

My amendment would simply do this. It would put a standard into the treaties that says that there has to be suspicion. You have to individualize an investigation. You can't push a button and search through 8 million Americans' bank records overseas. If we allow this to go without personal privacy protections, we are setting ourselves up for a dystopian nightmare, where the government looks at every transaction, every purchase, and everything we do in our lives. It is a big mistake to let this go.

There is no reason why this couldn't be corrected.

I have spoken to the countries involved, and they have assured me that there is not a problem at all with making these amendment changes to the treaties. Yet they have fallen on deaf ears.

It is a sad day for Americans taxpayers and a sad day for privacy that these tax treaties are being rushed through. I strongly object and hope other Senators will consider voting for taxpayer privacy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote take place after the completion of my remarks.

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

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President and fellow Senators, today the Senate is considering four tax protocols. These treaties—and these are treaties—have been approved by substantial bipartisan majorities in the Foreign Relations Committee in multiple successive Congresses. Two of these four protocols were reported out of committee without objection during the four most recent Congresses. It is in the interest of U.S. taxpayers that these be approved, and it is time for these to be approved.

I am honored that on my watch, we have finally brought these to the floor and brought them here at this moment to actually adopt these treaties, which will be adopted when the vote is called.

Tax treaties benefit U.S. businesses and citizens in a number of ways. Tax treaties create certainty for the business community. They promote a favorable business environment by minimizing uncertainty and helping U.S. businesses grow.

In the case of Americans working and conducting business abroad, tax treaties are indispensable in that respect. Tax treaties facilitate trade and investment by preventing double taxation. They provide U.S. taxpayers and investors with greater clarity about their tax burden. They provide tools to ensure that U.S. taxpayers are treated equally and fairly overseas, allowing them to invest and compete abroad with the knowledge that they will not face discriminatory barriers.

Tax treaties strengthen the ability of U.S. businesses to explore new opportunities abroad by establishing a predictable framework for how a tax burden

will be assessed. These treaties also provide tools to help resolve tax disputes between the United States and our tax treaty partners. Without these tools, U.S. investors would have limited ability to resolve these problems on their own.

It is not just businesses that benefit from tax treaties. These treaties impose reasonable limits in the amount of tax the other country can impose on a U.S. person who might live or work overseas. Tax treaties help us ensure that the United States can maintain an appropriate tax base by preventing tax fraud.

One of our colleagues has raised concerns about how the treaties deal with individual privacy and sensitive information. These treaties protect taxpayer information in a manner consistent with decades-long, established standards and practices under U.S. domestic law. These standards and practices have been upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court for more than half of a century. They have been used by administrations of both parties for decades. Changing the standard now would create confusion related to global administration of our tax laws.

I do not view this issue as an impediment or a change to how these matters have been successfully handled in the past. I ask my colleagues to oppose any amendments to these treaties. The treaties are consistent with the U.S.-modeled tax treaty and with a decades-long practice of implementing and enforcing our tax laws.

To be clear, any amendment to this resolution that materially changes the underlying provisions of these treaties will require acceptance by both our President and the foreign partner or the treaty cannot be ratified. These amendments constitute a material change to the treaties. They are damaging and would lead to, potentially, years of further delay when further delay is simply not acceptable.

These treaties had been held up for 8 years, and I am very pleased that this week we are finally moving forward in our role of advice and consent to the President on these commonsense treaties. It is time to move for the Senate to act on these treaties and a vote.

I urge my colleagues to approve them and to vote against the proposed amendments.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator PAUL have up to 5 minutes of debate prior to the second tranche of votes in this series.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 924

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the pending amendment.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MCSALLY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 4, nays 92, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 207 Ex.]

YEAS—4

Cruz	Paul	
Lee	Sullivan	
NAYS—92		
Alexander	Gardner	Portman
Baldwin	Graham	Reed
Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Hassan	Roberts
Blumenthal	Hawley	Romney
Blunt	Heinrich	Rosen
Booker	Hirono	Rounds
Boozman	Hoeben	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Brown	Inhofe	Schatz
Burr	Isakson	Schumer
Cantwell	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Capito	Jones	Scott (SC)
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	Kennedy	Shelby
Casey	King	Sinema
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Smith
Collins	Lankford	Stabenow
Coons	Leahy	Tester
Cornyn	Manchin	Thune
Cortez Masto	Markey	Tillis
Cotton	McConnell	Toomey
Cramer	McSally	Udall
Crapo	Menendez	Van Hollen
Daines	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Moran	Warren
Durbin	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Enzi	Murphy	Wicker
Ernst	Murray	Wyden
Feinstein	Perdue	Young
Fischer	Peters	

NOT VOTING—4

Bennet	Harris
Gillibrand	Sanders

The amendment (No. 924) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution of ratification.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Resolution of Advice and Consent of the Protocol Amending the Convention between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Spain for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with respect to Taxes on Income and its Protocol, signed at Madrid on February 22, 1990, and a related Memorandum of Understanding, signed on January 14, 2013, at Madrid, together with correcting notes dated July 23, 2013, and January 31, 2014 (the Protocol).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

AMENDMENT NO. 921

Mr. PAUL. I call up my amendment No. 921.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAUL] proposes an amendment numbered 921 to the resolution of ratification for treaty document No. 113-4.

The amendment (No. 921) is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide a reservation to the Protocol)

In section 1, in the section heading, strike “DECLARATION AND CONDITIONS” and insert “DECLARATION, CONDITIONS, AND A RESERVATION”.

In section 1, strike “declaration of section 2 and the conditions in section 3” and insert “declaration of section 2, the conditions in section 3, and the reservation in section 4”.

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 4. RESERVATION.

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following reservation: In the case of the United States, the provisions of paragraph 2 of Article XV shall apply as if the Protocol had entered into force on January 1, 2019.

Mr. PAUL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be waived.

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

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, I am offering a reservation to these treaties that would maximize the benefit for individuals and businesses that are impacted by these tax provisions.

My proposed reservation would establish only for the United States—and only for our tax purposes—an effective date of January 1, 2019. By entering into these treaties, the United States and our partners are committing to the same set of tax rules and solving the problems of double taxation that plague businesses that operate in several countries.

Senate debate on the merits of these treaties has taken many years, and there is no reason to punish American companies that paid their foreign taxes but then were double-taxed by the IRS due to the lack of a ratified treaty.

As I have said many times, I support the benefit of these treaties. I wish we added privacy protections, but I do support the benefits of avoiding double taxation.

I also support making whole those who have been double-taxed, and I think it is the right thing to do to backdate these to the beginning of the year. My proposed reservation would grant these companies and the IRS the additional benefit of having a uniform tax for 2019.

To give an example of a company in my State that would benefit, North American Stainless cannot pay dividends without being subject to double taxation. If we were to make this retroactive, we would not punish this company in my State. It is disappointing to me that the senior Senator from Kentucky led the opposition to this amendment because it would stand to greatly benefit a Kentucky company. It also would stand to greatly benefit many companies around the country if we were simply to make this retroactive.

We talked to the countries involved, and there is not one country that expressed any reservation about this. It is with great disappointment that I have to oppose the senior Senator from Kentucky, who is opposing this amendment and rallying those in the body to

prevent this from being retroactive. This would in no way slow down the treaties, and it is inappropriately said by some that it would. These treaties would go through with flying colors, and the reservation would apply only to our country.

I hope those who are thinking about how to vote on this will consider voting to make these treaties start in January 1 of this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 921.

Mr. CRAPO. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 4, nays 92, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 208 Ex.]

YEAS—4

Cruz	Paul
Lee	Sullivan

NAYS—92

Alexander	Gardner	Portman
Baldwin	Graham	Reed
Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Hassan	Roberts
Blumenthal	Hawley	Romney
Blunt	Heinrich	Rosen
Booker	Hirono	Rounds
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Brown	Inhofe	Schatz
Burr	Isakson	Schumer
Cantwell	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Capito	Jones	Scott (SC)
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	Kennedy	Shelby
Casey	King	Sinema
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Smith
Collins	Lankford	Stabenow
Coons	Leahy	Tester
Cornyn	Manchin	Thune
Cortez Masto	Markey	Tillis
Cotton	McConnell	Toomey
Cramer	McSally	Udall
Crapo	Menendez	Van Hollen
Daines	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Moran	Warren
Durbin	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Enzi	Murphy	Wicker
Ernst	Murray	Wyden
Feinstein	Perdue	Young
Fischer	Peters	

NOT VOTING—4

Bennet	Harris
Gillibrand	Sanders

The amendment (No. 921) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 94, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 209 Ex.]

YEAS—94

Alexander	Gardner	Reed
Baldwin	Graham	Risch
Barrasso	Grassley	Roberts
Blackburn	Hassan	Romney
Blumenthal	Hawley	Rosen
Blunt	Heinrich	Rounds
Booker	Hirono	Rubio
Boozman	Hoeven	Sasse
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Schatz
Brown	Inhofe	Schumer
Burr	Isakson	Scott (FL)
Cantwell	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Capito	Jones	Shaheen
Cardin	Kaine	Shelby
Carper	Kennedy	Sinema
Casey	King	Smith
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Collins	Lankford	Sullivan
Coons	Leahy	Tester
Cornyn	Manchin	Thune
Cortez Masto	Markey	Tillis
Cotton	McConnell	Toomey
Cramer	McSally	Udall
Crapo	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cruz	Merkley	Warner
Daines	Moran	Warren
Duckworth	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murphy	Wicker
Enzi	Murray	Wyden
Ernst	Perdue	Young
Feinstein	Peters	
Fischer	Portman	

NAYS—2

Lee	Paul
-----	------

NOT VOTING—4

Bennet	Harris
Gillibrand	Sanders

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 94, the nays are 2.

Two-thirds of the Senators voting, having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

The resolution of ratification was agreed to as follows:

TREATY APPROVED

The Protocol Amending the Tax Convention with Spain (Treaty Doc. 113-4)

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein),

Section 1. Senate Advice and Consent Subject to a Declaration and Conditions.

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Protocol Amending the Convention between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Spain for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with respect to Taxes on Income and its Protocol, signed at Madrid on February 22, 1990, and a related Memorandum of Understanding, signed on January 14, 2013, at Madrid, together with correcting notes dated July 23, 2013, and January 31, 2014 (the “Protocol”) (Treaty Doc. 113-4), subject to the declaration of section 2 and the conditions in section 3.

Sec. 2. Declaration.