

to keep more of what they earn. Our plan will also expand the child tax credit and make it available to more families, and our plan doubles the standard deduction, which will provide significant relief for those who need it the most. Under our plan, a family making \$24,000 a year will no longer owe any Federal income taxes. All of these measures will provide direct relief to working families.

Just as important for families, however, is the other half of our tax reform plan, which involves creating the kind of economic environment where hard-working Americans can thrive—the kind of environment where Americans have access to good jobs, higher wages, and more opportunities.

Over the past few weeks, I have come to the floor to talk about Republicans' tax reform principles and have highlighted some of the ways our tax reform plan will improve the economic outlook for American families. Last week, I talked about our third principle, reforming our Tax Code to keep those good-paying jobs here at home. This week I would like to spend a few minutes talking about our fourth principle, which is keeping American businesses competitive in the global economy.

In order for individual Americans to thrive economically, we need our businesses to thrive. Thriving businesses create jobs, provide opportunities, and they increase wages and invest in workers. Right now, though, our Tax Code is not helping businesses thrive, and it is making it more difficult for American businesses with an international footprint to compete in the global economy.

Our Nation has the highest corporate tax rate in the industrialized world—at least 10 percentage points higher than the majority of our international competitors. It doesn't take an economist to realize that high tax rates leave businesses with less money to invest, less money to spend on wages, less money to create new jobs, less money to devote to research and development of new products and services, and less money to put back into new property or equipment for those businesses. This situation is compounded when an American business has international competitors that are paying a lot less in taxes than you are. It is no surprise that U.S. businesses struggling to stay competitive in the global economy don't have a lot of resources to devote to creating new jobs and increasing wages.

On top of our high business tax rates, there is another major problem with our Tax Code that puts American businesses at a competitive disadvantage globally—our outdated worldwide tax system.

What does it mean to have a worldwide tax system? It means that American companies pay U.S. taxes on the profit they make here at home, as well as on part of the profits they make abroad once they bring that money

back home to the United States. The problem with this is that most other major world economies have shifted from a worldwide tax system to a territorial tax system.

In a territorial tax system, taxes are paid on the money earned where it is made and only there. You are not taxed again when you bring money back to your home country. Most American companies' foreign competitors have been operating under a territorial tax system for years. So they pay a lot less taxes on the money they make abroad than American companies pay. That leaves American companies at a disadvantage.

Foreign companies can underbid American companies for new business simply because they don't have to add as much in taxes into the price of their products or services. When foreign companies beat out American companies for new business, it is not just American companies that suffer. It is American workers. That is why a key part of the tax framework that Republicans unveiled last week involves lowering our massive corporate tax rate and transitioning our tax system from a worldwide tax system into a territorial tax system. By making American businesses more competitive in the global economy, we can improve the playing field for American workers.

There are a lot of other things we are going to do to help hard-working families and American workers, from improving the tax situation for small businesses to helping family business owners, farmers, and ranchers like those in my home State of South Dakota by repealing the death tax.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle like to complain about our plans to repeal the death tax. They complain that it is not something to really worry about since they claim relatively few estates are expected to actually have to pay the tax. Well, I would like them to come and talk to some of the farmers and ranchers in my State of South Dakota. Some of these farmers and ranchers are paying tens of thousands of dollars a year in an effort to avoid having their families hit by the estate tax when they die. Why? Because they know that without careful and costly planning, if the Federal Government comes around after their death demanding a staggering 40 percent of their estate, their children won't have the money to pay the government without risking the farm or the ranch.

Farming and ranching is a land-rich but cash-poor business. Farmers and ranchers own valuable land, but they are only earning cash on the crops they grow or the livestock they raise on that land. So while their overall farm or ranch may have a substantial value, the amount of money they have coming in is relatively small and subject to the swings in the market from year to year. Too often, when farmers and ranchers die, the vast portion of their estate is made up of their land, while

actual disposable income is a very small part of it. If they don't take measures to avoid having their family hit by the death tax, the family will have no choice but to sell off some or all of their land to pay the government, which means, in many cases, losing the family's farm or ranch. And the same situation faces other types of family-owned businesses across the country where the value of the estate is tied up in that business.

Removing the threat of the death tax for family-owned businesses, farms, and ranches would free up resources that these business owners could invest in their businesses and in our economy instead of on complex estate plans, insurance, and expensive tax professionals.

Before I move on, let me just remind everybody that when we talk about the death tax, we are talking about double and sometimes triple taxation. The money the government is taxing has already been taxed at least once. It boggles the mind that some think that a person's death is justification for taxing his or her income a second or a third time. Death should not be a taxable event. When someone dies, they shouldn't have to see the undertaker and the IRS at the same time.

Our Tax Code is increasingly strangling our economy and placing heavy burdens on hard-working American families. If we want to improve the economic situation of American families, comprehensive tax reform is essential.

Republicans in the House and the Senate are continuing to work on the final draft of the bill that we will take up later this fall. I look forward to passing comprehensive tax reform that will help American families thrive, that will create greater economic growth, better paying jobs, higher wages, and bigger paychecks for American workers.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:33 p.m., recessed until 2:16 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. STRANGE).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, a tragedy took place in Las Vegas this week. It is a tragedy that has affected hundreds of families. It is a tragedy in which each and every one of us sends our prayers to those who have lost loved ones. And to those who have family members who are now hospitalized, we send our prayers to you as well, with the great hope that a full recovery is in their future.

This was an unimaginable event that occurred in our country. It is now time for us to talk about this issue. There are many people who say this is not the time to talk about it, but the truth is, the only thing the National Rifle Association wants more than to sell lots of gun silencers is to put a silencer on the debate about gun safety legislation. The only thing the NRA wants more than allowing nationwide concealed carry laws is to conceal the overwhelming support for background checks. The only thing the NRA wants more than to stifle smart gun technology is to stifle debate on gun violence prevention.

So to anyone who says having this debate now is too soon, it is already too late for at least 59 people in Las Vegas and hundreds of others who were wounded. We should not wait another day.

We need to pass commonsense gun safety legislation so that we can hold a moment of silence for the National Rifle Association's stranglehold on American politics. That is what must end in our country.

We need a debate on this floor on background checks. We need a debate in this Chamber on whether we are going to do research on the relationship between guns and violence in our society. We don't need to debate the issue of bringing silencers into our society that can be attached to guns and that would have made it infinitely more difficult for the police to find where the shooter was or for people to know that they needed to hide or move to a more secure location. That would not have happened. We would not have had 59 deaths; we could have had 259 deaths, 559 deaths, or 959 deaths because a silencer would have given less notice to all of those people that they should be moving and hiding and protecting themselves and their loved ones.

On concealed carry, the Republicans are moving a bill that allows for someone to conceal a gun under a law in one State—because that State allows you to conceal a gun, you would be able to move into any other State and continue to conceal a gun even though that State's laws prohibit concealing guns. They want that law to move through.

So when the Republicans talk about debating gun control, what they are talking about is lessening the safety around these guns, lowering the standards that would protect people, and allowing for silencers to now be proliferating on these assault weapons, these weapons of war that should not be on the streets of our country and that have the capacity to kill people without people hearing them.

They say they are needed because we need to protect people's hearing when they are firing assault weapons. Well, it is more important that the police hear the bullets and that the people who might be hit hear the sound of those bullets as they are leaving the

gun. That is going to provide far more protection. It is far more important that the police in a State or in a city know that someone has a concealed weapon. It is critically important for police protection. But the National Rifle Association does not want those kinds of protections to remain on the books. That is who they are. That is what they want.

What should we be debating? We should be debating background checks. We should be debating whether someone should be able to buy a gun on Instagram and turn it into an "insta-gun" without background checks. That is what we should be talking about out here.

Over 90 percent of Americans want stronger background checks. Yet the Republican leadership turns a deaf ear to the request of the American people because the National Rifle Association does not want there to be background checks on people who are buying guns in our country.

More Americans have died from gun violence in the past 50 years on the streets of America than have died in all of our Nation's wars overseas in our entire history. Let me say that again. More people have died from guns in our own country in the last 50 years than all of our soldiers, sailors, Air Force, and marines have died going all the way back to 1776. That is how much of an epidemic this is in our country. It is an epidemic that now kills 33,000 people every single year in our country, but the Federal Government's investment in researching gun violence is zero.

Diabetes—76,000 U.S. deaths annually; they get \$170 million at the Centers for Disease Control. Flu—57,000 deaths a year; they get \$187 million for research. Asthma—3,600 deaths a year; they get \$29 million for research at the Centers for Disease Control. Gun violence—zero. An epidemic is ravaging our country, and the Republicans will not fund research to find this link between violence and the use of guns in our society, to do the research that can help us to reduce this carnage on the streets of our country. And because of an appropriations rider from the 1990s, the Centers for Disease Control hasn't conducted research into the causes of gun violence and how to prevent it. If 20 young children in Newtown had died of Ebola, we would have invested funding to study it. If 59 people in Las Vegas died of Zika, would we study it? Absolutely. But our country is suffering from an illness, and we have let it spread because we refuse to write a treatment plan.

The American Medical Association supports ending the ban on research. The American Public Health Association supports ending the ban on research. More than 141 groups want to end this ban on researching the link between guns and violence in our society.

The bill I have introduced with Representative MALONEY gives \$10 million to the Centers for Disease Control

every single year. Shouldn't we be studying how to stop people from firing guns and give the medical, the scientific, and the public health community the resources they need?

We also need to develop new smart gun technologies that would improve safety and reduce accidental shootings. My bill would authorize grants to develop and personalize handgun technology to increase efficiency and decrease costs. If you can use a fingerprint to operate your iPhone, you should be able to do the same thing with your gun to make sure that safety is ensured, to make sure it is your thumbprint on that gun, that if your gun is stolen or lost, no one else would be able to use that gun. Does that make sense? Well, your thumb can work for your smartphone. Your thumb could also work for smart gun technology.

So this is where we are. We are at this critical point where some people are saying: Not now. It is inappropriate. We shouldn't be raising these issues.

But what we should be debating is what the American people want us to debate. Over 90 percent want background checks on anyone who buys a gun in our country to make sure they are qualified, to make sure they do not have something in their background that should disqualify them from owning a gun in our country.

Our debate here should really be about one thing: making the NRA stand for "not relevant anymore" in American politics. The task for the Republican Party is different. It will be whether they will kill these bills that would legalize more fully silencers being put on automatic weapons in our country, kill the concealed carry law, which is moving through the House and Senate driven by Republicans, and, instead, debate the kinds of things that make our country safer, the kinds of things that poll after poll is showing that the American people want us to do. That is going to be our challenge in the days and weeks and months ahead.

This is the time; this is the place. We are the people who must be conducting this debate to make sure we add an extra measure of safety that American families can rely upon.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

MS. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, my colleague from Massachusetts has referred to the tragedy that we all watched unfold late on Sunday evening in Las Vegas, NV—the tragedy, the horror, the shock of so many. Alaska has felt the brunt of that tragedy as well. We lost two Alaskans; at least one other was injured. Mr. Adrian Murfitt from Anchorage, a commercial fisherman, lost his life that evening. Dorene Anderson, who is a mom and self-described hockey promoter, will not be returning to Alaska with her family. Rob McIntosh, who is a realtor

from the Fairbanks-North Pole area, was also injured. Our prayers are with him and with all of the families.

Whether they are from Alaska or from around the country, the tragedy, the loss, is just a shocking emotion that has been brought to this Nation. It is really horrifying on so many different levels. I express my condolences not only to the families of the Alaskans whom we have lost but to all of those who are suffering.

PUERTO RICO AND U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS
RECOVERY EFFORT

Mr. President, I want to speak on another matter, and that is the tragedy related to natural disasters we have seen visited on our country, the devastating impacts that Hurricanes Irma and Maria have had on the U.S. Virgin Islands and in Puerto Rico, the current relief efforts that are underway on those islands, and how we might help in the long term to rebuild, particularly as it relates to their electric grid and their power sector.

Mr. President, as the Presiding Officer serves on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, I have the honor of being the chairman of that Committee, and that is the committee of jurisdiction for our territories.

Our committee's history dates back to 1816, when it was then called the Committee on Public Lands. The acquisition of Puerto Rico, the Philippines, and Guam in 1898, through the Treaty of Paris, led to the creation of the Committee on Insular Affairs in 1899. The U.S. Virgin Islands were included in that committee's jurisdiction following their purchase from Denmark in 1917.

In 1946, the Committee on Public Lands and the Committee on Insular Affairs merged to form the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. In 1977, the committees were again reorganized, leading to the current structure of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Our committee has had the proud distinction of working with the territories for the last 70-plus years. Certainly, following Hurricanes Irma and Maria, we are committed to upholding our responsibilities to the people of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

Perhaps it is because I was born in a territory—I need to actually look this up; it may be that I am the only Member of Congress or Member in the Senate who was actually born in a territory—but I feel an affinity. One would not think there is much connection between a small island territory like Puerto Rico and the large landmass that we have in Alaska, but in many ways, Alaska is also islanded in the sense that we are not part of the continental 48. So I do follow with great interest and care how Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands are included.

With the current focus almost entirely on Puerto Rico right now, it can seem like a distant memory that only 2 weeks ago, before Hurricane Maria, we had Hurricane Irma, which hit the

islands of St. Thomas and St. John as a category 5 hurricane. One category 5 is bad enough, but then to have a second category 5 hurricane hit just 2 weeks later, this time impacting the island of St. Croix, is almost unfathomable.

The devastation we have seen in both the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico can seem overwhelming. Relief operations for the islands are different from what you have with the mainland. When you recognize how you move to accommodate relief, everything has to be brought in by ship or by plane. You don't have the convoys of trucks rolling down the highway from an adjoining State. You don't have the ability to take alternative routes to reach the affected areas. Once goods are delivered to ports, for instance, it is another challenge, then, to get them from the port for inland distribution.

Even under normal operating conditions, moving the amount of containers that have flooded into the territories would be a challenge, but when you add into it the debris, the downed power lines, the washed-out bridges and roads, the lack of power, and the driver shortages, the challenges become colossal.

Then you have other limiting factors. You have competition for hotel rooms and other lodging as you bring in relief workers to go to the islands while refugees who have lost their homes try to leave. Again, the logistics are almost overwhelming; it is a logistical nightmare.

Despite these very considerable hurdles, we do see that progress is being made. According to recent reports from the Army Corps of Engineers, Federal and local response crews have been working to reopen the ports and runways. In some cases, we have seen sunken ships that need to be removed before a port can begin operations again.

In Puerto Rico, 13 of 16 ports are open or open with restrictions. In the U.S. Virgin Islands, five of nine ports are open or open with restrictions.

In addition, 15 of 17 priority dams in Puerto Rico have already been inspected. In the case of Guajataca Dam, it is in the process of being reinforced. The dam's spillway continues to erode. Rainfall has increased the water level in the reservoir. We have seen that the debris and the downed power lines need to be removed to allow helicopters to place 44 concrete barriers within the spillway channel. In fact, 900 super sandbags are on their way. Pumps and piping are being procured to help decrease the water level. There are a lot of hands on deck there.

For electricity, as of October 1, 5 percent of customers in Puerto Rico have had their power restored. The Puerto Rico electric utility expects to have power restored to 15 percent of customers over the next 2 weeks.

I looked at this aspect of it and recognize that it is still pretty warm in Puerto Rico. I checked the weather

this afternoon, and it is 87 degrees. Over the next couple of days, it will be 93 degrees. Making sure that folks have power, have an ability to keep fans, to have air conditioning—this is critical.

Assessments show significant damage to the transmission and distribution systems, so, again, a great deal of work is yet underway there.

In the Virgin Islands, 15 percent of customers in St. Thomas and 10 percent of customers in St. Croix have had their power restored. This includes the airports and the hospitals.

On the hospitals, I would note that both the hospitals in the U.S. Virgin Islands—one in St. Thomas and one in St. Croix—have sustained heavy damage and may need to be replaced. Again, long term, moving forward, this is critical infrastructure.

We do know that in the immediate term, the primary relief that Congress can provide is through our appropriations process. We will soon be considering another tranche of disaster relief funds so that those impacted by these hurricanes have the food, water, and medicine they need as recovery efforts continue.

Other options, such as making the rum tax cover-over payments permanent and increasing or lifting the cap on community disaster loans may also need to be considered as ways to get the islands back on their feet.

Another part of our responsibility, though, is to look at potential long-term solutions to persistent problems. In the case of Puerto Rico, it is their antiquated electric grid and power generation system.

I have had many conversations with many colleagues in these past couple of weeks. I am concerned that current disaster recovery rules may mandate that the damaged or destroyed entity be restored with similar material, compared to its condition prior to the disaster. What may seem like a good, general rule of thumb in some scenarios, like this one—I don't think it makes a lot of sense. Why would we consider spending hundreds of millions of dollars to rebuild what was an inefficient, unreliable electric power grid in Puerto Rico?

Making sure that we do right going forward is important for us. I am going to be meeting with officials with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. They have been tasked by FEMA with rebuilding Puerto Rico's electricity grid. I am going to meet with the Army Corps and the Department of Energy to see if there is a way to modernize Puerto Rico's grid during its rebuild, whether by administrative or legislative action. I think we need to look at different considerations moving forward.

There has been a discussion about whether it makes more sense to bury transmission lines rather than rebuild towers. We need to look at microgrids and consider whether they should be developed to provide power to communities throughout the island even if the