

Senate proceed to votes on the amendments in the order listed; that no second-degree amendments be in order to any of the amendments prior to the votes; that no motions to commit the bill be in order; that upon disposition of the Toomey amendment, the bill be read a third time, as amended, if amended, and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill, as amended, if amended; further, that the Secretary be authorized to make technical changes to amendments if necessary to allow for proper page and line number alignment; further, that the amendments and the votes on passage be subject to a 60-vote threshold; finally, if the bill is passed, the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 108, which was received from the House and is at the desk; that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 4719

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask that we now proceed to H.R. 4719. It is my understanding it is due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for a second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4719) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory.

Mr. REID. I would object to any further proceedings on this matter.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

INVERSION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, more than a century ago, a small drugstore opened for business in Barrett's Hotel in Chicago, IL. The pharmacist, not yet 30 years old, and a veteran of the Spanish-American War, borrowed \$6,000 to open this drugstore. His name was Charles Walgreen. This was his first store but certainly not his last. As his chain grew, the pharmacies became a fixture in American culture—you know, the vintage image of a soda fountain, milk shakes, a drugstore counter. They would mix their own drugs to give pain medication and other products to people who came in that drugstore. This is how Walgreen's started.

Now, 113 years later, the Walgreen family no longer heads the company. But there are over 8,200 Walgreen's drugstores around the country. They still bear the Walgreen name. That company Charles Walgreen started is reportedly strongly considering a renunciation of its American citizenship

and a move to Switzerland. Why? To avoid paying their fair share of taxes.

Reestablished as a foreign corporation, Walgreen's would pay a smaller share of taxes. This practice is called "inversion." It is a tax trick, a loophole. Of course, Walgreen's will not actually move to Switzerland. Instead, they plan to acquire a European company and officially make Switzerland home to their new headquarters, but in reality they will stay in Chicago right where they are now. That is because Walgreen's does not want to actually leave America. Why would they? Why would they want to leave America? We have the most sophisticated workforce in the world. Why would they give that up? America has the infrastructure that, although in need of updates, is still the most extensive in the world. It provides Walgreen's with the roads and transportation it needs to supply its stores. Why would Walgreen's give that up?

Why would they give up the fact that we have a legal system we can trust, that enforces business contracts and upholds intellectual property protections they need? They would not turn their heads and walk away from that. America has a Medicare system that pays for seniors to buy pharmaceuticals at Walgreen's. I am sure Walgreen's will not be turning away that cash; that is what it is, cash.

Let's not forget that Americans enjoy a law enforcement apparatus that protects the company's assets. Why would Walgreen's want to give that up? Our military, which is second to none, will continue to protect the country where all of those Walgreen's stores are located. I am sure Walgreen's would not want to give that up. Not to mention the fact that America is a pretty good place to live.

So why would Walgreen's executives ever want to move their families across the world? That would be foolish, would it not? Walgreen's leadership will probably stay right where they are now in their fancy homes in America. While they remain here, Walgreen's will still expect American tax credits, even as it dodges as much as \$4 billion over the next 5 years in taxes. That is what inversion is all about.

Essentially what Walgreen's is saying is we love America. We love being in America. But we are not going to pay for it. The dictionary defines the word "exploitation" as "the fact of making use of a situation to gain unfair advantage." What a perfect explanation of what Walgreen's is going to do. What the Walgreen's company is doing sure seems like exploitation to me. After all, this is a corporation that made \$16.7 billion from Medicare and Medicaid last year—\$16.7 billion—and they are going to move overseas.

But, sadly, Walgreen's is not the only corporation jumping ship. Major American companies such as Medtronic and others have already announced plans to give up their corporate citizenship. Who will be next? A decade ago, the

senior Senator from Iowa warned of "unpatriotic companies that dash stash their cash." Now we are seeing this dash-and-stash scheme become common practice for corporations that do not want to pay their fair share of taxes.

In fact, the two largest transactions to move American companies overseas in history have taken place within the last month. When these companies reincorporate overseas, it is, simply put, unfair. It is unfair to the American taxpayer, to the American Government, and to many companies that refuse to engage in this deceptive practice.

Why should other American pharmacy chains such as CVS Caremark and Rite Aid be disadvantaged because Walgreen's balks at paying its fair share of taxes? To uphold our free enterprise system and ensure that American businesses are competing on a level playing field, Congress must close this loophole.

We have a new chairman of the Finance Committee. The senior Senator from Oregon is known to be a man who is fair and will make sure that people do not take advantage of others. He has made a commitment to me and anyone who will listen to him that this must change. It is going to start with the Finance Committee and start very soon. I have been encouraged by his statements. He has indicated he will work to close this loophole for these runaway companies.

The chairman of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, the senior Senator from Michigan, has also been leading on this issue. He has been talking about it for a long time. Two strong leaders—the senior Senator from Michigan, the senior Senator from Oregon—have locked arms and are going to do something about this.

Senator LEVIN's legislation, the Stop Corporate Inversion Act, puts a 2-year moratorium on inversions by U.S. companies. This moratorium will give Congress time to thoroughly and thoughtfully consider the issue. I do not need a lot more thought on it. I am ready to roll on this one. We need to get this done, and quickly. I will settle for the 2 years. I am frankly, though, open to all ideas. What I am not open to is the idea that this corporate exploitation of the American taxpayer is somehow acceptable, because it is not.

Today we are considering legislation that would amend the U.S. Tax Code to fight outsourcing, protect American jobs, and create job creation within our borders. The Bring Jobs Home Act, which ends senseless tax breaks for outsourcers, will offer companies a 20-percent tax credit to help with the cost of moving jobs back to America. Much like the Bring Jobs Home Act, ending this corporate citizenship scam will encourage American companies to pay their fair share. It will also let corporations know that cheating the American people with their tax trick is not a viable business plan.

Benjamin Franklin said this: "Tricks and treachery are the practice of fools, who have not wits enough to be honest." If corporations want to leave America, it is their right. But American taxpayers should not be forced to foot the bill when U.S. companies want all the benefits of commerce in this country without having to pay their fair share.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Republicans control the time from 3:30 to 4:30 today, and the majority control the time from 4:30 to 5:30 today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

SECURING THE BORDER

Mr. MCCONNELL. There is a lot we can get done in Washington when Democrats are willing to put the politics aside and work together for bipartisan results.

We saw an example of that yesterday when the President signed a bipartisan workforce training bill into law, legislation I and others proudly supported. Unfortunately, though, we have rarely seen such bipartisanship from Washington Democrats these days. Working toward bipartisan solutions and helping the middle class, it always seems like such a chore for them. Just look at what President Obama and the majority leader have planned for the coming days.

The President is off campaigning for a workforce training bill he already signed. It makes no sense, but this is a man who just can't stop campaigning. And apparently the majority leader is suffering from a similar condition. He is busy turning the Senate into a campaign studio. He wants to spend more of the Senate's time on a designed-to-fail campaign bill that he loves to trot out before every national election. We have seen this proposal a couple of years ago before the election. Then, of course, for political purposes they pray that it will fail.

Look, this is time that would be a lot better spent helping the middle-class families who are struggling in our country. Instead of worrying about design-to-fail legislation, we could be addressing things like the highway bill, which already passed the Republican-led House with massive bipartisan support, or addressing the humanitarian crisis on the southern border. That is where our focus should be. That is what the American people expect.

The Border Patrol estimates that as many as 90,000 unaccompanied children

will have crossed our border by fall. It is a dangerous journey to the border, and many have suffered heartbreaking treatment and abuse. That is why anyone who wants to help these children should be working overtime to spare them from this journey.

A few weeks ago the President made some modest policy recommendations that should be a part of any legislation that deals with this crisis. Unfortunately, the far left objected and the President has since wobbled.

That has led to top Democrats in Congress balking at even the most modest of reforms. They all seem to prefer a blank check that would preserve the status quo instead, and the President will barely lift a finger to encourage his own party to support these simple reforms.

Remember, now, this is the same President who keeps telling us about this mythical phone he plans to use. So what we are saying is use it. Call the Members of your own party who object to what you said you wanted and what we all know is needed.

Call the leadership of your party in the Senate who, despite the footage on the evening news, pronounced our southern border to be secure. Get them to support the policies that you told us would address this crisis. Frankly, it would be a much better use of your time than campaigning for a workforce bill you have already signed. Sending these children all over the country for indeterminate periods of time just isn't an answer.

We need to humanely return them to their homes as soon as possible, and President Obama needs to show some leadership to help us get a long-term credible plan in place to do just that. He owes the country at least that much.

Remember, news reports suggest the President could have intervened long ago to address this problem before it turned into a full-blown humanitarian crisis. But according to the Washington Post, he prioritized politics over helping these children.

The paper cited a Congresswoman who admitted that her fellow Democrats recognized the urgency of this crisis, but they kept mostly silent because they didn't want to cause problems for the administration's political priorities in Congress.

Democrats didn't want others to be able to point out that the President's policies had failed. It is really quite shameful. The Post also cited one source who said the administration staff was concerned about the growing number of children, but that they too were effectively overruled by White House political concerns.

Here is what the source said:

Was the White House told there were huge flows of Central Americans coming? Of course they were told. A lot of times. . . . Was there a general lack of interest and focus on the legislation? Yes, that's where the focus was.

In short, it appears the Obama administration knew about this problem

a long time ago, did almost nothing, and the country is now faced with this crisis.

So the President needs to get serious about this—not some other time—now.

What we are saying is cut out the campaigning, tell your party's leadership in the Senate to get serious and work with Members of both parties to get this addressed.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

BRING JOBS HOME ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 453, S. 2569, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 453, S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 11 a.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I listened carefully as the Republican leader came to the floor to talk about the Senate issues, and he failed to mention this issue, S. 2569, which we will be voting on in 1 hour and 10 minutes. In fact, we have listened carefully. There has not been a single Republican Senator who has come to the floor to literally debate this issue or to disagree with this bill. What is this measure that is the source of such a mystery on the floor of the Senate?

Well, it is an effort by Senator JOHN WALSH of Montana and Senator DEBBIE STABENOW of Michigan to bring good-paying manufacturing and other jobs back home to America. Wouldn't you think that would be worth a comment from the Republican leader or perhaps from one of the Republican Senators? I hope it means they are going to join us in a bipartisan effort in a little over 1 hour to bring this measure to the floor.

What does it say? Simple. We will give a tax break to companies that bring jobs home from overseas. We will reduce the current tax incentives for companies to ship American jobs overseas. There it is—straightforward, clear—bring the jobs home.

I would think this would be so bipartisan it would get a unanimous vote at 11 o'clock. But the fact is, despite the support of all Democratic Senators, we are still struggling to find five Republicans who will join us so we can move to this measure and do something in the Tax Code to help bring American jobs back home instead of shipping them overseas.