

So I have a proposal called the progressive consumption tax. "Progressive," what do I mean by that? It means the taxes paid at the Federal level will be more reflective of a person's ability to pay than our current income tax code is. We make it progressive so it is fair, in that they pay according to their ability to pay a progressive consumption tax. That consumption tax rate will be the lowest among the industrial nations of the world.

I will give some examples. I will be the first to acknowledge we have to get these scored and these numbers can change as we go along, but we are looking at a consumption tax rate of about 10 percent. This would put us at the bottom of the consumption taxes among industrial nations. Individuals who earn under \$25,000 and families up to \$50,000 would pay no consumption taxes. They would get a credit for the consumption taxes they otherwise would pay.

Similar to the current income tax code where they do not pay income taxes, they would not pay consumption taxes. It would be immediately rebated to them. If they work, it would be rebated under the payroll tax payments. If they don't work, they would get a debit card to get instant rebates and use it as people use debit cards.

So we would make it progressive. We would then be able to start the income tax rates at \$100,000, approximately, of taxable income, and 90 percent of Americans would pay no income taxes. It would start at 15 percent. There would be an additional bracket of 25 percent, starting at \$40,000 of taxable income. So a progressive income tax, simplified, with only four deductions, not this complexity today as we figure out whether something is deductible and all the complications.

We would have four deductions for State and local—with respect to federalism—State and local taxes: for charitable deductions because our charities are critically important to carrying out the important work of our country, for real estate and the needs for the real estate to reflect—so we don't see destruction of the real estate market, and we also allow deductions for employer-provided health benefits and retirement benefits. It is simplified, it rewards simplicity, and allows for the progressiveness of fairness in our Tax Code that does not exist today.

The corporate tax rate would get down to 15 percent. That is what corporate America tells us we need to be competitive in the industrial world. This adds up.

Some say: Gee. Consumption taxes raise a lot of revenue. We put in our proposal an automatic adjustment of the rate to make sure it doesn't bring in more revenue than we say. So we are fair on the progressive side to make sure it is fair from the point of view of the ability of middle-class families to pay, and it is fair from the point of

view of those who are concerned about government growing, in that it has a circuit break as to the rate based upon the revenue that you need.

What have we accomplished by this? We have accomplished a much simpler Tax Code that people can understand, a fairer Tax Code, one that rewards savings. Savings are not taxed. There is a greater ability to raise capital in the United States. It is border adjusted, which means the taxes come off our exported products so we can compete globally in a much easier way. This is what we accomplish.

So when people talk about fundamental reform, to me, this is what we need to do.

I am going to move this proposal as quickly as I can, but obviously it is going to take some discussion and debate. We are hopeful we will be able to answer anyone's questions on it. We are very optimistic, but in the meantime what do we do? We can't just stand by and allow Pfizer to take American jobs overseas because of corporate inversion. So I hope we will stand for what is right in our Tax Code, that we have the capacity to improve our current Tax Code to avoid the loss of jobs and shipping jobs overseas, as well as working to reform our Tax Code and provide the type of structure so the country that relies the least on government among the industrial nations has the lowest tax rate and has a fairer system for all Americans.

RECESS

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 2:15 p.m.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:27 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MURPHY).

HIRE MORE HEROES ACT OF 2014— MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1670 AND S. 1696

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I have a unanimous consent request that I will make in a moment to kind of set the stage for what I am asking the Senate to consider. We will be asking that we schedule a vote on two pieces of legislation: the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, S. 1670, which is my legislation; and S. 1696, the Women's Health Protection Act, by Senator BLUMENTHAL.

Very briefly, what I am trying to do is to have an opportunity for the body to talk about two pieces of legislation that relate to the abortion issue, the role of the Federal Government. Very quickly, my legislation would ban abortion at the 20-week period—the fifth month of pregnancy—based on the theory that the child can feel pain at that point in the pregnancy and that

the standard of care for the medical community is that you cannot operate on an unborn fetus at the 20-week period without administering anesthesia, and the reason for that is because the child can feel pain.

There have been individuals born at the 20-week period who have survived. But the theory of the case is not based on the medical viability under *Roe vs. Wade*; it is a new theory that the State has a compelling interest in protecting an unborn child at this stage of pregnancy. The partial-birth abortion ban, which applies at 24 weeks, is backed up to 20 weeks.

Here is what medical journals tell parents to do at 20 weeks: An unborn child can hear and respond to sounds. Talk or sing. The unborn child enjoys hearing your voice.

It is a whole list of things about the unborn child in the 20-week period.

We are one of seven countries that allow abortions at this stage in the pregnancy, along with China, North Korea, Vietnam, Singapore, Canada, and the Netherlands.

So I would ask the body to consider having a debate on my legislation about whether we should limit elective abortions at the 20-week period and also a debate on Senator BLUMENTHAL's legislation that basically would allow the courts to set aside several State restrictions on abortion. We are going to present a series of actions at the State level. I think his legislation would allow the courts to have a literal construction in terms of being able to strike down these provisions. I disagree with my good friend. We are good friends, although we have a different view. The Senator from Connecticut made a statement when he introduced the bill that every Senator should be on the record when it comes to this legislation. I agree. I hope every Senator would be on the record when it comes to my legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate proceed to consideration of S. 1670, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, and S. 1696, the Women's Health Protection Act; that there be up to 8 hours of debate equally divided in the usual form, to run concurrently; that there be no amendments, points of order, or motions in order; that upon the use or yielding back of the time, the Senate proceed to vote on S. 1670; that following the disposition of S. 1670, the Senate proceed to vote on S. 1696; and that both bills be subject to a 60-vote affirmative threshold for passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Thank you, Mr. President.

Reserving my right to object, and I will object, I respect my friend and colleague from South Carolina. We are friends, and we agree on a lot of issues.