

# Fwd: DCCC Convention Schedule & Leader Pelosi Op-Ed in The New York Times

Katie Lee

Thu 3/24/2016 4:27 PM

To: Stella Ross <ross@DCCC.ORG>; Lisa Presta <lisapresta@yahoo.com>; Missy Kurek <Kurek@DCCC.ORG>;

Calling her in an hour for card info

Katie Lee  
(703) 489-2391

Sent from my iPhone - Please excuse any mistakes.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jennifer Wilson <[jenwilson888@gmail.com](mailto:jenwilson888@gmail.com)>  
Date: March 24, 2016 at 6:19:05 PM EDT  
To: Katie Lee <[Lee@dccc.org](mailto:Lee@dccc.org)>  
Subject: Re: DCCC Convention Schedule & Leader Pelosi Op-Ed in The New York Times

Hi Katie,  
Checked my schedule, checked my bank account, ready to commit to the convention Speakers Cabinet package as we discussed. I'd like to put the 33.4 on my AmEx card. Will that work? Would prefer to do this via the phone, not in an email, so call me when you have a chance, or email me the person I should contact who can process the payment.

Thanks! I'm so excited! Met Hillary yesterday!

Jennifer Wilson

On Tue, Mar 22, 2016 at 11:26 AM, Katie Lee <[Lee@dccc.org](mailto:Lee@dccc.org)> wrote:

Good Afternoon,

**We are very excited to announce the DCCC's schedule of events for this July's Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia!** Special DCCC events include Leader Nancy Pelosi's Signature Concert Reception and a Political Briefing and Breakfast with Chairman Ben Ray Luján. More details, including special guests and performers, will be released in the coming months, but please don't hesitate to contact myself at [\(202\) 485-3430](tel:2024853430) for more information and to reserve your package today (or check on what you currently qualify for). **The attached Convention packages are valid through March 31<sup>st</sup>, so please consider a contribution to the DCCC before this deadline.**

I also wanted to make sure you saw two pieces published this week concerning House Democrats. The first is an **op-ed by Leader Pelosi in the *New York Times* today** concerning negligent House Republican funding measures. Please find that [below](#).

Also [below](#) is an article from ***Politico*** detailing House Republicans vulnerability when faced with the immediate prospect of a Donald Trump presidential nomination.

**Republican outside groups, turned off by the prospect of supporting Trump, have started an “intensified fundraising push to help defend the chamber.”**

**FROM POLITICO: HOUSE FIRE - "Trump puts GOP House majority in jeopardy"**

*- "Donald Trump is on the verge of two things once thought to be impossible: winning the Republican presidential nomination, and putting Republicans' historically large House majority in danger. ...The House GOP's leading indicators - its most vulnerable members, like Reps. Bob Dold and Carlos Curbelo - are already sounding the alarm against Trump and his rhetoric on women, Hispanics and other groups...The respected Cook Political Report downgraded Republicans' chances in 10 districts Friday."*

Thank you again and again for your continued support.

Best,

Katie

Katie Lee

West Finance Director

[202-485-3430](tel:202-485-3430) Direct

[703-489-2391](tel:703-489-2391) Cell

[Lee@dccc.org](mailto:Lee@dccc.org)

---

**Politico: [Trump puts GOP House majority in jeopardy](#)**

Democrats already have reasonable odds of flipping a dozen or so House seats.

By [THEODORIC MEYER](#) and [ELENA SCHNEIDER](#)

03/21/16 05:18 AM EDT



Democrats never dared dream they could challenge for the House this election. But Donald Trump has Republicans worried. | Getty

Donald Trump is on the verge of two things once thought to be impossible: winning the Republican presidential nomination, and putting Republicans' historically large House majority in danger.

Democrats have for the past year discussed the GOP's 30-seat majority as a long-term problem, solvable only by shrinking it over several successive elections. But Trump's remarkable rise in the GOP presidential race, and the backlash he has already provoked among the broader electorate, has suddenly raised the prospect of a large November wave against Trump and the Republicans who would share the ballot with him.

The House GOP's leading indicators — its most vulnerable members, like Reps. [Bob Dold](#) and [Carlos Curbelo](#) — are already sounding the alarm against Trump and his rhetoric on women, Hispanics and other groups. The party's outside groups are preparing an intensified fundraising push to help defend the chamber. The respected Cook Political Report downgraded Republicans' chances in 10 districts Friday. And though the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, which has been stung by overzealous predictions in past years, won't say outright that the majority is in play, the party is clearly thinking about it.

Democrats already had reasonable odds of flipping a dozen or so House seats. But DCCC Chairman [Ben Ray Lujan](#) recently started highlighting "reach" districts, like those of Rep. [John Mica](#) in Florida and Rep. [Steve Knight](#) in California, that broaden Democrats' target list enough to take back the chamber — if local candidates can take advantage of the sudden opportunity. Strategists are now turning their attention to moderate suburbs around Detroit, Minneapolis, Washington and other areas where House Democrats have struggled in recent years but Trump has already shown weakness.

"The idea that Trump is going to help with federal races is like putting lipstick on a pig," said Jason Roe, a California-based Republican strategist and a former spokesman for Marco Rubio's presidential campaign. "To deal with that, most people with a brain are cutting and running, redirecting resources from the presidential to keeping control of Senate and House."

A handful of particularly vulnerable Republicans have already distanced themselves from Trump.

"Donald Trump's hateful words towards wide swaths of our country, from women to Latinos to veterans and Muslims, disqualify him from ever serving as president of the United States, and he will never have my support or my vote," Dold [told Crain's Chicago Business](#) in a statement earlier this month. The Chicago-area Republican faces a tough battle to keep a Democratic-leaning seat.

But most House Republicans [are keeping quiet](#). "The hardest part about it is having to answer every time the nominee says something," one worried Republican consultant said. "If he says this, 'Do you agree?' If he says that, 'Do you agree?' That's the hardest part, not being able to control your race more. I think Trump makes every district tougher and every state tougher for a Republican."

To combat that, Republican outside groups are planning a bigger-than-expected fundraising push to protect the House. "I think there are lots of major donors who may have been budgeting to play in presidential who are now saying we need to make sure we keep the House and the Senate," said one top GOP strategist, who requested anonymity to describe private conversations.

Meanwhile, Democrats' flagship House super PAC, House Majority PAC, is setting aside resources to explore pickup opportunities in seats that haven't been competitive recently. "I believe the House could be in play if Donald Trump is the nominee," Alexandria Lapp, the super PAC's executive director and a longtime House strategist, wrote in an email.

The National Republican Congressional Committee remains bullish on maintaining its majority.

"House Democrats have been pushing their far-fetched fantasy about a wave election sweeping them to a majority every cycle since voters rejected Nancy Pelosi's speakership in 2010," said Katie Martin, the NRCC's communications director. "Here in the real world, a combination of their recruiting failures in races across the country and their own presidential candidate's abysmal favorability ratings ensure that Democrats' chances of winning the majority this year are as laughable as they were in 2012 and 2014."

One major question mark for Democrats is whether they have the candidates to ride a wave, if Trump generates one in their favor. With the filing deadline approaching in Colorado, Democrats still don't have a candidate in GOP Rep. [Scott Tipton](#)'s district, which the party targeted as recently as 2012 and which has a substantial Latino population. Bill Phillips, the Democratic candidate in Mica's Florida district — one of the seats Luján mentioned last week — had less than \$20,000 in his campaign account to start the year. In key California districts, Democrats face primaries and feuding between [local activists and the national party](#).

And both parties caution that, more than seven months from Election Day, they don't yet have enough polling data on individual House races to make a definitive judgment on the state of play. This summer, the effort will kick into high gear, after Republican delegates either nominate Trump at their convention in Cleveland or rally behind another candidate after multiple ballots.

Democrats need to net at least 30 seats to retake the House — the same number they flipped to take the majority in the 2006 wave. But John Lapp, who ran the DCCC's independent expenditure program that year, said this year was starting to feel familiar. "The type of people who came in during 2006 — when the campaign broke late and they were able to ride that wave — I think it's the early stages of that," Lapp said.

A potential path toward 30 seats, once thought to be outside the realm of possibility, has become clearer for Democrats in recent days. Luján ducked when asked whether Democrats could win back the House at a news conference last week, but his committee is actively preparing to compete in districts that weren't on the radar months ago. Democrats are targeting seats with "high numbers of independent voters, socially moderate voters, millennials and minority voters," Luján said.

"We are going to keep recruiting through filing day because of this momentum that has been created by Donald Trump," Luján added.

Luján specifically mentioned upstate New York's 22nd District, a battleground seat where moderate GOP Rep. [Richard Hanna](#) is retiring, and the fast-changing districts currently held by Mica in Florida and Knight in California. He also cited freshman Rep. [Mia Love](#), who represents a conservative Utah district, as a target.

National Democrats say they're also looking closely at a collection of socially moderate suburban districts. Many of them haven't elected Democrats in years, but they have high proportions of the college-educated voters who have been least keen on Trump in the GOP presidential primary so far. Democrats figure that lack of enthusiasm could weigh down Republican House members in November.

Those off-the-beaten-path GOP seats getting a new look include Rep. [Erik Paulsen](#)'s district in the Minneapolis suburbs, freshman Rep. [Dave Trott](#)'s seat outside Detroit, veteran Rep. [Dave Reichert](#)'s district outside Seattle, and Rep. [Kevin Yoder](#)'s district in Kansas City suburbs.

In Knight's California seat, a Simi Valley district north of Los Angeles that President Barack Obama carried in 2012, Democratic candidate Bryan Caforio says he wants voters to think of Trump and Knight as "two peas in a pod."

"Knight is the Donald Trump of Southern California. He's the man who, shortly after taking office, threatened to beat up a constituent," Caforio said, [citing an incident](#) in which Knight, baited by an anti-immigration protester, threatened to "drop [his] ass." "[Knight] has extreme immigration views, extreme family planning views, so I'm not surprised he hasn't condemned [Trump] because of those extreme positions he's taken."

Knight, like most other House Republicans, has stayed silent on Trump in recent weeks. But he [told](#) The Santa Clarita Valley Signal in January that he didn't think the billionaire "could win the general [election] in a million years."

"The hard part is that a lot of people are making absolute statements about what Trump is going to do for the electorate, but it's shown to be an incredibly unpredictable impact so far," said Matt Rexroad, a Republican consultant who's advising Knight.

GOP state Assemblywoman Claudia Tenney, who's running for the open upstate New York seat Democrats are eyeing, said she doesn't think Trump hurts her chances at all.

"I don't think Trump is going to be as negative as everyone thinks in this particular district," she said, adding that Trump's fierce criticism of trade deals resonates in a district that has lost manufacturing jobs. "Honestly, I meet a lot of Democrats who like him," she added.

Democrats believe they will gain more voters than they lose.

Asked on Wednesday whether the House is in play Luján said: "Look, I don't have a crystal ball. I don't know what's going to happen in November. But I'm optimistic about the environment that's being created today."

---

**New York Times**

# Shouldn't Congress Tell Us How We'll Pay for Tax Cuts?

March 22, 2016

By: Nancy Pelosi

THE long-endangered Republican Deficit Hawk is now extinct.

In December, the Republican Congress passed into law a huge permanent package of tax measures as part of the tax and spending deal. However, Republicans refused to pay for the legislation, thereby adding a thunderous \$2 trillion to the deficit over the next two decades, according to an estimate from the nonpartisan Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget.

As House Republicans prepare to leave for two weeks of recess without passing a budget for next year, the cost of this tax package is casting a long shadow over America's future, threatening to crowd out essential investments for hard-working American families.

Why isn't there a rule requiring lawmakers to account for new expenditures by finding offsetting budget cuts or revenue increases when Congress enacts them? In fact, there is.

In 1982, George Miller, a progressive Democratic Congressman from California, had a simple but transformative idea to cut the deficit and restore fiscal responsibility to Washington, which he called pay as you go, or paygo. Under this rule, when Congress wanted to pass a new law that would increase the deficit, legislators would have to pay for the cost with matching revenue increases or spending cuts.

Paygo still allows for flexibility in overall discretionary budget increases and in times of emergency, but it forces lawmakers to account for the impact of laws that have consequences for federal revenues or mandatory spending.

It's so common-sense that most people would be surprised it hasn't always been the rule. After all, even the priorities we want and need must still be paid for.

The historic Tax Reform Act of 1986 — sponsored by Democrats and signed into law by President Ronald Reagan — was grounded in this rule. In 1990, paygo was passed into law as part of the budget process under President George H.W. Bush. We extended it through the deficit-reduction and budget agreements of the Bill Clinton years, driving four consecutive annual budgets that were either in balance or in surplus.

Since then, however, Congress has often failed to do the hard, necessary work of paying for what it wants.

President Clinton handed his successor, President George W. Bush, a projected \$5.6 trillion 10-year budget surplus and eight years of economic expansion. But Republicans quickly abandoned any measure of fiscal responsibility and began a catastrophic spending spree. The completely unpaid-for tax cuts, including huge tax cuts for the wealthy in 2001, and two completely unpaid-for wars shattered our multitrillion-dollar surplus and created a vast new deficit.

After President Bush left the White House, President Obama was faced with a staggering \$1.2 trillion projected budget deficit in his first year alone, according to estimates from the Congressional Budget Office, and an economy in free fall. Under President Obama, the paygo law was reinstated, and we've brought the annual deficit from \$1.2 trillion when President Obama took office to \$544 billion today.

With the recent tax package, however, the Republican Congress is once again ignoring the inescapable mathematical realities behind budgeting. In advancing a narrow and expensive agenda largely benefiting special interests, they are adding trillions to the deficit in the coming decades.

Some of the provisions in the tax package have long been championed by Democrats — especially credits that help put more money in the pockets of hardworking but low-earning men and women, as well as working parents raising children or trying to send a child to college. Modernizing and making the research and development tax credit permanent is central to Democrats' Innovation Agenda.

However, Republicans used these provisions to advance hundreds of billions of dollars in unpaid-for tax breaks. Furthermore, Republicans refused to pay for any of the \$622 billion in tax extenders, good or bad. With the additional cost of debt service factored in, this permanent tax package will add well over \$800 billion to the deficit in the first 10 years alone — reaching \$2 trillion over 20 years.

In devising the December 2015 omnibus legislation to fund the government, Democrats were obliged to find money to cover every budget increase. We even scrounged on behalf of our 9/11 responders, coming up with the funds to cover \$7 billion in the budget for their lost wages and treatment of their illnesses from exposure to toxins at ground zero.

The Republican refusal to adhere to paygo is not only a problem for our deficit. It undermines the long-overdue passage of broad, bipartisan tax reform that would lower the corporate rate, close special interest loopholes, end costly tax expenditures, and ensure that all Americans are paying their fair share.

To contain and reduce the national debt, we must return to a simple rule called pay as you go. We can restore fairness to the tax code, delivering reforms that support bigger paychecks and better infrastructure for the American people, even as we honor basic fiscal realities.

*Nancy Pelosi is the Democratic leader in the 114th Congress.*