

reincarceration—at least a certain percentage of them won't. We can help people whose lives are in a tailspin because of drug or alcohol addiction or who feel as though they are on a dead-end street because they simply don't have the job skills or the education in order to compete in the economy.

I hope we can follow the lead of successful experiments in our States, such as Texas, and implement these commonsense, bipartisan reforms in our Federal prison system.

Mr. President, let me say in conclusion that I know the administration is very interested in engaging on criminal justice reform. Last year, we worked on a sentencing and prison reform bill that unfortunately seems to not be going anywhere. While the prison reform component of it seems to have a consensus of support here in the Congress and I think could pass and be signed into law, the sentencing reform piece is a little more controversial and I know divides even the Republican conference, and I am not sure what it does with the Democratic conference. But I believe we ought to start on a step-by-step basis, get what we can get done, and get it to the President for his signature, while providing these tools to inmates who are incarcerated through the Bureau of Prisons, and then keep working on the other parts on which we perhaps have not yet been able to build consensus.

I hope our colleagues will work with us on this important piece of legislation as we work to reform our criminal justice system in ways that make sense and that save taxpayer dollars.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

TAX REFORM

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, yesterday in the middle of the day, the Presiding Officer and I and the Senator from Texas and others had a chance to meet with the President and talk about tax relief. It seemed to me very clear that the President and those of us who are advocating tax cuts right now are on the same wavelength, which is, let's have tax cuts for hard-working families, and let's do the other things we need to do in the Tax Code to ensure that those very same families have better jobs.

As I said on the floor of the Senate last week, there are two ways to increase take-home pay. One is to start taking less out of the paychecks people are getting now, and another one is to give them an even better paycheck in the future. We need to look at both of those ways to increase the opportunity for working families and working individuals.

We are now into the eighth year of almost no economic growth. If there is no economic growth, there is very little incentive for your job to be a better paying job than it was the previous year no matter what has happened to your other costs, and we clearly see that happening.

We are into the first year of this new administration. We are looking at 3 percent annual growth after 8 years in which growth didn't exceed 2 percent. Anytime you begin to talk like an economist, people begin to wonder: Well, what does that have to do with me? Let me just say that for taxpayers generally, for working families generally, the more growth you have, one, the more revenue that comes in that takes care of problems like the deficit. The way you take care of those problems—the best way—is to grow the economy. Two, people are much more focused on keeping the workforce they have, getting the best of the workforce that is coming on board as their workforce moves on for retirement or relocates or does other things.

Three percent economic growth is not good enough. The post-World War II average—that is more than seven decades now of average—is, I think, almost 3½ percent. There are very few economic problems in our country that wouldn't be made substantially better, including our own Federal deficit, if we see growth exceed or even get to the 70-year average. There is no reason to believe that can't happen.

Yesterday, the President was talking about the two ways to immediately relieve pressures on families. One is more take-home pay, and two is a better job that also increases take-home pay. But the first step we can achieve immediately by the kind of tax relief we need.

There have been 8 years of stagnant wages. Half of the families in the country are living paycheck to paycheck. Very few families can face an emergency that is even \$500 without having to restructure what they are doing and how they are doing it. We can do a better job at this. We need more jobs. We need higher wages. And the two principal goals of this tax bill should be to do exactly that—create more wages now, more take-home pay now, and create an environment in which we are going to be more competitive. Simplifying the Tax Code is one way to meet that first impact, having a tax code that people understand better, that they think is fairer.

A tax code where people think they are being treated fairly is much more likely to be complied with than a tax code where people see that somebody else who makes the same amount of money as they make is paying a lot less taxes than they are paying. The American tax system is probably the greatest voluntary compliance. Sure, there are laws that require people to comply, but most people are never impacted by those laws. They know they could be, but the American people have shown a willingness to pay their fair share if they know that their fair share is, in fact, their fair share. A simpler tax system, a more easily understood tax system, a system that has fewer than the seven different tax brackets that people pay today are things we can and should achieve.

Doubling the standard deduction helps a lot when people look at the \$12,000 deduction they have now. For a couple, as they look at that deduction and realize that deduction, that standard deduction, has doubled, suddenly, if you are a couple filing jointly, you are not paying any taxes on the first \$24,000 you earn. If you are a single individual, you are not paying any taxes on the first \$12,000 you earn. Keeping enough of the family-benefiting exemptions helps make the family do what the family would like to do. What if they would like to give to their church and charity? There is no discussion saying we wouldn't keep the standard charitable deduction as a deduction. There is no discussion that we wouldn't keep home mortgage as a deduction so we are encouraging homeownership or looking at how to make the child tax credit bigger rather than smaller.

Many of the early analyses of what this Tax Code would do say that for a family of four, they would pay more than they are paying now up to certain income level. Generally, that will turn out not to be the case—certainly, at the middle-income levels and below if you factor in the child tax credit, which hasn't been determined yet.

Our tax-writing committee will be looking at that child tax credit as an important addition to the individual exemptions because it costs money to raise kids. The Congress surely should understand that, appreciate that, and factor that into the deductions. Just like we are doubling the deduction for individual earners, we also have to look at what that child tax credit should look like.

Tax policies that benefit homeownership, tax policies that encourage contributing to charities and community activities and church and synagogue and mosque—your religious activities—all would continue to be a part of this Tax Code.

Also, when talking about sending kids to school, one way to not have student debt is to encourage families to have ways to better prepare for what they, in most cases, would hope would be a goal or an expenditure their family would make. We can do things like expanding the Pell grants for poor families, but for families who don't qualify for that, we can do things that allow the deduction early on for putting money in a fund that prepares people to go to school.

Keeping well-paying jobs at home and encouraging more jobs to come here is also an important part of the goal. You can't have the highest corporate rate in the world and expect that you are going to be as competitive as you would be with other countries. A corporate rate of 35 percent, in 1986, was fairly near the middle when that rate was arrived at with President Reagan and others working on it the last time we did a tax rewrite, and right in the middle is about where we should be. However, now the situation is we see that right in the middle is no

longer 35 percent; it is about 20 percent. Ireland just revised its 15 percent rate to 8 percent. Great Britain is reducing their rate to a little less than 20 percent. They have been, I think, a little more than 20 percent. We need to be sure the products we make here and the jobs that are created here—that there is a competitive ability to sell that same product anywhere in the world, with the advantage, obviously, of being made by our great workforce but also an advantage where our tax system doesn't work us out of the marketplace, doesn't make us less competitive.

A territorial tax system will be one of the things we are going to hear talked about a lot. For most of us, that doesn't seem to have any impact. We earn our money here, we pay our taxes here, but we also want to be sure that if American companies sell products somewhere else and earn money there, that they can, should, and would bring that money back to the United States to reinvest it in the kinds of things that create jobs here.

I think this doesn't have to be all that complicated. We need to understand what the core principles are. We need to get to those core principles. We need to get this done this year so people are planning, in the first months of next year, on how to take advantage of a new, simpler, fairer, and more competitive Tax Code. This needs to be job one of this Congress for the next few weeks. We need to get that done so job one for the country, beginning at the end of this debate, is what we can do to create more and better jobs and create more take-home pay for hard-working families.

I am joined by some of my colleagues who are going to talk about this same topic, I hope, and others. We need to be focused. I can tell, with the President's comments yesterday, he is focused on this. We are focused on this. This is a job we need to get done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from Alaska.

MR. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I wanted to reinforce and underscore some of the comments made by my colleague from Oklahoma, Senator LANKFORD, on what is happening in the Senate right now. It is actually really important for the American people to understand what is going on. Maybe we would finally get the press, who sit up there above your chair, Madam President, to write about this topic.

Right now, we are debating a very well-qualified district court judge nominee—a Federal district court judge nominee from Oklahoma. Senator LANKFORD was down here, and he obviously knows the nominee, Scott Palk. He is so qualified that the vote for cloture to move forward on this nominee—who, by the way, was nominated by President Trump for a Federal district court position but was previously nominated by President Obama with fairly bipartisan support—was 79

to 18. That is really strong bipartisan support. It just happened about an hour ago on the Senate floor.

So what are we doing? Well, we are still going to be debating for 30 hours. We are not really debating the nominee because he is well qualified. That is what we are doing in the Senate, supposedly. Anyone watching, you know we are not debating him because he is very well qualified, but we are still going to burn 30 hours. Why is this? Well, this raises a much broader issue of the tactics that are happening on the Senate floor right now. The minority leader and his colleagues will not come down and explain what they are up to.

I gave a speech on this a couple of weeks ago, and I just asked: Come on down. Let the American people understand why we are spending all this time on nominees who are very well qualified and have enormous bipartisan support. Why are we being required to go an additional 30 hours? Those are the rules, but normally there would be unanimous consent to move forward. What is happening now hasn't been explained, but it definitely hurts the American people, whether you are a Democrat or Republican. What is happening now is, every single nominee from the Trump administration, whether Federal judge or Assistant Secretary for Health and Human Services, is being delayed. Here are the numbers. Eight years ago, President Obama had about 66 percent of his nominees confirmed at this period in the fall of his first term. People were working through them. If you didn't like the nominee, you would just vote against them, but you wouldn't say we are going to burn half the week of the Senate to debate somebody who is not even controversial. This judge, when we finally get through the 30 hours, is going to pass with 80 Senate votes, but we are burning through it anyway. President Obama, 8 years ago, had 66 percent confirmed. The number for President Trump 8 years later is 33 percent. Imagine our friends in the media—the New York Times—if Republicans were doing this to President Obama during his first few months in office. There would be front-page stories every day. The Republican Party is trying to undermine the new President—delaying, delaying, delaying. You don't hear a peep from our national press. They don't write about it.

It is a problem because we have work to do in this country. I have asked the minority leader to just come down and tell the American people why you are doing this. We have had numerous judges, very noncontroversial, very bipartisan, where we essentially spent the whole week “debating” them. We are not debating this judge, but we are going to spend 30 hours on him.

Why are they doing that? And why are my colleagues on the other side of the aisle agreeing to it? I asked them to come on down and explain it to the American people, the people watching

on TV or in the Gallery. Why are you doing this? Does it help the country? Whether you are a Democrat or Republican, it doesn't help the country. That is the whole point, but nobody wants to come down and explain their delay tactics. The press will not write about it because some of them like it, I think.

Here is the truth. When we are spending all this time all week on this judge who will get voted on—and he will pass because he is very well qualified. Senator LANKFORD laid out his resume. He was previously nominated by President Obama. We are going to vote for him after this 30-hour period, and he will pass with a strong bipartisan vote. What is the challenge? What happens to the other issues we need to address in this country—in this body? We can't get to them, if we wanted to turn to other issues to start moving them.

My colleague from New Hampshire was just on the floor. She talked about all the things we have to do. I agree with her 100 percent: tax reform, healthcare, budget—we never do the budget here anymore—National Defense Authorization Act, growing the economy, as my friend from Missouri talked about, infrastructure, immigration, and the Dreamer issue. We have so much to do, let alone getting Trump administration officials confirmed and judges confirmed. That is a big list, but because we are spending 30 hours on a debate, which really isn't a debate on the judge, and we can't get consent from the other side to actually work on these other issues, this is what we are doing. We are just burning time.

The minority leader will not come down and explain it. I don't know if he can explain it, but that is what we are doing. Again, if the shoe were on the other foot, the press would be going crazy. Right now, they just let it happen. My view is, it would be great if one of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle would come down and say: Here is why we are wasting all of this time. Just let us know.

As Senator LANKFORD mentioned, this judge was nominated by the President in May. Now we are going to spend most of the week “debating” him, when that is not what is going on. It is just a delay tactic. My view is, we should just say: OK. You want to play ball like that? We will stay here 24/7 and keep the Senate open 7 days a week. Let's get to work. Let's stay here until Christmas. See if the minority leader and his team keep doing that, keep delaying. I think we should call their bluff.

Right now, the delay tactics—which nobody on the other side wants to explain—in my view, are not defensible, and they are not helping the country. Whether you are a Democrat or Republican, you want to seat the government. You want to get good people working for the American people. Right now, that is not happening.

I just wish the other side would either explain it or stop doing it. Let's get to work for this Nation.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Madam President, I fully associate myself with the comments just made by the Senator from the great State of Alaska. We have to get to work here.

TAX REFORM

Mr. President, I am here to talk about one of the most pressing issues we have to deal with. Yesterday, we had lunch where the President spoke about why tax reform was so critical for healing the economy and really having our Nation rise to its full capabilities in terms of economic performance and global competitiveness. You read the headlines. The headlines read like: Republicans are for the big guy, for the corporations, not for the little guy.

You will hear them talk about policies that will have us drowning in red ink. You will hear them talk about unsustainable economic policies. I saw all of those headlines before, about 6 years ago, in the North Carolina statehouse when we inherited a disaster for an economy. It was after the 2008 crisis. We had a State that was drowning in red ink, with a \$2.5 billion structural deficit. We had a tax code that was absolutely out of sync with our competition, and we set about to fix it.

This is what we ended up doing. All of the headlines looked exactly the way the headlines looked today, but we had members on both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans, who recognized that North Carolina should be one of the fastest growing, most competitive States in the Nation. So we went about trying to figure out how to make that happen. We determined, for one thing, that there was an undue burden on individuals and working families. So we had to simplify the tax code, and we had to reduce the tax burden on the individuals. We also recognized that our corporate tax rate was preventing us from getting the job expansion opportunities. The States like South Carolina, Tennessee, Alabama, and Virginia were winning time after time after time.

By the time I came in as the speaker of the house, there had been a long time before we had any major economic development opportunity in North Carolina. So we were able to put together a corporate tax cut, an individual income tax cut, and, in our case, even a sales tax cut, which all of the pundits said was going to be a disaster. It ended up engineering and serving as the basis for one of the most significant economic turnarounds of any State for over the past 30 or 40 years. It went from a zero rainy day fund to a \$2 billion rainy day fund, putting more money into education, putting more money into Medicaid, and creating the resources that would allow us to do the other things we wanted to do.

When I was speaker, I had to go look to see what Texas was doing—I see the

Senator from Texas is here—and say: What could we do to be more competitive with Texas? We looked at Iowa. What could we do as a matter of tax policy that would make us more competitive with Iowa on, let's say, agriculture? Those were our peer competitors. As a State leader, I am looking at my peer competitors in their States.

For our corporate tax policy, we look at China, at Russia, at Europe, and we look at our competitors and make it very clear that we are out of step. As Senator BLUNT said, years ago we weren't out of step, but we are today. We are not competitive with people with whom we should be cleaning their clock in terms of economic expansion. You only get that done if you lower the corporate tax rate. If you actually get people who will invest that capital and hire more people, provide more opportunities for working families, and create more demand for jobs so that wages go up, that is how you ultimately get this economy moving to a point where we create the resources to also ultimately pay down the debt. I still consider that to be the single greatest threat to our national security.

Along the way, the reason I know our tax policy was about right where it needed to be was that virtually every lobbyist in Raleigh was mad at me—and I mean all of them.

If you look at 1986, the last time we did meaningful tax reform, virtually every lobbyist on Capitol Hill was mad at the folks who voted for the bill, and that was on a bipartisan basis. So we have to have Members who are willing to go big, who are willing to actually reduce the corporate tax rate, to work on the tax burden for working families, and to recognize that it is on us.

We are in a historic opportunity to turn this economy around and to take advantage of the fact that other countries are not heeding the call. They are heaping more regulations on their businesses. They are adding more taxes in some cases. This is a historic opportunity for us to just blow past the competition and ultimately create the resources to retire our debt and provide the critical resources we need for so many other things that we need to get here, like strengthening our international defense, making sure our homeland is safe, and securing the border. All of these kinds of things can be done, but they can only be done if we have the courage to move forward with tax cuts and tax reform.

I hope that all of my Members, before Thanksgiving, are in this Chamber and have an opportunity to vote for a bold reform package but, more importantly, for the fulfillment of a promise that we made to the American people if we had majorities in the Senate, in the House, and in the White House. We have it, and it is time for us to act.

I don't care what the headlines read because I have seen those headlines before. I don't care what the special interests want in terms of exemptions and exceptions because I have had

those meetings in my office before. At the end of the day, every single one of those folks who wanted to pick apart one exception or an exemption have come back into my office and said: You know what; you have protected us from ourselves, because if you had listened to us, you would have done far less than you were capable of doing.

There is nobody who follows State politics that would question what was done in North Carolina. It has been an extraordinary turnaround. Now it is time to do the same thing for this great Nation.

I hope that all of my colleagues would set aside the distractions, mute the voices of the special interests that will want their special exemption or exception and fulfill the promise that we made to the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I rise today at a time of extraordinary opportunity. The American people have entrusted us with something that, historically, is quite rare: a Republican President, Republican control of every executive agency, and Republican majorities in both Houses of Congress. Now it is incumbent on us to stand up and lead, to deliver on the promises we made to do what we told the American people we would do.

We have before us right now an opportunity for historic tax cuts. Just last week, this body voted out a budget resolution that is the vehicle for adopting tax cuts. I urge every Member of this body to come together in support of a strong, bold tax plan that cuts taxes on every working man and woman and that brings back jobs and economic growth.

Growth is really fundamental to every other challenge we have in this country. If you look historically, since World War II, our economy has grown on average about 3.3 percent a year. Yet, from 2008 to today, we have grown only 1.2 percent a year—about a third of the historic rate of growth.

If we don't turn that around, none of our other problems are solvable. If you care about the national debt, if you care about the deficit, if you care about rebuilding and strengthening our military, if you care about strengthening and improving Social Security and Medicare so that they are there for the next generations, we have to have growth. With economic growth, every one of those is possible. Without growth—if we stay mired in the stagnant Obama 1- and 2-percent GDP growth, none of those problems are solvable.

Growth is foundational. I would like to lay out three principles and then seven key elements that I think should guide this body in tax reform. No. 1 is growth. When we are adopting tax cuts, we should focus directly on jobs and economic growth and focus on the reforms that produce jobs, that expand