

carefully counsel patients on prescriptions and over-the-counter medications to help heal sickness and reduce pain. Pharmacists are also considered one of the top two most trusted professions in America.

During October, as well as throughout the year, I encourage everyone to visit your pharmacist, ask questions about your prescriptions, receive advice about preventative care, and get to know the person who provides your medicine and works to keep you healthy.

Thank you, fellow pharmacists, for all that you do. Please know that your work is appreciated and you are an important part of keeping our Nation healthy.

GUN SAFETY LEGISLATION

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, we are now a few days after the most violent and largest massacre in modern American history in Las Vegas, Nevada.

Many that you encounter has a story, amazingly, about who was there during that week. They obviously were not at that site, but they may have been in Las Vegas for work or otherwise. It will be on the minds of Americans for a long time.

Just this past Monday, I stood with Sheriff Acevedo, my chief of police, my sheriff, my constable; mothers who have lost loved ones and children; and a woman who had been abused and her significant other carried around a heavy weapon to scare her, threaten her, and abuse her.

Why we can't have gun safety regulation, I don't know, but I believe after Sandy Hook and after Pulse nightclub, we must pass real gun safety legislation. We must ban assault weapons, ban the bump stocks. We must have universal background checks.

Madam Speaker, it is a shame that we cannot save lives. We need gun safety now, not money in your pockets.

□ 1615

OVERCOMING PROBLEMS WITH THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I want to commend President Trump's decision this week with executive orders to do some of the work we have been unable to do so far in the House and the Senate, helping people overcome the problems with the ACA, the Affordable Care Act.

One of the measures he put forth was association health plans to allow employers' employees to form health plans that suit them—indeed, to asso-

ciate with their type of business, their type of industry on a small scale in their neighborhoods. It makes perfect sense, if you want to give people more choices.

Also, short-term, limited-duration health insurance plans, which allow people to have, if they are in between jobs, instead of limiting it to just 3 months, perhaps just a little longer. In the interim, while they are in between jobs, they have choices that they could afford with the elements in the plan they would like.

Finally, health reimbursement arrangements, which make it where employees—if they want to provide benefits to their—employers to their employees, that they can reimburse for more issues in their plan, such as helping them pay for their premiums, if that is how the employee wishes to have that.

Flexibility is what we need; choices are what we need; and then Congress needs to be able to accomplish something in the Senate so we can bring it back and give this to the American people.

RESPONSE TO THE REPUBLICAN TAX PLAN

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Speaker, 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Speaker, before my colleagues in the Congressional Progressive Caucus and I begin our discussion about the response to the Republican tax plan, I wish to take a moment to express our sympathy for the people of northern California who are facing devastating and destructive wildfires.

I represent a Silicon Valley district where hundreds of our neighbors to our north and south remain missing. Tens of thousands are suffering at this very moment from the destruction of more than 150,000 acres and counting, as well as an increasing number of family homes and businesses. It seems that our Nation has been struck by one national tragedy after another. Our prayers are with the California residents, and I know that everyone in this body is committed to their relief.

I also, on a personal note, want to recognize Liz Bartolomeo, who has been my communications director and worked very hard with the Congressional Progressive Caucus. She is going on to work for Democracy Alliance. I

wish her very well in her next steps, and I thank her for her service to our office and to the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

The purpose of this hour is to discuss the Republican economic plan, and I have distinguished colleagues of mine who will be joining us. I just want to, at the outset, articulate the basic difference in philosophy.

The President and the Republicans believe that to grow our economy, to create jobs, the way to achieve that is by giving tax cuts to corporations, giving tax cuts to the investors in stock, giving tax cuts to the executives who already get large compensation packages; and that if we do that, if we cut corporate tax rates at a time where corporations are making record profits, if we give more tax breaks to those who are investing in our stock market, if we give more tax breaks to those who get dividend checks, then somehow, magically, people making 30 grand or 40 grand will see their wages go up, that somehow we are going to get many more jobs in places across this country.

And the question is why would we believe that? Why would we think the trickle-down economics, which has failed time and again, is going to help? Does someone really believe, in my district, who is a construction worker or a nurse or a teacher, that lowering the corporate tax rate is going to do anything to put more money in their pocket, that it is going to do anything for a nurse who is struggling to get an apartment and pay rent to be able to afford that rent, or that it is going to do anything for people in Youngstown, Ohio, to be able to send their kids to school or get vocational training or get a college education?

The difference is very simple. Our belief is, if you want to raise wages—if you want to give more pay to average Americans, just go raise wages. Provide the tax credit to those making under \$75,000. For one-third of the cost of the Republican tax plan, which is geared towards corporations and the investor class, we could give every single American, who is making under \$75,000, a 20 percent pay raise. I believe that is bottom-up economics, and that is actually what is going to grow the economy.

It is not a matter of just the economics. It is a matter of common sense. Think about it. Who do you think is going to create more jobs in the United States? Someone worth 5 million bucks who gets tax money back and is going to invest in stocks? Or is that money going to create jobs in the United States? Or could that money be spent anywhere in the world, sheltered anywhere in the world? As opposed to if you give that money to someone making \$50,000, \$60,000, they are going to spend that money in their local community; they are going to buy more groceries; they are going to buy more things for their house; they are going to get more education; that money is

going to go into the local economy, and it is going to actually create jobs. That is what is going to grow the economy. That is our only shot of getting 3 percent economic growth if we invest in actual workers, the people doing the work.

By the way, they haven't gotten a raise for the past 40 years. Since 1979, wages in this country have stagnated, and we heard the same thing: just cut the taxes on the top and the wages will go up. But the wages haven't gone up.

Guess who promised to help, finally, those forgotten Americans? Guess who promised to help them? President Donald Trump. That was his whole campaign: The stock market is doing great, but you are being left behind. The coasts are doing great, but you have been left behind. And I am going to come to the White House and I am not going to give the keys to the Wall Street bankers. I am going to actually worry about raising wages.

His biggest disappointment as President is that he went back on the promise that he made to ordinary Americans, and we know that he can do it if he wants to. All he has to do is tell his Wall Street advisers: No, no more tax breaks for Wall Street. I want the tax credits going to Main Street, and I can do that at a third of the cost of the plan that you are selling to me and the American people.

This is the debate in this country, supply-side economics that believes the greatness of America is with the investor class and the CEO class and the elite class, or bottom-up economics that our party and the Progressive Caucus is putting forward that believes the greatness in America is with the people who actually do the work, who work 40, 50 hours, who go on the assembly lines and work in factories, who work overnight as nurses taking care of folks, who are doing the education as teachers.

Who do we believe is really contributing to the economy? Who do we believe is really driving America's economic growth? The Democrats believe it is ordinary workers across this country, that that is the greatness that drives the American economy, and the Republican tax plan believes it is the investor class.

It is a very clear difference, and our commitment is not just one towards fairness but also one about investing in people who are going to create jobs and create innovation in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), my distinguished colleague, who is not just a constitutional law professor and a leading thinker on issues of jurisprudence but has also been a leader with the Congressional Progressive Caucus in helping us craft an economic policy that is really for ordinary Americans and not for just the very wealthy.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman KHANNA for his leadership in putting this together.

Madam Speaker, I want to invoke a great Republican member of this body

who went on to become President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln, who spoke of "government of the people, by the people, for the people."

The tax plan that has been presented to us by the GOP in the 21st century is government of the 1 percent, by the 1 percent, and for the 1 percent. It was written by a billionaire Cabinet of a billionaire President for the richest 1 percent of taxpayers in the country.

The same policy experts whose healthcare plan was to throw 30 million Americans off their health insurance and reduce women's access to complete reproductive services now have a tax plan to sell America. But read the fine print first. In fact, you don't even need to read the fine print. You just have to look at the headlines.

Under this plan, 80 percent of the total tax cut will end up going to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans who earn more than \$900,000 a year. Let me repeat that: 80 percent of the money that will be saved in this tax cut will go to Americans earning \$900,000 a year. That is astounding.

In the meantime, tens of millions of middle class families making between \$50,000 and \$150,000 a year will pay higher taxes than they were paying before. And check this out. The very wealthiest sliver of Americans, those who make at least \$5 million a year, and, on average, \$16 million a year, would get an average tax cut of over \$1 million. That is a \$1 million tax cut for millionaires.

The slogan for this plan should be: The Trump tax cut, because the rich just aren't rich enough and everybody else is doing just fine.

Madam Speaker, if you know anyone who makes \$16 million a year, please ask them to write me and tell me what they are going to do with their extra \$1 million. Maybe they will send it to a Swiss bank account or to the Bahamas; maybe they will run for Congress; maybe they will invest it in Australia where a lot of the super-rich are apparently now buying property in order to have a getaway plan from the escalating crises of climate change in North America.

□ 1630

So the billionaires make out like bandits.

What about the rest of us? How much will this plan cost us?

Well, the bipartisan Committee for Responsible Federal Budget's initial analysis shows that the GOP plan would add \$2.2 trillion to deficits over the next decade. This is the result of cutting taxes for the wealthy by a staggering \$5.8 trillion and then adding new tax revenue of only \$3.6 trillion, so we are going to be adding \$2.2 trillion in deficits.

What about the deficit hawks?

They are an endangered species, as Congresswoman PELOSI says now. Actually, they have mutated into a completely new species. We don't have deficit hawks anymore. We have deficit

ostriches. They are willing to squawk and strut and kick dust like hawks when there is a Democrat in the White House, but when a budget-busting, deficit-ballooning, debt-deepening Republican occupies the White House and proposes inflating the deficit and the debt to unprecedented levels with the most breathtaking fiscal recklessness anyone has ever seen, they become deficit chicken hawks and transmogrify into deficit doves, and then finally turn into fast scurrying deficit ostriches and run away from everything they have been saying for years about the necessity to reduce the deficit, they simply bury their heads deep in the sand and let the debt and the deficits climb up all around them.

Speaker PAUL RYAN, when he was campaigning with Mitt Romney, said the national debt is threatening jobs today, it is threatening our prosperity today. Senate Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL, while calling for changes to Social Security and Medicare in 2013, told supporters only one thing can save this country, and that is to get a handle on the deficit and debt issue. Well, that was then, this is now, as they say. Now the GOP leaders are twisting arms to vote for a tax plan that will blow up the deficit and drive our children and our grandchildren's generations deeply into debt.

What happened to all of the fine speeches we heard about how we owe it to our kids not to engage in deficit spending? What happened to all the magnificent oratory about how the national debt is a moral crisis?

Can any of the Members of Congress, who built their careers on the principle of deficit reduction and ending the debt, explain why it is responsible today to add more than \$2 trillion to our national deficit?

We await an answer, Madam Speaker.

Why are they doing this to America? Why are they proposing it? Who wins with this assault on the common good?

Well, let's see. Donald Trump and his family certainly do. The only President who ever bragged that he would be able to make money by running for President is showing what a good job he is actually doing at achieving his objective.

A New York Times analysis shows that Trump and his family could save more than \$1 billion under this plan. That is right, the President and his family could save more than \$1 billion under the tax proposal that has been sent to us in Congress. Of course, it is impossible to know precisely how much would be saved because President Trump, despite his campaign promise to release his tax returns, if elected, still refuses to release his tax returns, which constitutes not only a radical breach of faith with the people, but a radical break from past practices of other Presidents for the last half century, who have opened up their tax records for the rest of us to see.

But let's see what we can do based on information we know. This proposal

would eliminate the estate tax, which would generate massive tax savings for President Trump and his family. If his assets, reportedly valued at \$2.86 billion, were transferred after his death under today's rules, his estate would be taxed at around the 40 percent level, still leaving his heirs with more than \$1 billion.

Repealing the Federal estate tax, which they propose to do, would save his family \$1.1 billion, at least, in estate tax costs.

Why would we do this?

The Founders of our country were passionately opposed to hereditary wealth, just like they were passionately opposed to hereditary government. They thought it was dangerous to have the intergenerational transmission of wealth and great fortunes like that. They said that it would cause idleness and irresponsibility in the heirs to great wealth, and they would be able to convert their wealth not just into bigger estates, bigger land purchases, bigger houses, but actually in the public offices. They had a very profound democratic critique of that kind of intergenerational wealth inequality, because, at a certain point, you have bought enough houses, you have bought enough jets, and now you want a governorship, you want the Presidency, you want a Senate seat. In a democracy, we need to have much reduced levels of inequality that are being proposed under this idea of abolishing the estate tax.

They also are proposing to abolish the alternative minimum tax, which is the only reason that President Trump paid any taxes in the one year over the last two decades that we know he paid taxes in, in 2005. Remember, somebody mysteriously leaked information about that year to the Rachel Maddow show, and it turned out that the President paid taxes because of the alternative minimum tax which says that you can't push a good joke too far, you can only use all of your deductions and allowances, and so on, up to a certain point. If you are at a certain place, in terms of your wealth, you have got to pay something.

Well, The New York Times now estimates that the GOP tax plan to repeal the alternative minimum tax would save the President at least \$31.3 million. He would not have had to pay in that one year that we know where he paid taxes, and we don't know about the rest because he has refused to release it.

And let's just look at one more provision, which would change the treatment of pass-through business income. According to The New York Times, President Trump could save as much as \$6.2 million on business income and \$9.8 million on income from real estate and other kinds of partnerships under changes to the taxation of pass-through income.

Now, look, Madam Speaker, nobody likes paying taxes, nobody loves it, especially when we know that there are

billions of dollars being wasted, for example, at the Department of Defense in boondoggles, fraud, and abuse taking place, according to a hearing that we had just this session in the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee. So people don't love the experience.

But just as Oliver Wendell Holmes said, that he didn't mind paying his taxes because he understood that they were the price of civilization. It is what we all put in, in order to have roads and highways and airports and schools and universities. That is what it means to be a citizen. People don't mind, as long as there is a basic sense in the public that everybody is participating and we are not getting ripped off.

And I am terrified that if they succeed in barreling this plan through Congress, that it is going to spread more cynicism and more disenchantment and more negativity about the tax system and about the government, and we can't afford it. Because of the escalating crises of climate change, which are all around us, our people are suffering. We have millions of people in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands tonight who have no access to power, no access to electricity or clean water. We have people in Florida and Texas and Mississippi and Louisiana who are still recovering from the last hurricanes. We have Californians, many of whom have died already, who are struggling against the forest fires out of control.

Now is a point when we need a tax system that brings our people together, that says that wealthier people can pay more because they are wealthy, but everybody is going to pay their share, and we are all going to participate together. That is the tax system we should be looking for, a tax system where we get rid of all of the special interest inflected deductions and allowances and loopholes and rip-offs that are built into the system, where it is simplified.

In the European countries, you can pay your taxes in about 10 or 15 minutes, and you don't have to go to the multibillion-dollar tax preparation industry, or go find a law firm to do it. We can simplify our taxes if we decide to get rid of all of the special interest loopholes. And wealthy people can pay more because they get more out of being part of this society, and they use more of the infrastructure of the country, instead of paying less than everybody else, instead of trying to rip off the system by paying nothing.

Madam Speaker, now is the time when we need the wisest and most principled leadership to get us through the accumulating crises of the time. This tax plan is totally irresponsible. I hope that it will be withdrawn and we can work together across the aisle on a bipartisan plan that will represent the best values of government of the people, by the people, for the people.

Madam Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from California for allowing me this opportunity.

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Speaker, I thank Representative RASKIN for his thoughtful points and comments on the President's tax policy.

I have a few other points before we conclude. The President has said that we can't afford foreign aid given our deficits, but the President thinks that the average American doesn't know math. Mr. President, the average American can do math.

The deficit is \$20 trillion. Our foreign aid every year is no more than \$30 billion to \$40 billion. Your proposal would increase the deficit between \$200 billion to \$500 billion. So this red herring that somehow foreign aid is responsible for the deficit is just false.

What is responsible for the deficit is the massive tax cuts that you are proposing that would add, according to conservative economists, between \$2 trillion to \$5 trillion more to our deficit, and it is all to finance the corporate interests, all to finance the investor class.

We have, on the Democratic side, on the progressive side, proposed an alternative, and that alternative is based on the view that we need to encourage job creation and raise wages for mainstream America, that we need to invest in the people actually doing the work. It is based on the thinking of people who used to be Republicans and people like Jack Kemp, who said: Let us invest in areas that don't have jobs and economic growth and have heavy investment for training on the technologies of the future. That used to be the thinking on the other side of the aisle. We used to have differences, but there used to be creativity and a sense of what is actually going to invest in people to grow the economy.

And now, under this President, it is just a mantra of tax cuts for the very wealthy, tax cuts for the people who need it least, tax cuts for corporations, no sense of actually investing in new industries, investing in the training and skills of the 21st century, investing in bringing capital to places that need them. I hope and believe that as people in good faith will look at the two contrasting proposals, one that says tax cuts for corporations, the other that says let's invest in American workers, let's invest in American communities, that they will conclude that the way to actually raise wages, the way to actually create jobs, the way to actually grow our economy is by bottom-up economics by investing in the American workers and in those Americans who are part of the middle class.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

□ 1645

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas