

in the Federal judiciary were vacant. The Congressional Research Service found that not since President Clinton took office has a President had the constitutional obligation to fill more judicial vacancies at the start of his term than President Trump. I, certainly, believe he made the right choice when he selected Judge Gorsuch to serve on the Court, and I have been enthusiastic about the other judges whom he has nominated, including the four we have had a chance to talk about and will continue to have a chance to talk about this week.

I think President Trump will continue to nominate judges who will, first of all, pay attention to the Constitution and what it says, who will apply the rule of law, and will not legislate from the bench. Those three hallmarks of how this Senate should define, and how this President has so far defined, what a judge is supposed to do not only can happen but can happen at this moment for—or at least as of January 20—12 percent of the judicial positions, and that number will continue to grow as judges, for whatever reason, leave the bench as judges decide to take early retirement. If at the end of the 4 years of this administration we have filled all of the vacancies that will have occurred, we will have filled more than 12 percent of those lifetime appointments. So it is really important that the Senate act to confirm these nominees and fill as many vacancies as are there to be filled.

Last month, the *Federalist* reported: “Democrats are forcing more cloture votes than any early Presidency and demanding the full 30 hours of floor time per nominee that the Senate rules allow.”

Yesterday, at the press stakeout that we had outside of this room, I said that the Senate was designed to protect the rights of the minority, and that is a good thing. Just the fact that it would take 6 years to replace the entire Senate means that the country has to stay focused on one set of ideas if all of the Senators are going to reflect that one set of ideas much longer than the 2-year opportunity to change everybody in the House. Also, the understanding that the Senate provides that protection for minorities to be heard in a big and diverse democracy like we have is a good thing. In the points that we were making yesterday, I also said that the protections for the minority are always held onto, appreciated, and protected until the minority decides to abuse those protections. When that happens, the minority always loses the protection.

What we have had over and over again—47 times this year as compared to 1 time with President Obama for nonjudicial appointments, 5 times in the entire first Obama year up until this time in October, I believe, no times for either President Bush, and 1 time for President Clinton—is that the minority has taken a judicial nomination or another nomination and said we

are going to insist on 30 hours of debate because the rules allow for 30 hours of debate. Well, the rules allow for 30 hours of debate for contentious nominees. The rules allow for 30 hours of debate when there is really going to be a debate. Last week, we had 30 hours of debate on a judge, but 20 minutes were spent talking in support of him while zero minutes were spent in opposing him. The 30 hours that could have been used for other purposes was gone.

Frankly, I think that was the reason the 30 hours was demanded—so the other work of the Senate had to be set aside so we could do the equally important work of letting the President put people in vacant positions that needed to be filled. That 30 hours will be changed if the minority continues to abuse it. It has happened in the entire history of the Senate, but that is what happens when you abuse these rules that protect you and give you rights. It will happen again here if this does not change.

We see the same thing happening this week. We have had lots of time this week—30 hours of debate, a final vote, and Democrats and Republicans vote. In fact, regarding the judge I mentioned a minute ago, 28 Democrats voted for that judge. There were 30 hours of debate, and not a single critical word was spoken in debate about the judge. A majority of the Democrats and virtually all of the Republicans voted for that judge. That is not an acceptable way to stop the Senate from getting to the other work the Senate needs to do. This is not basketball without a clock, where they used to effectively play the delay game. The delay game got abused, and the clock became part of the system. The clock will run faster here, too, if our colleagues do not begin to see the importance of what we do here.

NOMINATION OF DAVID STRAS

Mr. President, while these nominees have had cloture votes—again, President Obama, I think, only had one on a judge in his first year—there is one nominee, Minnesota Supreme Court Justice David Stras, in the Eighth District, which is the district again that Missouri is in, who has had his nomination held up. There is a rule sometimes that has been used in the Senate—almost always if a judge is being replaced that only affects your State—whereby a Senator can say: I am really opposed to that. In most of the history of the Senate, that kind of hold has been honored. It has not been honored on judges who represent another State, many States, or will be a judge in the circuit for many States just because they happen to come from your State.

The American Bar Association has said that Justice Stras is “well qualified.” It is its very highest rating. He received his bachelor’s degree, with the highest distinction, from the University of Kansas, which is another State in this circuit. He received his MBA from the University of Kansas and his

law degree from the University of Kansas. He clerked on the U.S. Supreme Court before practicing law and teaching at the University of Minnesota. Not only was he appointed to fill a vacancy on the Supreme Court in Minnesota, but he was elected. In fact, he was elected and received more votes than the person who is holding his nomination received when he was elected to that job.

I urge my colleagues to not only support his nomination but to do what we need to do to get these nominees to the floor and let everybody express their opinion and be given the time needed to do that, not to continue to abuse the rules, not to continue to hold these important vacancies hostage to getting anything else done because we have 30 hours of debate in which nobody decides to come and debate.

By the way, if we want to continue to allow Senators to hold nominations in circuits that their States happen to be a part of, in the Eighth Circuit, most of the work before that court comes from Missouri more than any other State. We would be glad to have an additional judge, and there is nothing that would prevent that.

The right thing to do here is to let the nomination of a well-qualified person come to the Senate floor and be debated, if there is debate to be had, and be voted on and to take one of those significant 140-plus vacancies on the Federal judiciary and fill it with a person who is well qualified, just like this week. In four other circuits, we intend to put three women and one man on those courts who will hopefully be able to serve long and well and will take their important philosophies to the courts with them when they go.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, thank you.

As we heard my colleague from Missouri saying, we have a great opportunity this week to confirm four outstanding individuals to the Federal circuit courts. These nominees are well-qualified individuals who have demonstrated a strong understanding of the proper role that a judge plays in our constitutional system.

I am especially pleased that we are considering three exceptionally talented women for the Federal bench. Federal circuit court nominations are extremely important. Circuit courts sit directly below the Supreme Court in our judicial system. Because the Supreme Court reviews relatively few or a smaller number of cases, many times the circuit courts have the last word in the majority of those cases, so it is essential that we have judges on the circuit court who will treat all litigants fairly.

When I think about what I want in a judge, I think fairness is the first thing that comes to mind. We want someone who treats litigants fairly, who shows respect for our Constitution, our statutes, and the controlling precedents.

We need somebody knowledgeable in the law. That sort of goes without saying but certainly is a top attribute of a judge. Every party before our Federal courts has the right to expect evenhanded, fair judges and fair justice from those judges who are handling their case.

Each of the four nominees being confirmed this week have a strong record and impeccable qualifications. They respect the rule of law. All were given a high rating by the nonpartisan American Bar Association.

Yesterday I was very pleased to support Amy Barrett's confirmation to the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. Despite obstruction by my colleagues on the other side, I am pleased that yesterday we confirmed Ms. Barrett, but I still have deep concerns about some of the debate and some of the questions that were raised about her religious beliefs throughout the confirmation process.

The Constitution clearly states that there can be no religious test for any Federal office. The Senate has a responsibility to consider qualifications and fitness for office of individuals nominated by the President, but that does not include an evaluation of a nominee's religious beliefs. Our Constitution fundamentally protects religious liberty for all Americans. That principle is deeply rooted in our Nation's history and allows individuals of all faiths the freedom to exercise their religious beliefs.

Ms. Barrett's credentials clearly demonstrate her ability to serve on the Federal bench, which she will be doing, and I hope future nominees are questioned by this body on their record, their qualifications, and their jurisprudence, not on their faith.

Today we confirmed the nomination of Michigan Supreme Court Justice Joan Larsen for the Sixth Circuit, a supremely qualified individual. A former clerk for Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia, she served as a Deputy Assistant Attorney General and as a law professor at the University of Michigan before joining her State's highest court, the supreme court.

We are now considering the nomination of Colorado Supreme Court Justice Allison Eid for the Tenth Circuit. Justice Eid served as Colorado's solicitor general and is a law professor at the University of Colorado. She clerked for Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas and was appointed by Chief Justice John Roberts to serve as a member of the advisory committee on Federal appellate rules.

Finally, we will consider the nomination of Stephanos Bibas to the Third Circuit. Mr. Bibas is a law professor at the University of Pennsylvania and clerked for Justice Anthony Kennedy after earning degrees from Columbia, Oxford, and Yale.

This is a supremely qualified slate of nominees, as their impressive credentials make clear. My colleagues who are familiar with these nominees have

given praise to these nominees in earnest and honest discussion, which very much lends itself to my support. Without question, their fitness for the Federal bench is evident.

The fact that Democrats have been holding up these qualified individuals is totally misguided. We heard from Senator BLUNT in his remarks about the numbers. There are currently 21 circuit court vacancies and 120 district court vacancies in the Federal judiciary. While the Senate has an important role in examining nominees to fill these vacancies, Democrats have required virtually every potential judge to go through a time-consuming floor process that is simply not sustainable, even when there are no objections raised against the individuals. In fact, Democrats have used political tactics to delay virtually every one of President Trump's judicial nominees, controversial or not.

Every Senator has the right to vote against a judicial nominee if they believe that person to be unfit or unqualified—we all have that right—but engaging in a *de facto* filibuster against virtually every judicial nominee is an abuse of the rules, I believe, especially when the nominee has overwhelming bipartisan support.

The American people expect the Senate to confirm well-qualified nominees. They also expect us to advance a legislative agenda that will improve our economy and our security. By filibustering against qualified nominees, Democrats are keeping the Senate from tackling our important legislative work.

Starting with Justice Neil Gorsuch to the nominees being considered this week, President Trump has nominated mainstream judges who will serve our country for years in the judiciary. I commend the President, the chairman, Senator GRASSLEY, and the members of the Judiciary Committee for their work in advancing these talented individuals. We should confirm these judges and act promptly to fill other judicial vacancies.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, tomorrow morning the Senate will vote on the nomination of Colorado Supreme Court Justice Allison Eid. She is going to be voted on to serve on the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals. She is an eminently qualified and exceptional nominee who has received widespread, bipartisan praise and support.

Justice Eid has spent over a decade on the Colorado Supreme Court. Before her appointment, she served as the Colorado State solicitor general. In that role, she represented the State before both Federal and State courts. She also served as a tenured faculty member at the University of Colorado School of Law, where she taught courses in constitutional law, legislation, and torts. Justice Eid practiced commercial and

appellate litigation at Arnold and Porter. At the beginning of her legal career, Justice Eid served as a clerk for Judge Jerry Smith on the Fifth Circuit and as a law clerk for Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas.

Justice Eid was raised by a single mother, whom Eid credits for her significant personal and professional achievements. She earned a scholarship to Stanford and graduated with distinction and is a member of Phi Beta Kappa. Justice Eid received her law degree from the University of Chicago, where she graduated with high honors and Order of the Coif. She has had an impressive legal career, and she has an impressive life story.

In her long and celebrated tenure on the Colorado Supreme Court, Justice Eid has heard roughly 900 cases and written approximately 100 opinions. In 2008, 75 percent of Colorado voters retained Justice Eid to the Colorado Supreme Court.

Her nomination has also received wide, bipartisan support. As an example, Justice Eid's former clerks, who noted that they "come from a diverse set of geographic, economic, cultural and political backgrounds," wrote a letter to the Judiciary Committee supporting her nomination. Judges work closely with their law clerks every day. Law clerks understand a judge's deliberative process and approach to the law better than anyone. How did these clerks describe Justice Eid? They said: "She never fails to provide her full attention and dedication to each individual case, mastering the relevant facts and carefully analyzing the law, whether the text of a statute or the word of a contract." Her law clerks also wrote that she goes "where the law takes her" and that in their decade of collective experience in over 900 cases, Justice Eid "treats each case individually without any preconceived notion of desired outcome."

The National Native American Bar Association also endorsed Justice Eid. In their letter to the committee, they noted that she "has demonstrated deep understanding of Federal Indian law and policy matters, as well as significant respect for the tribes as governments. Such qualities and experiences are rare among nominees to the federal bench." They went on to note that "while we do not expect that Justice Eid will agree with tribal interests on every issue, we also believe that she is immensely well qualified and we are confident that Justice Eid is a mainstream, commonsense Westerner who will rule fairly on Indian Country matters." That is from the National Native American Bar Association. I think "mainstream, commonsense Westerner" is the perfect way to describe Justice Eid.

Despite this bipartisan support and her professional achievements, all the Democratic members of the Judiciary Committee voted against her nomination in committee, and I suspect most of the minority will vote against her

confirmation when it comes up. That surprised me. Justice Eid received a majority “well qualified” rating from the American Bar Association, an outside group who evaluates judicial nominees. My colleagues on the other side claim that this group’s ratings weigh very heavily in their decision to support or oppose a judicial nominee. In fact, my Democratic colleagues claim that these ratings should carry a great deal of weight with Senators, and they argue that the Judiciary Committee shouldn’t hold hearings on nominees who have not yet received ABA ratings.

This week, we are voting on four circuit court nominees—including three women—who received “well qualified” ratings from the ABA. The American Bar Association rated two of these individuals unanimously “well qualified.” Yet the vast majority of my Democratic colleagues voted against the two nominees on whom we have already voted, and I am willing to bet that the other two nominees will see similar opposition from my Democratic colleagues.

Why do my Democratic friends profess such admiration for the American Bar Association’s evaluation process and then vote against nominees who received the American Bar Association’s “well qualified” rating? I would like to see them put their money where their mouth is or maybe, better yet, their vote where their mouth is. If my colleagues believe so strongly in the ABA evaluations, they should start voting for nominees who receive “well qualified” ratings, but I suspect they will not.

When the Judiciary Committee voted on Justice Eid’s nomination, my Democratic colleagues really stretched to find reasons to oppose that nomination. One of the chief reasons given for opposition to her nomination centered on a quote in a Denver Post article that said Justice Eid has “earned a reputation of one of [the Colorado Supreme Court’s] most conservative members.” I find that statement to be misleading. Of the seven justices on the Colorado Supreme Court, Justice Eid is one of only two justices appointed by a Republican Governor. To argue that she is somehow extreme just because she was not appointed by a Democratic Governor is very unfair.

Furthermore, the Denver Post published a subsequent article that disagreed with this characterization. By contrast, the more recent article stated that “appointment by a Republican or Democrat does not always dictate the ideology of the justice. . . . Even categorizing justices as either conservative or liberal is generally an error.” I would agree with the Denver Post on this point.

Justice Eid should not be evaluated by her ideological reputation but, rather, by how she approaches issues before her judiciary. That is how I have evaluated Justice Eid and other judicial nominees, and that is why I strongly support her confirmation today.

I am very proud to support the nomination of Justice Allison Eid. She is the third in a series of distinguished female circuit court nominees we have had the opportunity to vote on this week. Her impressive experience and numerous accomplishments speak to her qualifications for this role. I commend the President for nominating these outstanding and accomplished women to our circuit courts. Justice Eid is an exceptional nominee, and her record overwhelmingly supports her nomination. As a result, I will support her confirmation tomorrow, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this week we have been talking about some sterling nominees for our Nation’s circuit courts of appeals. These are our intermediate appellate courts in the country, one step above the trial courts where cases are tried and one step below the Supreme Court of the United States.

What most people don’t realize is that the Supreme Court only decides roughly 80 cases a year. In other words, there is no guarantee that if your case is tried in the trial court, it will go beyond the circuit court of appeals. So in many instances, our circuit courts are the “supreme court,” or the court of last resort. These sterling nominees that the President has nominated include Professor Amy Barrett, who yesterday was confirmed to the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals by a bipartisan vote of 55 to 43. For some reason, our friends across the aisle have decided it is to their advantage to inexplicably drag out the clock against a really accomplished scholar—and to boot, a mother of seven—but, of course, to no avail.

What is worse is our colleagues across the aisle have seemed to have forgotten some of their own priorities when it comes to judges. For example, the senior Senator from Minnesota has said in the past: “It is time to get women on the bench.” Well, we just did that yesterday, and we are going to do it again. “They should get an up-or-down vote . . . that is what women deserve.” I would say that is what the President’s nominees—whether they be women or men—deserve, but, unfortunately, that hasn’t always been the case.

There is still time, however, for our Democratic colleagues to honor their previous statements and to put more women on the circuit courts without needlessly stringing them along with unnecessary delays.

Joan Larsen was the first. She was confirmed earlier today. She fulfills

the desire of the senior Senator from Vermont to “confirm women practicing at the pinnacle of the legal profession.”

That is certainly where Joan Larsen works. She has been a justice on the Michigan Supreme Court and was nominated to the Sixth Circuit, which handles Federal appeals from Michigan, Kentucky, Ohio, and Tennessee. Justice Larsen graduated first in her class from Northwestern University’s law school. She then clerked for the prestigious DC Circuit Court of Appeals, right here in Washington, DC. She then went on to serve as a law clerk to Justice Antonin Scalia of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Since then, she has worked in public service at the Office of Legal Counsel at the Department of Justice during the George W. Bush administration and has taught at the University of Michigan Law School.

Both of our Democratic colleagues from Michigan have returned their blue slips, which is the piece of paper which says they are OK with the nomination going forward, signaling their approval. Given her credentials, my question would be, How could they not?

Ms. Larsen will make an excellent judge. She already has been, but she will make an excellent addition to the circuit court of appeals, and I am glad we have now confirmed her.

Another nominee is on the way. Justice Allison Eid of the Colorado Supreme Court has been nominated to the Tenth Circuit post formerly held by Justice Neil Gorsuch, who was recently confirmed to the U.S. Supreme Court. The Tenth Circuit sits in Denver and includes Colorado, New Mexico, Kansas, Oklahoma, Utah, and Wyoming.

As in the case of Professor Barrett and Justice Larsen, Allison Eid is exceptional in every respect. She attended Stanford University and the University of Chicago Law School, where she was elected to the Order of the Coif and graduated with high honors. She clerked for the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans and then went on to clerk for Justice Clarence Thomas on the U.S. Supreme Court.

As with Justice Larsen, Justice Eid has received the blue slips from both of her home State Senators, which means they are willing to let this confirmation go forward. So I look forward to her quick confirmation.

Finally, the fourth judge who will be confirmed this week is professor Stephanos Bibas, who teaches at the University of Pennsylvania Law School. He has been nominated for the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, which covers Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. Stephanos Bibas was educated at Columbia, Oxford, and Yale Law School. He, likewise, clerked for the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals and then went on to clerk for Justice Anthony Kennedy on the U.S. Supreme Court. He has worked both in private practice and as a prosecutor. Now he

has distinguished himself as an academic, teaching and publishing in the realm of criminal law and procedure.

In their ringing endorsement of his nomination, a diverse group of more than 100 law professors noted Professor Bibas's "fair-mindedness, conscientiousness, and personal integrity." Those are the sort of qualities we should all want in a circuit court judge.

We are going to confirm Stephanos Bibas and the other nominees I mentioned, no matter how long it takes, this week. The majority leader has put our friends across the aisle on notice, and there is nothing they can do to stop those confirmation votes before we call it a week.

Once again, the administration has demonstrated its skill at picking bright nominees for the right reasons. This week's nominees will read the law faithfully. They will honestly interpret its text, and they will apply it to cases with a sense of humility no matter what their preferred outcome might be.

I appreciate President Trump, Leader MCCONNELL, and the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY, for the hard work in bringing these nominees to the floor. Now let's get them on the Federal bench.

TAX REFORM

Mr. President, the other issue I wish to bring up in my remarks today is tax reform, because we all know that the House of Representatives will release the Ways and Means Committee's beginning bill for tax reform—something we have promised for a long time and that the country is anxiously awaiting.

This will be the culmination of months—if not years—of hard work, of meetings, white papers, listening sessions, and the like so that we can deliver on our shared goal of a simpler, fairer tax system that boosts jobs and puts more money in the pockets of every American. Those are our goals.

We know that many hard-working Americans have had a rough time in recent years. Sending their kids to college and securing retirement seems to be harder and increasingly out of reach for some of my constituents back in Texas and people around the country. I hear about their concerns and their anxieties—economic anxieties—every time I go home. It is not acceptable that 50 percent of Americans are finding themselves living from paycheck to paycheck and that a third of voters are one trip to the mechanic shop away from a household financial crisis.

Last week, several of my colleagues and I sat down with the President—we were members of a bipartisan group of the Senate Finance Committee—and discussed our objectives in achieving meaningful and lasting changes to our Tax Code. The President agreed that we should cut taxes for hard-working Americans and that we should nearly double the standard deduction, which reduces the number of people who will have to itemize deductions on their tax

return, thus, making compliance with the Tax Code much simpler and cheaper. We agreed that we would significantly increase the child tax credit and reduce taxes on businesses and job creators.

This last objective—reducing taxes on businesses and job creators—deserves a little bit more discussion.

Ireland represents an interesting point of comparison for the United States. We have the highest tax rate in the world—35 percent for businesses that do business all around the globe. Ireland has a corporate rate of 12.5 percent. That is 35 percent to 12.5 percent. Because of that, it has become a haven for large American companies, especially in the high-tech sector.

Ireland has since ended its so-called "double Irish" tax scheme, which allowed it to benefit from taxes on income that should have been taxed in the United States. In other words, there is some rivalry and competition when businesses do business worldwide as to where their profits will be taxed. We want to make sure that those profits are taxed in the United States and not in countries abroad, where we would enjoy no benefit from.

This example illustrates what happens when we keep our tax rate so high. Sadly, companies leave. They go elsewhere, because they know that the difference between a 35-percent tax rate and a 12.5-percent tax rate in Ireland may be the difference between making a profit for your shareholders—whether it is the teachers retirement system or the firefighters pension fund—or ending up in the red and not making a profit at all. Savvy companies will leave, and they will go elsewhere. They know to create new entities and search the globe for better rates. It is really a matter of their competitiveness in a global economy.

Of course, when they do this, it is legal. It is rational because they want the best deal they can get for their shareholders. They also want to make sure they can achieve a profit for their shareholders and not a loss, frankly, due to the differential in tax rates.

When companies dodge U.S. taxes, it means we here in the United States miss out on revenue that we would otherwise reap. One thing is for sure. With \$20 trillion in debt, we want to make sure that our Tax Code is fair and simple and is competitive and will help us grow our economy in a way that will help us pay down those deficits and that debt.

Now, our Democratic friends have been known to demagogue this issue a little bit, saying: Who wants to cut these corporate tax rates overseas? Corporations shouldn't get a tax cut, even though they know what the facts are.

Well, they should simply listen to people like Barack Obama. In 2011 he was speaking to a joint session of Congress and called on Republicans and Democrats alike to lower the U.S. corporate tax rate because he knew—and

he was right—that this was hurting our global competitiveness in a global economy and that companies, out of sheer self-interest, were keeping the profits they had earned overseas rather than bringing them back and suffering from double taxation, meaning that workers here in the United States didn't get the benefit of that infusion of extra cash in their paycheck, and the investment that should occur here in the United States was occurring overseas strictly because of our Tax Code.

My colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon, described corporate inversions. That is what happens when an American company shifts its legal address to a foreign country, such as Ireland, for tax purposes. He called it a "contagion" that has affected the Tax Code with "the chronic diseases of loopholes and inefficiency." He went on to call the Tax Code an "anti-competitive mess." He is right.

The senior Senators from Maryland and Ohio have also made similar statements in past years.

We all realize that simplifying our Tax Code will reduce tax compliance costs, which currently run for small business owners at around \$19 billion a year. Our Tax Code has simply gotten to be too complex and too convoluted for honest, law-abiding small business owners to do it on their own. So they have to hire somebody else to help them sort it out.

The less money that a small business pays in tax compliance is the more they can spend on their employees or on expanding their business or on investing in new equipment or simply giving their workers a pay raise. Let's give them the relief that they need. Let's reduce the corporate rate, as President Obama and our colleagues on the other side used to argue for. With our proposals, we can also get moving on fixing the rest of the Tax Code to let the hard-working people of Texas and American families keep more of what they earn, improve their standard of living in the process, and to make our Tax Code more competitive in a global economy so that businesses that operate internationally will be incentivized to bring that money back here to the United States to make and manufacture products that are stamped "Made in America" and to improve the wages and quality of life and income of American workers. It just strikes me as a no-brainer, and that is exactly what we are going to set out to accomplish to.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, thank you.