

6,700 flight delays every day this summer. I repeat, every day, 6,700 delayed flights. By comparison, the worst travel day of last year, 2012, was about 3,000 flights being delayed. That was after severe thunderstorms accompanied by 2-inch hail and a 90-mile-an-hour wind that ripped across the Midwest and Northeast and a tornado touched down in New York. That caused 3,000 flight delays. On any day this sequestration kicks in, it will be double that. Travelers were stranded at airports across the country during that very bad day we had last year. Some were stranded for days. It is going to be worse than that. As I said, this summer more than twice that number of flights will be delayed every single day.

While major airports such as LaGuardia in New York and O'Hare in Chicago will see the worst delays, furloughs will impact every airport in the Nation. So whether Americans are traveling to Orlando, Las Vegas, San Diego or Seattle, Maine or Montana, they should expect a long wait for a flight.

This will make air travel frustrating, to say the least. It is bad enough now. It will be worse. It will be time-consuming for millions of Americans, whether taking the family to see the Grand Canyon or heading to New York for business. It will cover everything. At airports across the country, millions of Americans who fly will get their first taste of the pain of sequestration.

Many Americans have been feeling that pain for weeks. For example, in Rockland, ME, Meals on Wheels, a wonderful program, been in existence for a long time, decades—it is for people who are old and homebound. They bring them a meal, one meal a day, a hot meal. In Rockland, ME, Meals on Wheels has a waiting list for the first time in 16 years.

It is going to affect Meals on Wheels Programs all over the country. They have literally cut the size of meals they serve to the elderly in order to save money. Not only are they going to be able to do less meals, but those they serve are going to be smaller. This is the only meal most of these seniors get every day. They may have a bowl of cereal, eat a piece of toast. But as far as a hot meal, this is it.

In Fayetteville, AR, a Head Start Program will close 13 days early this spring, leaving hundreds of needy children without anywhere to go and without nutritious meals to eat. Nationwide, more than 70,000 little boys and girls will be kicked off Head Start, a program for low-income children who could not afford preschool.

As the name Head Start says, the purpose of it is for these tiny little boys and girls to have preschool programs so they can learn to start to understand what it means to read, to understand what education is all about. Economically burdened little kids, because of this program, who want to get a head start will not be able to; these programs will be savaged.

At Duke University, just one program out of hundreds at the School of Medicine program will have 50 people laid off. These are people doing some of the most important research there is in the world to cure diseases such as Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, diabetes. All over the country, thousands of these researchers will be furloughed or they will be laid off.

The U.S. military has cut tuition assistance for soldiers and eliminated a program helping more than 100,000 homeless veterans get off the street and back on their feet. The U.S. Air Force has grounded one-third of its fighter jets and bombers because of the across-the-board cuts. These programs are to train our military so in a time of crisis they can be prepared. They cannot be prepared if they cannot practice. More than 1 million Federal workers, including hundreds of thousands of Defense Department employees, are preparing to take forced furlough days. This is not only a hardship for individual families, it is also a threat to our national economy and our national security.

In national parks across the Nation—Great Basin in Nevada, Bryce Canyon, UT, Mount Desert Island, thousands of miles away from those two places in Maine—employees face reduced hours, and closure will affect thousands of travelers.

Long delays at the airport will not be the only damper on summer vacation travel. For every person who loses work because of this sequestration, that is less they can buy to help people who are selling goods and services. We cannot and we should not only address the FAA cuts. As important as they are, we should look at the whole spectrum. We cannot ignore the sequester's overall effect on Americans and on programs that help small businesses grow, fund crucial medical research, and keep our children and seniors safe.

While airport delays are costly and frustrating, some would say they are not as severe as the pain of a senior citizen missing a meal, the only hot meal they would get that day, or veterans going without a roof over their head at night.

Families and businesses in every State in the Nation, in red States and blue States, are at risk because of these haphazard cuts. That is what they are. But Congress has the power to reverse these self-inflicted wounds without adding 1 penny to the deficit. We are winding down the war in Afghanistan, and Iraq has been wound down significantly. We have provided the money. The money is there. We have not spent it. We do not need to. We can use those savings from wrapping up two wars to avoid the full brunt of the sequester's arbitrary cuts. The Congressional Budget Office said that would score, that money is available, money we could use. Funding for the operations in Iraq and Afghanistan is kept in the so-called Overseas Contingency Operations Account. That is

what it is called. Since the worst of the sequester cuts is creating an emergency situation, we should consider using these funds to offset their impact. These really are emergencies. We should do it. I am not proposing to use these funds to offset the entire sequester, but Congress has the power to avert the most painful and senseless of the sequester's cuts using these monies.

Twenty-eight Republicans in the Senate and 174 Republicans in the House voted to oppose these sequester haphazard cuts. If those same Republicans will work with Democrats, we could act now to protect families, businesses, ensure our national defense, and save Americans millions of hours spent waiting at the airport.

I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 5:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

#### MARKETPLACE FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. DURBIN. I note Senator ENZI is on the floor. At 5:30 p.m. we are voting on a measure which will affect literally millions of Americans. I will provide some illustration about this bill.

A close friend of mine is the mayor of Normal, IL. His name is Chris Koos, and he is a local businessman. His business sells bicycles, running shoes, running paraphernalia, and equipment. Chris has a good business and has done well.

He told me that in the last 10 or 20 years things have changed. He said, It is not unusual for someone to come into my store, ask to see a pair of running shoes, try them on, look at the different colors, and then leave without buying anything. Sometimes they will come back several weeks later with shoes and they will say: Chris, we bought these over the Internet, and they are not what we thought they would be; what can we do about it?

This is called "showrooming" and is happening more and more. Why would somebody try on the shoes, not purchase them, and then go to the Internet? In many instances, it is because many Internet retailers do not collect sales tax. In my State, this means 9 or 10 percent less cost to purchase an item over the Internet.

This is the reality for most companies. Some companies, Internet retailers, collect a sales tax. I recently purchased a book on Amazon, and they

charged the sales tax, which is appropriate in Illinois. Most companies do not collect the sales tax.

I wish to tell another side of this story. When we are dealing with the collection of this sales tax, we are dealing with existing law. Forty-six States in America have sales tax. The States that do not are Montana, Oregon, New Hampshire, and Delaware. Every other State has either a sales tax or what they call a use tax, and the State law requires all of us living in those States to pay a sales tax on Internet purchases even if the seller didn't charge it.

In my State, people are supposed to pay it when they file their annual State income tax return. There is a line: How much do you owe for Illinois sales tax that should have been paid on remote purchases or online purchases? It is really an honor system is what it comes down to. Though there is a legal obligation, there is no direct enforcement. It turns out that only 1 out of 20 people in Illinois even know this exists. So only 5 percent of the population know.

As I mentioned several times, a few years ago my bookkeeper said—when she was doing our taxes—Senator, do you want to pay the sales tax you owe? I said: I think I do. I did, and we have ever since. But most people aren't aware of it.

So here we have businesses all around America, on Main Streets and in shopping malls, collecting sales tax on the things they sell and competing with Internet retailers who do not collect the sales tax. Secondly, we have individuals with an obligation to pay the sales tax, but most of them do not. So the bill we will consider at 5:30 this afternoon is going to try to resolve this problem.

Over 20 years ago the U.S. Supreme Court said: Congress, you have to fix this. We are not going to fix it by court decision. The States can't fix it because it affects retailers from all around the United States. In the Quill decision before the Supreme Court, they said: Congress, you have to fix it.

It was about that time my colleague, Senator ENZI of Wyoming, teamed up with Senator Byron Dorgan of North Dakota to fix it. Many years have passed and here we are today on the floor of the Senate trying to finally resolve this issue. We have reached a good place. I think we have a reasonable approach to it, and this is what it says: States have to decide to opt in to our system. In other words, no mandate from the Federal Government.

If States opt in to what we propose in this legislation, here is what it means. It means States will be willing to provide the Internet retailers with the software program so that when they sell into the State of Illinois and the purchaser gives the home address, the program will automatically calculate how much sales tax should be collected on the sale. This is free to the retailers, and it allows them to collect the

sales tax and then remit the sales tax to the State of Illinois or the other States in which they are selling.

We have worked with businesses—Internet businesses, obviously—and have the support of amazon.com, the largest Internet retailer. For years they have been fighting this battle State by State. As I said, they are now in Illinois collecting sales tax on things they sell over the Internet. But they have decided, and many others as well, it is time to put an end to these statewide court battles, statewide legislative battles, and finally have a national program to collect the sales tax.

What it means is a lot of money for the States and localities. My State is struggling with terrible budget problems. We are in the red with deficits, our pension system is in trouble, and money that should be collected for sales tax is not being collected. So what we are doing with this bill is allowing States to have Internet retailers selling in those States to collect the sales tax.

Several of my colleagues will come to the floor to oppose this, and they have one thing in common. Most of them—I think virtually all of them—live in States that don't have a sales tax. So what about those States? If we say Internet retailers can collect a sales tax, what does that mean in the State of Montana, for example? It means nothing changes for the people living in Montana. If there is no State sales tax they have to pay in their stores, this bill is not going to impose any new sales tax on the people of Montana.

So, then, why are the Senators from Montana opposing it? They are arguing their Internet retailers should not have to collect a sales tax for sales made in States that do have a sales tax. My answer to that is, if you wanted to do business in Illinois—if you wanted to move your shoe store to Illinois—you would have to follow Illinois law; you would have to play by Illinois rules—you would have to pay your property tax and collect the sales tax. That is accepted. If you want to do business in our State or any other State, those are the rules. We think the same thing should apply when it comes to Internet sales.

If a Montana Internet retailer, a State with no sales tax—Montana has no sales tax—wants to sell in Illinois, we are saying they need to collect money from the Illinois purchaser—not from the Montana purchaser but from the Illinois purchaser—for the sales tax and remit that back to the State of Illinois. If they do not want to do that or sell in Illinois or any State with a sales tax, that is their right. But if they do, for the privilege of selling in our State, we are saying they will pay this sales tax.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a column from last week, April 21, from the Wall Street Journal, entitled "Tax Internet Sales, Stimulate Growth."

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 17, 2013]

#### TAX INTERNET SALES, STIMULATE GROWTH

(By Arthur B. Laffer)

States can cut their income-tax rates if Web vendors collect the sales taxes that are legally due.

Reinvigorating the economy should be priority No. 1 for federal and state leaders. After enjoying an average growth rate above 3.5% per year between 1960 and 1999, Americans have had to make do with less than one-half that pace since 2000.

The consequences are already dramatic and will become even more so over time. Overall we are 20% poorer today than we would be had the pre-2000 growth rate persisted. All other things being equal, less national income also means federal and state fiscal problems are more intractable.

At the state level, there are reforms that can alleviate the problems associated with declining sales-tax bases and, at the same time, allow the states to move closer to a pro-growth tax system. One such reform would be to have Internet sellers collect the sales taxes that are owed by in-state consumers when they purchase goods over the Web.

So-called e-fairness legislation addresses the inequitable treatment of retailers based on whether they are located in-state (either a traditional brick-and-mortar store or an Internet retailer with a physical presence in the state) or out of state (again as a brick-and-mortar establishment or on the Internet).

In-state retailers collect sales taxes at the time of purchase. When residents purchase from retailers out of state (including over the Internet) they are supposed to report these purchases and pay the sales taxes owed—which are typically referred to as a "use tax." As you can imagine, few people do.

The result is to narrow a state's sales-tax base. It also leads to several inefficiencies that, on net, diminish potential job and economic growth.

Exempting Internet purchases from the sales tax naturally encourages consumers to buy goods over the Web; worse, the exemption incentivizes consumers to use in-state retailers as a showroom before they do so. This increases in-state retailers' overall costs and reduces their overall productivity.

The exemption of Internet and out-of-state retailers from collecting state sales taxes reduced state revenues by \$23.3 billion in 2012 alone, according to an estimate by the National Conference of State Legislatures. The absence of these revenues has not served to put a lid on state-government spending. Instead, it has led to higher marginal rates in the 43 states that levy income taxes.

Therefore—as with any pro-growth tax reform—the sales tax base in the states should be broadened by treating Internet retailers similarly to in-state retailers, and the marginal income-tax rate should be reduced such that the total static revenue collected by the state government is held constant.

One difficulty in imposing an Internet sales tax is the existence of dozens, if not hundreds, of sales-tax jurisdictions in many states, often with the tax rates and tax classification of the same goods varying by jurisdiction. It is overly burdensome to task companies with remitting sales taxes to more than 9,500 such tax jurisdictions. Instead, each state should set up a single sales-tax system, making compliance as easy as possible for today's modern sellers.

Addressing e-fairness from a pro-growth perspective creates several benefits for the

economy. A gross inequity is addressed—all retailers would be treated equally under state law. It also provides states with the opportunity to make their tax systems more efficient and better aligned toward economic growth, as well as improve the productivity of local retailers.

The principle of levying the lowest possible tax rate on the broadest possible tax base is the way to improve the incentives to work, save and produce—which are necessary to reinvigorate the American economy and cope with the nation's fiscal problems. Properly addressing the problem of e-fairness on the state level is a small, but important, step toward achieving this goal.

Mr. DURBIN. There are differences of opinion about this, but here are several things we should make clear. This is not a new tax. The bill we have before us will not create any new tax. It creates a method for compliance or collection of an existing tax.

Secondly, it is only fair to the businesses across America—the entrepreneurs who open their stores every morning and do business. If they are required to collect a sales tax on their sales, it is only fair those who are competing with them do the same.

Also, I might add, it is naive to believe the Internet retailers are selling into States and not using the benefits of the State. When I buy a book on Amazon or wherever it happens to be, ultimately it may be delivered by UPS, for example. That UPS truck is going to use the streets of Chicago and the streets of Springfield. It will use all the basic infrastructure of the cities and the State of Illinois to deliver its product. I don't think it is unreasonable they collect taxes to support the State and the city where they are making their sales, and that is what this is about.

I also note, Mr. President, that today the White House announced the President supports this bill to give States the authority to collect sales tax from Internet retailers. The White House spokesman said: The Senate bill will level the playing field for small businesses and brick-and-mortar retailers undercut by online retailers. Governors and mayors are overwhelmingly in support of this bill. They told the White House the bill is needed. The States are losing out on revenues that can go to education, law enforcement, infrastructure investments, and health care.

We have a wide array of businesses supporting this. You can imagine. Retailers large and small are supporting it. Labor unions are supporting it as well. Business and labor have come together. They believe this is only a matter of fairness.

I want to thank my colleague, Senator ENZI of Wyoming—and then I will yield the floor for him—for his leadership, persistence, and patience on this issue. It has been a long time. Senator ENZI was in the retail business before he came to the Senate, and he was one of the earliest supporters of this measure. When Senator Dorgan retired, I asked MIKE if I could join him in this effort, and he has been a terrific ally.

At this point, Mr. President, I yield the floor for my colleague and friend from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. I thank the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, for his interest and participation in this issue, his ability to explain it, and for the way he has brought a lot of people along in helping out with this bill. He has been a great replacement, and we have made more progress than we ever have in the other 14 years of working on the bill. So I thank him for that and for his ability to explain things so clearly.

I also want to thank Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER who helped us change this bill in the last year from about an 80-page bill to an 11-page bill and made it States rights. As Senator DURBIN so eloquently explained, this takes action by the States. This is just to clear up the Quill case that made it a little confusing about whether they could charge a tax and then challenged Congress to fix the problem.

The solution Senator ALEXANDER came up with condensed the bill considerably and made it a lot easier. But it made it a States rights issue so that the States have to take some action.

I thank Senator HEITKAMP as well. She is brandnew to the bill but has more years of experience than anybody because she was a part of the Quill case when it came up. She was representing North Dakota in that case, and that is the other side of the case. She can explain the intricacies of that and the challenge we were given, and the number of reasons why it didn't happen earlier.

One of the reasons is that 20 years ago the Internet was in its infancy and nobody knew what its capabilities were going to be. Most people didn't even know it was out there. That has changed over quite a period of time to where it is now one of the handy tools everybody uses. We have come to recognize there are apps that are available that will answer any question and sources of information that will provide us with what we need to know on virtually any subject. I think that has probably put some encyclopedias out of business, but it has made information more readily available, and it has made products available that people didn't have the availability of before. But it is creating a bit of a dilemma that marketplace fairness straightens out.

Today we are scheduled to vote on the motion to proceed to the bill at 5:30, and I do strongly encourage my colleagues to vote yes. Let me explain why.

As Senator DURBIN said, I have been working on this sales tax fairness issue since joining the Senate in 1997, and I may have a unique perspective on the dozens of proposals that have been introduced. For instance, I have worked sales tax from a number of different aspects. I worked the sales tax issue when I was in the Wyoming Legislature. I know when our legislators were

considering sales tax they didn't intend to discriminate against the people in the communities, those who hire the people in the communities and pay the property tax to the communities and participate in all of the community events. They definitely didn't anticipate they were going to be the source where people could come in and feel and touch and try on the product and then check the bar code with their cell phone—one of the advances made possible now through Internet use—and then find out if there is a lower price, which is usually based on no sales tax.

I am pleased some businesses across the Nation have said that isn't fair and have decided to voluntarily do the sales tax. And there is no problem with them doing that.

I have also been a retailer, so I know that feeling. My wife and I had a shoe store, so I know the feeling, again, the Senator from Illinois described, of people coming in, trying it on, feeling it, making sure it is the right size and then checking to see where else it is available. It is discouraging when the sales tax is the difference. So as a former small business owner, I believe it is important to level that playing field for all retailers—the in-store, the catalogue, and the online—so an outdated rule for sales tax collection doesn't adversely impact particularly small businesses and Main Street retailers.

I know a lot of year books would never be published if it wasn't for the support of some of the local businesses. Thousands of these local businesses are forced to do business at a competitive disadvantage because they have to collect a sales tax or a use tax and remote sellers don't. In some States that can mean a 5- to 10-percent price disadvantage. We should not be subsidizing some taxpayers at the expense of others. All businesses and their retail sales should be treated equally.

As a former mayor, I know sales taxes go to State and local governments to bring in needed revenue for maintaining schools, fixing our roads, supporting law enforcement, fire protection, those first responders we are always so conscious of, particularly today and through this last week. If Congress fails to authorize States to collect tax on remote sales, and electronic commerce continues to grow, we are implicitly blessing a situation where States will be forced to raise other taxes, such as income and property taxes, to offset the growing loss of sales tax revenue. Do we want that to happen? I don't think so. We need to promote economic growth, not stifle it.

As the Supreme Court identified in the Quill v. North Dakota decision in 1992, the Quill decision challenged Congress to come up with a better system, a way of making it fair. The local brick-and-mortar retailers collect sales taxes, while many online and catalog retailers are exempt from collecting the same tax as a result of that case, and that was based on whether they

had a nexus. The nexus has changed dramatically since that time. That used to be where you would go and actually pick up something, but now it is where you can order something and that can be even moved around the country virtually at will. So we designated some States as not having to do it. Web sites could be set up in that State for people to sell through from anywhere.

So the taxes need to be collected. It needs to be fair, and right now it is not only fundamentally unfair to Main Street retailers, but it is costing States and localities billions in lost revenue. The Supreme Court invited Congress to address this issue, and we stalled. We know that early on the Internet was new, but now everything is done on the Internet. So now is the time for Congress to act.

Many Americans don't realize that when they buy something online or order something from the catalog of a business outside their own State, they still owe the sales tax. I know from being a legislator that was part of what we put in place. There is a form in Wyoming that you can fill out and pay your tax. It is pretty hard to keep track of, particularly on smaller items, but it ought to be easier on big items. And I do know there are about three people who comply with that.

For over a decade Congress has been debating how to best allow States to collect sales tax from the online retailers in a way that puts Main Street businesses on a level playing field with the online retailers. So on February 14, 2013, the bicameral—House and Senate—and bipartisan—Republicans and Democrats—put together the Marketplace Fairness Act that was introduced to close that 20-year loophole that distorts the American marketplace by picking winners and losers, by subsidizing some businesses at the expense of other businesses and subsidizing some taxpayers at the expense of other taxpayers. All businesses in retail sales and all consumers and their purchases should be treated equally.

The bill also empowers States to make the decision themselves. This is not Congress saying what has to be done or whether they collect them. If they choose to collect already existing sales taxes on all online purchases regardless of whether the sale was online or in-store, States will be able to if this bill passes. If they want to keep things the way they are, that is the State's choice. That is why this bill is the States rights bill.

The Marketplace Fairness Act does not tax Internet use, it does not tax Internet services, and it does not raise taxes. It gives States the right to collect what is owed by the purchasing individuals. Some argue that the bill is a disguise to create taxes. It is not. Consumers are already supposed to pay taxes and use taxes in most States for purchases made over the phone, by mail, or by way of the Internet.

Mr. President, in a couple of minutes we are going to have a moment of silence for the tragic events that hap-

pened. I yield the floor for the time to be able to do that.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for a moment of silence and that the Senator from Wyoming then be again recognized.

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

#### MOMENT OF SILENCE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a moment of silence to honor the victims of the bombings in Boston, MA.

(Moment of silence.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish to thank the leader for that moment of silence. I hope everybody in America will keep the people of Boston—particularly those who were injured or lost family members and those who saw the pain and the tragedy—in their prayers. I hope we would keep all the people across America who witnessed that on television or saw the replays of it on television in our prayers, and I hope the recovery will bring Americans together, as happened on 9/11.

#### MARKETPLACE FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. ENZI. To return to the discussion on marketplace fairness, I mentioned that most consumers are aware they are supposed to pay the tax on purchases that the retailer does not choose to collect at the time of the purchase, so I would like to provide some highlights of what the Marketplace Fairness Act actually accomplishes.

The bill gives the States the right to decide to collect or not collect taxes that are already owed. The legislation would simplify and streamline the country's more than 9,000 diverse State tax jurisdictions and provide 2 options by which States could begin collecting sales taxes from online and catalog purchases.

The bill also carves out small businesses so that they won't be adversely affected by the new law by exempting businesses with less than \$1 million in online or out-of-State sales from the collection requirements until they have had a year in which they have had more than \$1 million worth of sales. This small business exemption will protect small merchants and give new businesses time to get started. As has been mentioned, when they meet that level, then they have to be provided with a program that will do the calculations for them, provide for submitting the revenues, and also hold them harmless for any errors there might be in the program.

So don't let the critics get away with saying this type of simplification can't be done. The different tax rates and jurisdictions are no problem for today's software programs. When you order something online, you have to put in your ZIP Code. The ZIP Code will tell what the tax is from whatever jurisdiction.

As a former mayor and State legislator, I strongly favor allowing States

the authority to require sales and use tax collection from retailers on all sales for each State that chooses to do so. We need to implement a plan that will allow States to collect revenue using mechanisms already approved by their local leaders. We need to allow States the ability to collect the sales taxes they already require.

If enacted, it would provide approximately \$23 billion in fiscal relief for States for which Congress does not have to find an offset. This will give States less of an excuse to come knocking at the Federal door for handouts and will reduce the problem of federally attached strings.

A lot of people don't realize that the Federal Government is out of money, and that is shown by what was done through the sequester because the Federal Government usually pays property tax to States and localities that have Federal property. That amount has never been equal to what other people would be paying in their property taxes, but it has been a show of good faith that they recognize that with the government there, there is a loss of revenue and that the Federal Government should do something. So there is a tax level they have been paying. It hasn't gone up much and it hasn't gone down much until this year. Then, as part of the sequester, they decided they would hold 5.3 percent from all the States and all the local governments. That is called payment in lieu of taxes, and that is one way the States and the counties have lost money and a way they are going to have to make up for it if that continues. But there is also the possibility that the revenue they take in from this can reduce something like property taxes.

For many years I have worked with all the interested parties to find a mutually agreeable legislative package to introduce and ultimately enact into public law. This year Senators DURBIN, ALEXANDER, HEITKAMP, and I worked together with 25 of our bipartisan Senate colleagues to produce a bill that assists sellers and State and local governments to simplify taxes and use collection and administration. We are working with our House supporters—Representatives STEVE WOMACK, JACKIE SPEIER, PETER WELCH, and JOHN CONYERS—and have found common ground on this important issue to move forward with a bipartisan, bicameral bill in this Congress. I wish to publicly commend all of my Senate and House colleagues in taking a leadership role and working on this important issue.

The Marketplace Fairness Act is about States rights, and it is about fairness on the budget bill. We had a vote on this, and I was very pleased that 75 of the 100 Senators voted in favor of making the marketplace fair. So I strongly encourage my colleagues to vote for the motion to proceed on S. 743, the Marketplace Fairness Act, tonight at 5:30 when we have that vote. I