Talking Points for Mitch McConnell - Office Visit July 20, 2017

Synposis: Mitch McConnell embraces a view that there is a symbiotic relationship between the political and the wealthy class. He helps them through governmental actions, and they help him with contributions that allow him to maintain his power. Widely disliked by most people, McConnell does have a keen ability to raise lots of money for himself and others in his party through wealthy donors. In return, the GOP party facilitates the wishes of their wealthy backers. Cutting taxes that directly reduce the social responsibilities of the wealthiest and cutting regulations that harm others in society but cut costs and consequently increase business profits and returns for the wealthiest.

To sell these actions to voters, McConnell must convince the public he does all this for their benefit. He indicates lower taxes will increase their disposable income and allow for greater investments and economic growth. Cutting regulations will reduce business costs and allow businesses to increase jobs and job growth. Thus, he has talked about both a "war on coal" and a "war on the private sector". He has complained endlessly about "job killing regulations" and "over regulation". These GOP policies of course focus only on the costs to businesses, and ignore the benefits and consequences for society. McConnell's efforts deflect from the real question of "who primarily benefits" while ignoring the "social consequences" of lower taxes and fewer protections. Thus, the goal of these questions will be to force McConnell to address how far he is willing to reduce social protections, how he can ignore the benefits provided by protections and the consequences of his votes on his constituents. Finally, to try and get him to admit the primary beneficiary of his actions are not his constituents, but the supporters who fund his political war chest.

- #1. President Trump has claimed that 75% of regulations can be eliminated (maybe more) without affecting society negatively. Do you believe 3/4th or more of all regulations can be eliminated without having an appreciably negative impact on society? If not, what percent of all regulations do you feel are unnecessary?
- #2. You have voted to eliminate the Department of Labor fiduciary rule and state sponsored retirement plans for non-government employees, the Interior Department stream protection rule and its methane rule. The Department of Education Teacher Preparation and Accountability rule and the FCC broadband privacy rule among others. All these protections require considerable time from their initial proposal to their final publication and virtually all were shown to provide greater benefits to society than costs to business. Please justify your voting against protections for your constituents that primarily lower business costs by eliminating social benefits, responsibilities and obligations to others in society.
- #3. Fewer rules, regulations and protections, mean less trust and confidence in others we must deal with, and in the government upon we depend for ensuring our trust. *Describe why you think a loss of social trust due to the absence of protections will not negatively impact economic growth and expansion in the US.*
- #4. Your recent efforts to promote the Better Care Reconciliation Act is a prime example of legislation designed primarily by you and your colleagues to reward the wealthiest Americans with lower taxes and less social obligations at the expense of the majority of constituents in your own state. *Please explain to the hundreds of thousands of your constituents who would have lost their health care under your BCRA solution why their health care concerns are less relevant than allowing the wealthiest Americans to keep even more of their very large annual incomes.*