

enforcement officers who ran toward, not away from, the gunfire and who are now nursing various wounds. Here in Washington, we will continue to monitor the situation. We will continue to keep the fallen in our prayers in the days ahead.

TAX REFORM

Mr. President, turning to the legislative business at hand, the last time Congress enacted tax reform was 1986. Back then, I was a State district judge in San Antonio, TX, the Spurs had a bad losing streak, and gasoline was 89 cents a gallon.

A lot has changed since 1986. We have seen parties in Congress win the majority, lose it, and win again. We have seen six Presidents come and go, bringing us to this moment, this year, with the President committed to providing Americans with real tax relief and the promise of a resurgent economy. After countless meetings, hearings, and conversations amongst Members who represent varying and diverse constituents, Republicans in the House and the Senate and the administration have joined together to unveil a unified framework for tax reform.

In the more than 30 years since our Tax Code has become overhauled, it has become the punch line in a bad joke. No one will defend it. Everyone knows it needs to be fixed. Over time, the code has become more complex and is now riddled with deductions, credits, and loopholes advocated by an army of lobbyists and special interests, so much so that the majority of Americans now pay somebody else to prepare their taxes because it is too complex for them to figure it out on their own, but with renewed focus and determination, we are committed to taking this framework and using it to enact real reforms to simplify a Tax Code that has grown so complex over the years, but that is not the main reason.

The main reason we need tax reform is that the Tax Code has become the enemy of a growing, prosperous economy; the enemy of more take-home pay, and the enemy of America's competitiveness in a global economy. It is self-inflicted harm, and we can and must do better.

Our first priority should be to reduce taxes for all American families, not one socioeconomic class or another—everyone. With a simpler, fairer, and more competitive Tax Code, we can raise living standards so people who earn the money can make decisions on how best to spend it themselves—on their children's education, on their home, on a car they need in order to get reliable transportation to get to and from work, or just maybe putting a little bit of money away for retirement.

I think about the newly graduated teacher in Houston's public schools who is worried about stagnant wages, the entrepreneur in Austin with a great business idea who needs investors to succeed, or a single parent in San Antonio who is living paycheck-to-pay-

check. Ultimately, this is about empowering all citizens to pursue the American dream. This is about reducing government's big bite out of our wages each month and about small businesses spending more time growing and creating jobs.

By coming to the aid of hard-working American and Texas families, we will reawaken the sleeping giant that is our economy by incentivizing investment and job creation.

I know these are lofty goals. If it were easy, we would have done it more recently than since 1986. I know some of our colleagues across the aisle and some in the public are already questioning this framework. Some have wasted no time lobbing accusations, but they don't even bother to do their homework first. They are engaging in the same kind of class warfare many have come to love to wage here in Washington, DC, but those tactics are deeply cynical and deeply untrue.

Here is their lie. They say our tax plan cuts taxes for the wealthy and hurts the poor, even though the actual plan hasn't been written yet. Some claim they already know what the bill says, and they don't. That is entirely predictable in this political environment and wholly false. Let me tell you why.

First, we will cut taxes for all American families without shifting the burden from higher income households to lower or middle-income households. To accomplish this, the framework creates a large zero tax bracket by doubling the standard deduction. The first \$12,000 of income for an individual and \$24,000 for a couple would be tax-free.

Let me say it again. If you are a couple who makes \$24,000 or less, you will pay zero Federal income tax, which is effectively a zero tax bracket. Additionally, the proposed individual rates are collapsed into three, at 12 percent, 25 percent, and 35 percent. So instead of seven tax brackets, which we have now for individuals, we will have four, including the zero tax bracket. This framework also enhances the child tax credit. It repeals the death tax that has hurt small businesses and their families; it has broken up family farms and ranches. And it repeals the special interest tax breaks that primarily benefit the wealthy.

The other refrain some critics have already started making is the claim that our tax plan gives big tax cuts to job creators. As I said, in addition to closing the special interest loopholes, nearly everyone will see some sort of benefit, and job creators will take that benefit and invest in their businesses. They will hire more people, and they will improve wages and growth in the economy, from which we will all benefit. So why would our Democratic colleagues oppose that?

Our unified framework is a template that will be used by the tax-writing committees to put the nuts and bolts together for tax reform. As a member of the Senate Finance Committee, I

look forward to working with Chairman HATCH, Ranking Member WYDEN, as well as colleagues in the House—Ways and Means Chairman KEVIN BRADY, Speaker RYAN, and others—on these ideas. I even look forward to working with our Democratic colleagues if they will join us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Thank you, Madam President, for the recognition.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Today is a day of mourning for Las Vegas and for America. My heart goes out to all those touched by the ruthless and cowardly shooting last night.

One of the victims was Lisa Romero, a secretary at Miyamura High School in Gallup, NM. The students knew her well as Ms. Lisa, and she was adored by everyone at the school. Her loss will be deeply felt. I send my condolences and prayers to her family, as well as her school family, and to everyone in Gallup, NM.

I also want to recognize the true bravery of first responders—the police, the fire fighters, the EMTs—some of whom risked their own lives to save others. There are heroes in America, and we saw them in action last evening.

Las Vegas, NV, and New Mexico share a kinship. Nevada is a sister Western State. Many New Mexicans have family in Las Vegas, and New Mexicans are reeling because of this tragedy. As westerners and as Americans, we must always come together to support the victims, thank our first responders, and focus resources and policy on preventing future massacres.

Madam President, I rise in opposition to the renomination of Mr. Ajit Pai to the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. Pai, both as FCC Commissioner and now as Chairman, has not been a vigorous watchdog for free speech. He has not put the people's right to information first. In fact, he has put corporate interests first, and he has opposed policies outright that ensure underserved communities have access to essential technology. I strongly oppose his renomination to the Commission.

Let's begin with his responsibility to guard First Amendment rights. President Trump has relentlessly attacked NBC, CBS, ABC, CNN, the New York Times, and the Washington Post. He called these established and esteemed news outlets "fake news." He even called them "the enemy of the people."

Earlier this year, in February, during a Senate Commerce Committee hearing—this was an oversight hearing—I asked Chairman Pai pointblank whether he agreed with the President that these mainstream news organizations were the enemy of the people. He refused to answer, refused to disagree with this patently outrageous and anti-American statement.

His written answers were better, but even then Chairman Pai did not demonstrate that he could stand up to

power and defend First Amendment rights. Democrats on the Commerce Committee sent a letter asking again whether he believed the media were the enemy of the people, and he qualified his answer in the negative by writing that “the President has made clear he was referring to ‘fake news’ [as the enemy of the people].” I wish that were true, but it is not. The President referred to well-respected, mainstream media organizations.

The FCC must unequivocally stand up for the First Amendment, and the Chairman needs to strongly disavow the President’s unfounded attack on the media.

The FCC took a huge step forward in favor of consumers in 2015 when it passed the open internet order. That order, known as the net neutrality order, was codified. The principle underlying net neutrality is simple and fair. It means that internet service providers must treat all internet traffic equally. They cannot block access to particular websites, apps, or services. They can’t give fast lanes or special treatment to websites or apps that pay more or are favored by some companies’ executives.

Consumers benefit because internet service providers can’t “pick winners and losers in the online marketplace for services and ideas.” Those are the words of President Obama.

Our democracy benefits because the internet lowers the barriers to communication—but not if the massive companies that control infrastructure can erect new ones. As a Commissioner, Mr. Pai voted against that pro-consumer measure, and as Trump’s Chairman, he has now moved to dismantle it. The American people are outraged with the Chairman’s move to undo net neutrality. The Commission has received a record 22 million comments in that regulatory proceeding.

Who is against net neutrality? The megaproviders like Comcast and Verizon—Chairman Pai’s old employer—can benefit financially from giving advantage to selected websites. Chairman Pai’s record is that if there is a choice between consumers and big corporations, corporations win.

Let’s look at what the Chairman did recently to allow the biggest broadcast company in America to become even bigger. Congress has put into law a limit on the market share that ultra-high frequency or UHF stations can own, and that limit is 39 percent. The Commission had considered that Sinclair Broadcast Group, the largest broadcast company, holds a 38 percent market share. But Sinclair wants to expand its reach and merge with another big company, Tribune Media. The \$3.9 billion deal would give Sinclair control over 200 more local television stations and expand its market to 72 percent of the television-owning households. Here is a chart that shows how expansive Sinclair’s proposed takeover would be. You can see here the current marks, and you can see down below the proportional footprint.

Traditionally, the FCC has interpreted its rules to prohibit Sinclair from making that deal, but Chairman Pai authored an order in April reinterpreting FCC policy to allow Sinclair to grab almost three-quarters of the market, and Sinclair happens to be well known for its friendly coverage of President Trump. It even requires local broadcast outlets to regularly carry national commentary from a former Trump campaign and White House media surrogate, and its executives have been complimentary of Chairman Pai personally.

Congress intended for there to be a multiplicity and diversity of voices and opinions on the airwaves. Congress explicitly wants to prevent one media organization from having an outsized influence over the Nation.

I have strong reservations about Chairman Pai’s leadership and values. Free speech, media ownership rules, and net neutrality are essential to a healthy democracy, and the Chairman is equivocating or moving backward on all fronts. For these reasons, I oppose this nomination.

Nevertheless, if he is confirmed, I hope we can find common ground and work together. One area where we could do that is rural and Tribal broadband in the West. In my home State of New Mexico, rural areas, pueblos, and Tribes do not have access to the internet that is anywhere near adequate. Approximately 63 percent of people living on Tribal land lack access to acceptable fixed broadband speeds, compared to only 17 percent of the U.S. population as a whole. The gap is even higher for residents of Tribal lands in rural areas, with approximately 85 percent of Tribal people lacking access.

We all know that in today’s world, broadband internet is essential to virtually all successful economic and commercial activity. It is essential to everyday life in America. As a member of the Commerce Committee, I will continue to push the FCC to do all it can to close the digital divide.

Broadband expansion is not a question of political ideology; it is a question of political will. The Federal Government played a big role in expanding electricity and telephone service to every American. We, as a country, have made major investments. We must do the same for rural broadband. Senate Democrats have made a number of concrete proposals recently. I hope we can work with our Republican colleagues on these. I urge Chairman Pai to take them seriously.

Members of the Commission must be 100 percent committed to principles of free speech, to protecting consumers and the underserved. Mr. Pai’s record does not give me sufficient confidence that he shares that commitment, and, therefore, I urge all of my colleagues to reject his nomination.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, I come here today to talk about the nomination of FCC Chairman Ajit Pai, but before I begin, I think all of us have incredibly heavy hearts in our homes, in our States, in the country, and in the world, as the horrifying events of Las Vegas really begin to sink in.

I just saw an article come across the news line in my home State of West Virginia with one of the first identifications of the victims. Her name was Denise Burditus. She is from Martinsburg, WV. She and her husband Tony were at the concert together. They have been married 32 years. They were high school sweethearts and were there vacationing and at the concert. Tony wrote on his Facebook page that his wife died in his arms. So we have lost a mother of two, and soon to be a grandmother of five, to this horrible tragedy. My heart sinks for them and for everyone. I really don’t have the words to say to comfort or explain or understand, except that I feel deeply sad and sorry, and I pray for them and their families.

Today, Madam President, I want to talk about the nomination and reappointment of Ajit Pai as the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. Chairman Pai has been an important partner in my quest to bring rural America and much of my State online. I was very lucky to meet Chairman Pai several years ago. Without question, he has been a champion.

Without question, high-speed internet access has allowed us to connect with one another on a scale we never could have imagined a decade ago. No other technology has become so critical to our daily lives. It is the backbone for our innovation, competition, and economic growth. From starting a business to digital learning and telemedicine, broadband access is critical to the strength of our economy and our communities. Unfortunately, for all the potential opportunities that broadband can offer, not having access to this important service can create insurmountable barriers.

Better connecting States like mine—West Virginia—through improved broadband has become one of my top priorities. Without this, our rural areas risk being left behind. The digital divide exists in this country, and rural Americans are the ones who are on the wrong side of the divide. Small communities and businesses across West Virginia and elsewhere in rural America lack this fundamental infrastructure.

No one understands these issues more than Ajit Pai. Chairman Pai grew up in rural Kansas. He told me that sometimes when he goes home to visit his parents, he cannot get connected in his own hometown. He knows the challenges facing rural communities.