrees Fahrenheit. The result of that onslaught was that the entire island of Puerto Rico is still recovering. The Virgin Islands were also slammed. Houston saw epic, widespread flooding. Welcome to the new typical, thanks to ocean warming, which comes to us thanks to climate change, which comes to us thanks to carbon pollution, which still comes to us in such a polluting flood, thanks to a generation of industry lying that has not stopped to this day.

At the Southern New England Weather Conference earlier this month, University of Rhode Island Professor Isaac Ginis presented his worst-case scenario models for a "Hurricane Rhody," which would bring levels of destruction to Rhode Island not seen since we were hit by the Great Hurricane of 1938, the destruction of which is seen here in downtown Providence, or Hurricane Carol, which brought similar destruction in 1954. That is Providence City Hall. This is the roof of a streetcar. Another streetcar is half-flooded. And this is water in a river pouring in downtown Providence through the streets. Essentially, this is white water in downtown Providence.

The flooding that Providence endured in Hurricane Carol caused us to build a hurricane barrier across what is called Fox Point to protect downtown. However, even with the hurricane barrier in place, Professor Ginis's simulations show 3 feet of flooding in downtown Providence if a category 3 hurricane were to hit us at high tide. And, he proposed, if our "Hurricane Rhody" were to swing back around and make a second landfall, as Esther did in 1961—he modeled it based on the previous experience of Hurricane Esther—then if it came back, even in a weakened category 2 state, Providence could see up to 14 feet of flooding.

But wait, there is more. Fast forward a few decades and several feet of projected sea level rise, and then Providence doesn't stand a chance. The Rhode Island Coastal Resources Management Council and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration put 9 to 12 projected vertical feet of sea level rise riding up Rhode Island's shores by the end of the century. According to CRMC—our Coastal Resources Management Council—at 10

feet of sea level rise, Rhode Island would lose 36 square miles of total land area. Good-bye to much of Newport, Warwick, Barrington, Block Island, Point Judith, and other coastal communities Rhode Islanders hold dear. This is the present projection by our State agencies, our State University, and NOAA.

As the Senate prepares a third disaster relief funding package, we can't just fund immediate hurricane recovery. We must also help coastal communities look ahead to the next storm. We need better coastal flood mapping and risk modeling. We need to prepare for damage to natural and engineered coastal infrastructure. We need research and modeling to understand what coastal populations face from the new typical: stronger hurricanes, sea level rise, heavy precipitation, disrupted fisheries, and increased storms and storm surges.

We have to prepare for this. It would be stupid not to put a small percentage of what we are spending in cleanup and recovery into prevention, protection, and preparation. It is just common sense.

The Trump administration does not represent American views on climate change. It has been captured by an industry that has been dishonest about this issue for a generation, and it now represents the falsehoods of that industry. For that reason, it also no longer represents American determination to tackle this challenge. That determination is now found in State Houses, in corporations, in our great universities, and with the American people. Americans know that we can pull together to avoid some of these worst-case scenarios. Coastal communities, in particular, are keenly aware of the special risks they face.

In the Senate, I remain eager to work with my colleagues on all of the above. You know where to find me.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STRANGE). The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPUBLICAN TAX PLAN

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise this evening to talk about the tax bill, which will come to the floor very soon. We have started debate, and we will be debating it the next couple of days. There is a lot to talk about, a lot of numbers, and a lot of data. I will try to limit the numbers as best I can, but it is important to review some of the numbers.

For tonight's purposes, I start with just two numbers. The first number is 59,456, and the second number is 7. What do I mean when I say 59,456? It is in dollars. The average annual tax cut for those making over \$1 million a year in 2019 is \$59,456. As many people know who have been following the debate,

the Senate bill delayed a corporate tax cut by 1 year so most of the analysis starts in the year 2019 not 2018. So there is \$59,456 of a tax cut for those making over \$1 million in the first year of the bill, 2019.

What does 7 mean? Seven is also a dollar number. Seven dollars is the average monthly tax cut for Americans making between \$20,000 and \$30,000 a year in that same year, 2019.

If you wanted to compare the annual number of \$59,456 to the annual average tax cut for that income category for the same year, it would be about \$84. No matter which way you look at it, there is a basic unfairness there. Even when you apply percentages, it is very clear that folks in those lower income brackets don't get the benefit the richest among us—the superrich people making more than \$1 million—get. Even if you drop down the number to over one-half million dollars and up, those folks are getting sometimes double, even triple, the tax cuts for people in the broad middle.

The one I just cited might be the most egregious example, people making \$20,000 to \$30,000 a year getting just \$7 a month in a tax cut.

One of the reasons the bill is so stingy and so unfair when it comes to folks in the lower income brackets or even the middle-income brackets is because so much has been given in the bill to big corporations. Right? There is only a certain amount of revenue you can move around in a bill like this.

Because the corporate—and I should say the permanent corporate tax cut. The tax cuts for families is not permanent, but the permanent corporate tax cut is \$1.5 trillion, and by one estimate it is \$1.414 trillion over 10 years. When you allocate that much to big corporations and make it permanent, obviously, it limits your ability to help the middle class in a robust or substantial way.

I think most Americans will ask: Why don't we limit any kind of corporate tax break and apply, potentially, hundreds of billions—with a “b”—of dollars to a bigger middle-class tax cut? But the majority so far, starting with the Finance Committee, has decided not to do that.

I just leave that for people to consider. Is it fair, when you are doing a tax bill, so-called tax reform, for the first time in three decades, that people making over \$1 million who don't need \$59,456—does it make sense to give them that and give the store away to corporations in a permanent fashion and give folks making \$20,000 to \$30,000 just 7 bucks a month or 84 bucks over the course of a year, on average?

It gets worse. The numbers get even more egregious, even more insulting. That same year, in 2019, 572,000 of our country's richest households would get \$34 billion worth of tax cuts. You heard that right. In 1 year, a rather small group of Americans—572,000 of the richest households—get \$34 billion of a tax cut in just that 1 year. That \$34 billion

in that 1 year for the richest among us gets even higher if you add in other provisions, other tax cuts, but I will be conservative and just limit it to the \$34 billion.

Some people might ask: Well, what about the rest of the country or most of the country? What is left? Well, if you compare that \$34 billion for a relatively small group of the wealthiest, if you compare that to 90 million—my arms don't stretch out far enough to compare 572 taxpayers with 90 million. What happens to 90 million taxpayers who happen to make under \$50,000? A couple of minutes ago I talked about \$20,000 to \$30,000. Now we are talking about everyone below \$50,000 in a year. That is about 90 million people. What happens to them? Well, they get a grand total of \$14 billion, and some even see a tax increase. So let's leave the tax increase for people making less than \$50,000 off the table for now because some will get a tax increase, and some will get a benefit. So it is hard to comprehend that 90 million people divvy up \$14 billion, but a tiny fraction of that—572,000 people—get \$34 billion just in 2019. Then you have 2020 and 2021, and they keep getting those dollar amounts.

Some people might say: Well, you know, everyone should get a tax cut in a bill like this, and even if the wealthy get a tax cut, that is the way Washington works. I have described this bill this way over and over again, and I will keep describing it this way. It is a giveaway. It is a giveaway to the superrich. It is certainly a giveaway to big corporations. They get \$1.5 trillion, and it is permanent.

There have been a lot of analyses done of this bill, and there are lots of stories to point to. I just point to one that came out just yesterday. The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities came out with a report that is a little more than seven pages' worth. They do reports like this on a regular basis, sometimes more than one report in a week. I know folks can't read it from a distance, but here is what the headline says: “JCT Estimates”—Joint Committee on Taxation, that is the acronym—Joint Committee on Taxation estimates “Amended Senate Tax Bill Skewed to Top, Hurts Many Low- and Middle-Income Americans.” That is what the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities said yesterday. So what they are analyzing is not the original proposal folks in the Senate Republican caucus offered. This is the amended Senate bill.

Here is what they say, in pertinent part. I will just read maybe two sentences.

Under the amended bill, in 2025 (when most of its provisions would be in place), high-income households would get the largest tax cuts as a share of after-tax income, on average, while households with incomes below \$30,000 would on average face a tax increase. By 2027, when many of its provisions would have expired, those at the top would still get large tax cuts, but every income group below—

I will read that again.

—every income group below \$75,000 would face tax increases, on average.

You heard that right—tax increases on average. So whether you look at it in the year 2019 for people making \$20,000 to \$30,000 or 2019 for people making under \$50,000 and compare that to the wealthiest among us or whether you look at it in terms of what happens just a few years later in 2025, you can see the basic unfairness of this.

Just at a time when we have this great opportunity to do a number of things which would not only turbocharge the economy and potentially lift families out of poverty—and certainly lift children out of poverty—just when we have the opportunity to simplify the code, to help middle-class families in a substantial and robust way, not the stingy way the bill does it, to the point where some might get a tax break one year that is very limited and then that goes away and their taxes go up and others are losing healthcare because of the repeal of the individual mandate—what is most egregious here is maybe not even the giveaways. That is egregious enough. What is outrageous is, the giveaways happen, and the debt is run up to do that. Then, on top of all that, we miss an opportunity, as Washington often does. There is an old expression that Washington never misses an opportunity to miss an opportunity. This is an opportunity to give the middle class maybe a record tax cut, but the majority has chosen not to do that. This is also an opportunity to lift a lot more children out of poverty with a much more generous child tax credit, a much more substantial commitment to lifting kids out of poverty, because we have a bill that allows us to do that, a big tax bill that only comes around once every couple of decades, potentially. The last time this was done was 31 years ago. So this is a critically important moment for the middle class, a critically important moment for children—middle-income children but also children from low-income families who don't get a lot of help under current policy.

Now, some people might ask: Well, how have the rich done over the last number of years? Maybe some might want to make the argument—the ridiculous argument, but they might want to make it—that somehow the rich need a little help. Well, let's see what has happened since 1980. Since 1980, the richest 1 percent have seen their share of national income almost double—double—from 11 percent to 20 percent in 2014, the last time this was measured. So the richest 1 percent, in about 35 years, have seen their share of all national income almost double. So the richest 1 percent have been doing pretty well over the decades since 1980. Do they really need yet another tax cut? Do they really need tens of billions of dollars split or divvied up among a very small number of Americans? I don't think so, and I think most Americans would agree with me.

According to the New York Times, no other nation in the 35-member Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—the so-called OECD countries, 35 countries, and we are one of them—no other country has seen this widening of the gap between the richest and everyone else. You could see it in the other example. The richest small number in America get \$34 billion, and then 90 million people have to split a number that is less than half that. That is really an insult to who we are as Americans.

That same JCT—the Joint Committee on Taxation—their estimate of the Republican bill shows that households earning over \$1 million would get an average tax cut about 73 times larger than households earning between \$50,000 and \$75,000 in 2019, that same year, the first year.

We can go on and on with these comparisons, but I want to go back to the number I started with, that \$59,000 number. If you keep the dollar sign on it, and use it for another purpose, you have just arrived at roughly the median household income for the United States of America. So the median household income is about \$59,000. That is the median household income all across the country. That number happens to be roughly the same number as the \$59,456, the average annual tax cut for those making over \$1 million in 2019.

There are lots of other ways to describe the bill. The bill raises \$134 billion on the backs of hard-working Americans by changing how the Tax Code measures inflation. Not many people are paying attention to this, but the measurement is going to change if the bill passes. This number only grows over time.

For someone who is just starting out in their professional life, they would see this change haunt their paychecks for the next 50 years. So they are going to change how the Tax Code measures inflation. Not many people know that, and I think they are starting to find out.

If all of that wasn't enough, this bill would do a number of other things which are particularly destructive. It will reward companies that have outsourced jobs, it will increase healthcare premiums by an average of an additional 10 percent a year, and it is going to give, at the same time, obscene tax cuts to the superrich by, at the same time, increasing taxes on the middle class.

So when I described this bill last week in the Finance Committee as a thief in the night, I didn't choose those words casually; I meant every word of it. It is a thief in the night because of what the adverse impact on middle-class families and lower income families trying to get to the middle class would be, compared to what happens to the wealthiest among us. So it is robbing people of an opportunity to get a better tax cut for the middle class and giving away the store to the rich.

I will have more to say about this, but I see the majority leader is on the floor.

I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-55, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Poland for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$250 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,
Lieutenant General, USA, Director.
Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-55

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Poland.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment: * \$249 million.

Other: \$1 million.

Total: \$250 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Up to one hundred fifty (150) AIM-120C-7 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAM).

Non-MDE: Also included are missile containers, weapon system support, spare and repair parts, support and test equipment, publications and technical documentation, personnel training and training equipment, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistical and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (PL-D-1AE).