

Janice Shelton. She ran that place so well and was so polite, yet so firm, in what she would allow to happen and not happen. There was no bad language. She had a little cup, and if people used bad language, they had to put money in it. She was so gracious and so kind, and she had unbelievable energy. It didn't matter what the job was, big or small, Janice could handle that job. She was a stenographer, but she was a person who could handle the most difficult administrative situation, and she was a woman of tremendous faith.

Janice had a love affair with her husband Bobby for a long time. I remember Bobby, with that southern accent of his. When Bobby was still in business around here, he would bother his morning breakfast crowd by wearing T-shirts of mine. He ran with a kind of conservative crowd, and my T-shirt didn't fit in very well all the time. But she and Bobby were so loyal to me.

Janice was good to my family. She knew every one of my children and knew my grandchildren. She suffered with the bad times that we had. I remember I was heavily involved in the final stages of the Obama health care bill when she walked into my office and said: I have to talk to you. She told me my wife had been in a very bad automobile accident. She, of course, was available anytime she was needed to help Landra or me with things—those personal things you can't have just anyone help you with; it had to be somebody like Janice.

Janice's desk was right outside my office door. She was a fixture there. She was there all the time that I was. Whatever my hours were in the Senate, those were her hours. And I mean that without anything other than the truth. If I was there until 10 o'clock, she was there until 10 o'clock. Often, after I would go home at night, I would call back and say: Janice, why are you still there? And she would say: Well, I still have a few things to do.

I have missed Janice now for almost 3 years. I talked to her as often as I could. I am going to truly miss her now. She will leave a tremendous void in my heart. I am going to call my kids later today—I haven't done it yet because I haven't had time for anything—and tell them about Janice's passing.

I wish words could convey to everyone within the sound of my voice what a wonderful human being Janice Shelton was. I will miss her. The impact she has made in my life and my wife's life will be there forever.

Two of my staff came into my office separately and broke down in tears about Janice no longer being with us. She created such loyalty, such admiration for her hard work and professionalism. I love Janice Shelton and always will.

MASS SHOOTING AT UMPQUA COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND GUN VIOLENCE IN AMERICA

Mr. REID. Madam President, just a few days ago—last Thursday—our great

Nation witnessed another tragedy. While preparing these remarks, we were trying to come up with what we should say, and “tragedy” doesn't quite convey how horrible that mass killing was in Oregon.

Once again, a young man was able to obtain an arsenal of guns and end the lives of innocent people. Nine men and women woke up Thursday morning, all to attend a community college, but they were assaulted and killed in a demented, sadistic killing ritual. Lucero Alcaraz, age 19; Treven Taylor Anspach, age 20; Rebecka Ann Carnes, age 18; Quinn Glen Cooper, age 18; Kim Saltmarsh Dietz, 59 years old; Lucas Eibel, 18 years old; Jason Dale Johnson, 34; Lawrence Levine, 67; Sarena Dawn Moore, 44—all victims of a deranged gunman's murderous attack.

Madam President, our hearts are broken for the families and loved ones of the victims and for this whole community of Roseburg, but a broken heart isn't enough, is it. This senseless act of gun violence is not an isolated tragedy. Communities all around our Nation are shattered daily by these cruel and undeserved acts of gun violence.

The reality of gun violence in the United States is not only shocking; it is pathetic. Every day, gun violence claims the lives of 30 Americans. Tomorrow at this time, 4:15–24 hours from now—about 30 more Americans will be killed by guns. And 11,000 Americans are murdered with guns each year. This year alone, we have had 200 mass shootings—200. Anywhere else in the world these alarming facts would prompt action. Sadly, here in the United States we have become so desensitized to the lives taken every day by guns that our response is to do nothing—to do nothing.

Each time gun violence claims a life in America, the Nation follows the same routine. Here is what it is. The same thing happens. We have shock and sorrow. Then we start asking questions. Who did that? Who was the killer? We usually have to wait a few hours to find out who it was. Why did they do this? Why did they carry out this horrible act? Then we wonder aloud, when the time allows it: What could we as a nation have done to prevent this terrible thing from happening? But we don't do anything. We don't act.

It is within our power to reduce gun violence in this Nation and prevent mass shootings—not all of them but some of them, a few of them. We know these tragic events almost always occur in instances where somebody is unstable or they are terribly violent, and they are able to get a gun easily and use it to carry out these terrible attacks. We know this, yet we fail to pass improved Federal laws placing distance between mentally ill, violent people and guns. Instead of taking action, lawmakers all around this country pander to the extreme rightwing gun lobby and leave Americans vulnerable to these attacks. This year alone there have been more than 200 mass

shootings—this year. The United States is the global leader in mass shootings—this great Nation. Can't we raise standards in this country for gun purchases? The answer of course is yes. We can do it while not infringing on the rights to restrict access to firearms but to keep Americans safe. Let's not mince words about who would stop us from passing background checks: Republicans who wage a rightwing ideological crusade fashioned by the National Rifle Association and Gun Owners of America. These two organizations are in a scramble of who can raise the most money. That is what it is all about. If one of them does something, the other will do better than that. Each request comes with “Can you send some money?” This rightwing ideological crusade, fashioned by the NRA and Gun Owners of America, is to prevent background checks to keep guns out of the hands of terrorists, criminals, and the mentally ill.

The National Rifle Association is a far cry from the sportsmen's organization it once was. The NRA once called mandatory background checks “reasonable.” That is what they said. Now it uses its energies and its members' dues to fight against even the most sensible reforms. In opposition to this deadly agenda, Democrats have long sought to strengthen background checks. But instead of joining Democrats in finding ways to protect American lives, Republicans have pledged their loyalty to what was once a moderate sportsmen's organization.

Times have changed. Now the NRA and its leadership are committed to a radical agenda that allows criminals and mentally ill Americans to access guns and commit these terrible acts. Is this what the American people elected us to do? I think not. Is this the protection they want or deserve? I think not. Americans are smarter than that. They deserve better than that.

The majority of people who belong to the NRA believe there should be background checks to stop people who are mentally unstable and are criminals from buying guns, and 90 percent of gun owners believe there should be background checks, including 86 percent of Republicans. But even in the face of overwhelming public support, Republicans still refuse to join Democrats in taking steps to implement background checks that could save the lives of countless Americans.

We have witnessed the consequence of inaction too often. Why do I say that? This is over a period of many, many years—now decades: Fort Hood, 13 Americans killed; Tucson, 6 Americans killed; Carson City, 4 Americans killed; Newtown, 27 Americans killed, including 22 babies, little tiny children; Aurora, 12 Americans killed; the Navy Yard, here in DC, 12 Americans killed; Charleston, 9 Americans killed while worshipping; Moneta, VA, 2 journalists shot to death on live television; and now there is the massacre at Umpqua Community College, 9 dead.

These tragic events have shattered the lives of too many families. The shooter was armed with 6 firearms and loads of ammunition, and when they came to his home they found at least 14 guns—and another gun. I thought it was only 14, but, no, they found another one. So add them up—15 plus 6, or 21 guns—21 guns.

We do not yet know why this young man murdered these innocent people in cold blood. But what does it say about our country that it is willing to stand by, idle, while these tragedies happen, happen, happen?

Smarter gun laws in this country are long overdue. The lives of these men, women, babies, and children are at stake. How many more innocent lives must be taken before we are willing to act? How many more communities and families' lives will be shattered? How many more sacred places of worship will be violently attacked? How many more colleges or schools will be terrorized and forever traumatized by gun violence? How many more Americans will we mourn? How many more solemn statements, speeches of condemnation, and frank discussions must take place? What will it take before we stand up as a nation and say: Enough, not another innocent American will fall victim to this ideological crusade of having more guns and more guns and more guns.

If we don't take action, we are equally responsible for innocent deaths as are the sick individuals who plot and carry out these horrific massacres. I have started reaching out to Senators and talking about what can be done to advance the cause of background checks while Republicans are in charge for the next year or so. But one thing is clear. To pass background checks, we need Republicans to stop acting as puppets for the NRA.

Madam President, would the Presiding Officer announce what the schedule is for the rest of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

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

NOMINATION OBJECTION

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, our Founders designed a constitutional government powerful enough to defend against all threats, foreign and domestic, yet safe enough itself not to threaten our liberty. The separation of powers is a primary feature of our Constitution. Our Founders knew that encroachment by the executive onto the legislature, or vice versa, isn't only a political dispute but ultimately a threat to the freedom of all Americans. Thus they provided both branches with checks and balances to prevent such encroachment.

Late last week, we learned shocking news. Armed agents of the executive violated the law to intimidate a Congressman from doing his job. This is exactly the kind of encroachment against which our Founders warned. The executive hasn't yet acted with anything like the gravity this matter deserves. Until it does, I intend to use the powers of my office to demand action and to protect our constitutional order.

Let me say more about the shocking news. In an inspector general report issued last week, we learned that dozens of Secret Service employees illegally accessed the personnel file of Representative JASON CHAFFETZ. More than a decade ago, Congressman CHAFFETZ applied to the Secret Service; he was not hired. Now he is the chairman of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

In late March of this year, the committee held an important oversight hearing into a serious misconduct by Secret Service agents. Mere minutes into the hearing, an agent at the Secret Service's Washington office illegally searched the Service's database, which contains all manner of criminal, security, investigative, personnel, and other data. The agent discovered Congressman CHAFFETZ's old job application. This search was a blatant violation of the Privacy Act, about which the computer-based system explicitly warns on a prompt screen. The agent admitted conducting the search simply out of curiosity, presumably because Congressman CHAFFETZ was conducting an oversight hearing.

Far from an isolated incident, word quickly spread throughout the Secret Service, and 45 employees accessed Congressman CHAFFETZ's records over the next week on 60 different occasions. These employees were located around the world, from London to Sacramento, in multiple headquarters offices, even on Bill Clinton's protective detail. The inspector general could identify only four instances of potentially legitimate access. Moreover, the inspector general concludes that the information was shared with hundreds of people—each a violation of the Privacy Act.

Some employees realized their mistake and self-reported to their supervisor, according to the inspector general. While these employees indeed made a serious mistake, at least they

owned up to it. Others remained defiant, saying they didn't read the warning banner or even claiming a right to satisfy personal curiosity because the personnel files are "our database."

Let me state for the record my admiration for the vast majority of Secret Service agents, officers, and other professionals. We saw their professionalism on display again last month during Pope Francis's visit and at the U.N. General Assembly. They are dedicated professionals who risk their lives to defend our Constitution and laws. Indeed, Secret Service whistleblowers aware of this situation helped to initiate the inspector general investigation. Like the soldiers with whom I served in the Army, the upstanding men and women of the Secret Service want to get rid of their bad apples more than anyone.

Unfortunately, the senior leaders at the Secret Service once again failed their people. The inspector general identified 18 supervisors who knew or should have known of the illegal searches and disclosures. With but one exception, the inspector general found no evidence that these senior managers reported the matter up the chain of command or took steps to stop or remedy it.

These leadership failures went all the way to the top. One example is Deputy Director Craig Magaw. When briefed by a subordinate, Mr. Magaw reportedly "made a shooing hand motion and stated 'Yeah, yeah we know.'" Despite the gravity of the allegations, Mr. Magaw apparently took no steps to learn more or stop the illegal activity, and he claims not to recall this exchange.

Another example is Chief of Staff Michael Biermann, whom the inspector general characterizes as the de facto gatekeeper for Director Joe Clancy and Deputy Director Magaw. Mr. Biermann admits to hearing rampant rumors about the Chaffetz matter within 24 hours of the hearing. Yet he also apparently didn't inquire any further to learn the truth or take action to stop illegal activity.

The most egregious example of leadership failure in the inspector general report is Assistant Director Ed Lowery, the head of training for the Secret Service. Mr. Lowery wrote in this email about Congressman CHAFFETZ, "Some information that he might find embarrassing needs to get out. Just to be fair."

Lo and behold, 2 days later, a news Web site ran an article—unsourced—about Congressman CHAFFETZ's decade-old job application to the Secret Service. I wonder who the source could have been. For that matter, I wonder if this kind of attitude from the head of training explains some of the Secret Service's recent struggles.

There is even more egregious behavior not in the inspector general report. Thanks to a Friday afternoon news dump, we now know that Director Joe Clancy himself both knew of the Chaffetz matter at the time and misrepresented the facts to the inspector