

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 112, Eric Hargan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Eric D. Hargan, of Illinois, to be Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Eric D. Hargan, of Illinois, to be Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services.

Mitch McConnell, Lamar Alexander, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, Mike Rounds, Chuck Grassley, Thad Cochran, Steve Daines, Roger F. Wicker, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, John Hoeven, John Thune, Mike Crapo, Bill Cassidy, James M. Inhofe, Tom Cotton.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture motion be waived.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 301, Randal Quarles.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of fourteen years from February 1, 2004.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of fourteen years from February 1, 2004.

Mitch McConnell, Orrin G. Hatch, James Lankford, Jerry Moran, Johnny Isakson, John Thune, Thom Tillis, Shelley Moore Capito, Mike Crapo, James E. Risch, Mike Rounds, John Barrasso, John Cornyn, Chuck Grassley, John Boozman, John Hoeven, Rob Portman.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture motion be waived.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 226, Callista Gingrich.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Callista L. Gingrich, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Holy See.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Callista L. Gingrich, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Holy See.

Mitch McConnell, Bob Corker, Johnny Isakson, Patrick J. Toomey, Richard Burr, Orrin G. Hatch, Roger F. Wicker, Tom Cotton, James Lankford, Pat Roberts, Ron Johnson, Richard C. Shelby, Cory Gardner, John Thune, James E. Risch, Deb Fischer, David Perdue.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the man-

datory quorum call with respect to the cloture motion be waived.

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

The Senator from Connecticut.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I think all of us felt a familiar knot in our stomach early this morning when we received news of what might be the deadliest mass shooting in American history. The numbers are hard to comprehend. They certainly aren't final. Fifty-eight people are dead, and perhaps over 500 have been wounded, either by the gunshots themselves or by the pandemonium that ensued once the thousands of concertgoers in downtown Las Vegas figured out they were being fired upon from above.

There is nothing wrong with sending every thought and prayer and every bit of your heart to Las Vegas, to all of the family members who lost loved ones, to those who are recovering, to the first responders, and to the community at large. It really does help. I lived through one of these as a witness in Sandy Hook. Many of those parents are still my friends. We are about the same age, and our kids are the same age. While there are absolutely no words and no gestures that can ever salve the wounds that come with losing a child—especially a first grader—it did not hurt to know that the rest of the world was thinking every single minute about that community. There was an overwhelming amount of stuff that showed up in Sandy Hook—the teddy bears that piled up in the days and weeks that followed. It was a reminder to that town that they weren't forgotten. It helps. It does. But it is not enough.

I want to just spend a few moments—I know I was preceded by a few of my colleagues—to talk about the work that we have to do here if we are to address what I would consider to be a festering, lingering paradox that exists in this country. What I mean by that is this. This is a country that leads. Almost every great magical invention in this world today—whether it be open economies, participatory democracies, communication through the internet—is essentially a modern American invention.

The reason that we were able to catapult the rest of the world in just a quarter millennium to a point of global preeminence is because we saw big problems and we solved them before anybody else did. Then we took those solutions and we exported them to the rest of the world. That is a definitional characteristic of this country—working harder than anybody else to solve big problems and then giving that solution to others so they can use it for themselves. The paradox lies here. We solved a lot of big problems: How to govern ourselves, how to order our economies, how to talk to each other, and how to save people from disease. Yet maybe the longest standing human concern is a very simple one—concern for our physical safety.

I can chart you a history of civilization based upon society's ability to protect more consistently our physical body. That is, in fact, one of the original reasons why humans found each other—to try to protect ourselves from physical harm that comes from the outside. The paradox lies in the fact that, when it comes to this country's ability to protect its citizens from physical harm, we are not a leader. We are a laggard. We are an outlier when compared to other industrialized first-world nations. You are much more likely to meet a violent death, especially by the hands of a firearm, in this country than you are in other first-world countries.

It is time for us to explore why this paradox exists. Why are we such a leader and why have we been such a leader over the course of 240 years on so many different concerns, and yet we are a laggard when it comes to protecting ourselves and our fellow citizens from physical violence? The scope of this problem is enormous. When you look at OECD countries, there are just a handful that have a higher rate of violence—and, in particular, gun violence—than the United States.

I have been down on this floor as have Senator DURBIN and others to talk about the numbers, over and over. But every day approximately 80 people lose their lives by gunfire, and two-thirds of those are suicide. But still, about 30 people every day are killed with a gun that is used by someone else. There is really no other country in the industrialized world that meets that rate of gun violence.

The mass shootings, which get the most attention, are truly epidemic. We have become normalized and regularized to 50 or 40 or 30 people losing their lives, but this happens nowhere else other than the United States at this rate. This is a uniquely American problem, and, by the way, it is not just the Las Vegases, the Orlandos, and the Sandy Hooks. We have actually had more mass shootings this year than days in the year, if you categorize a mass shooting as four or more people being shot in any one given time. Let me guarantee you, if four or more people were shot in your town or your neighborhood, that would be a cataclysmic event, and yet it happens on average more than once a day in this country. Because we have become so regularized to it, only with the moments like last night, where the scale is truly epic, do we focus on it as a Nation.

I want my colleagues to understand the pain that comes when the victims of this kind of epidemic violence see nothing but silence from this body. The hurt is deep. The scars are wide in Newtown, but they are made wider by the fact that this body, in 4½ years, has done absolutely nothing to reduce the likelihood of another mass shooting. Indeed, because we have done nothing, the mass shootings continue.

I know these are harsh words, but I believe it in my heart. I think this is

an unintentional endorsement that gets sent to these mass murderers when, slaughter after slaughter, Congress does nothing. If the greatest deliberative body in the world doesn't act in unison to condemn them through policy change, it starts to feel and look like complicity. So there is going to be another wave of unimaginable pain that will sweep across Las Vegas and the country as we learn about who these victims were and, perhaps, as the numbers mount. They will, over time, be just as angry and just as furious at this body as those parents in Sandy Hook are today that we do nothing to try to reduce the likelihood of these shootings. Compassion is important, but it is not enough.

I read a little passage of the Bible to my 5-year-old son every night. I am the furthest thing from a theologian, but I know that sprinkled throughout the Bible are references to the fact that prayer has to be matched with action—with works. James says: "Show me your faith apart from your works, and I will show you my faith by my works." Thoughts and prayers need to be matched by action, and that is our job. Our job, frankly, is not just to send good thoughts. The reason why we exist is to act, to change the laws of the Nation, and to address challenges that our constituents face. Since the beginning of time, the most important challenge our constituents have faced—the human race has faced—is that of physical security.

So before I turn this over to my colleagues, let me just run down very quickly through the arguments that are going to be used over the next few days to continue to do nothing. The first is already in operation today, and it is a critique I hear very often. It is often lodged at me personally. It is this: To talk about policy change in the wake of a mass shooting is to politicize it, to cheapen it. I reject that argument in full force because the reality is that every single day there is a mass shooting. Every single day 80 people die from gun violence. Unfortunately, the news media doesn't pay attention to that regular carnage.

If we aren't talking about policy change the day after a mass shooting in this country, then you are never talking about policy change, because a mass shooting happens, on average, every day. Unfortunately, the ones in which 8 people are shot or 12 people are shot do not get national attention.

Second, whether we like it or not, the world's attention—the country's attention—is positioned on this question of how we protect our country from harm in the immediate aftermath of these mass shootings. It is an enormous gift to the gun lobby, to the forces of status quo, if we cannot talk about how to change our laws to make people safer when everyone's mind is on that question. When a murder occurs, there is not a 48-hour waiting period before the police can try to investigate who did it and how to hold them

accountable. So why can't we get immediately to the question of why these shootings are happening and try to solve it?

Also, others today are saying that legislation is a pointless exercise because you can't regulate away evil. There is truth to that. There are evil people in the world who are regularly doing very bad things, and there is no way that a set of laws can stop people from doing harm. But I would argue in some way, shape, or form, that the very nature of government is an attempt to try to regulate the effect of evil on citizens. Our laws against murder, arson, rape, and assault are attempts to try to make sure that people are protected from evil, from bad people. So why can't we have a conversation about how to make sure that people who are contemplating mass violence, at the very least, do the least violence possible?

It is not coincidental that these epidemic mass shootings, in which 50 or 60 or 40 people have died, largely have happened after the expiration of the assault weapons ban. Now that it is much easier to get your hands on a gun that is much more accurate and much more lethal, the likelihood of large numbers of people dying, as happened last night, is much greater.

An AR-15 style weapon does something different to a human body than a pistol does. That is why 20 kids were shot in Sandy Hook, and not a single one of them survived.

Laws do work. Just look at a State like Connecticut, which requires universal background checks, doesn't allow you to buy assault weapons, and requires you to get a permit before you can carry it. When we passed that set of laws, it resulted in a 40-percent reduction in gun violence, even when you attribute or account for other factors that could have caused that reduction. That is a Johns Hopkins study.

In places that have universal background checks, gun homicides are lower; domestic violence homicides are much lower by a degree of 40 percent. Laws work. The data is irrefutable on this point.

Though you can't regulate away evil in total, you can do more to protect people, especially from this mass-scope gun violence.

Third, people will say: Well, this guy clearly was very mentally ill. With gun laws, you can't do anything about the fact that people are mentally ill. That is true. We should fix our broken system of mental health treatment because it is broken, but we should also recognize that this problem of mass execution is a uniquely American problem, despite the fact that there is no evidence that we have a higher rate of mental illness than any other country.

There are plenty of very mentally ill people in other OECD countries. But in those countries, their mental illness is not a straight line to a gun crime, in large part because they have a very different set of laws that make it harder

to get your hands on a gun and much harder, if not impossible, to get your hands on a weapon that does the kind of mass violence we saw last night.

Lastly, one of the favorite arguments is that this is just too hot an issue for the U.S. Senate or a political body to handle, that it is controversial. It is controversial, but it is not as controversial as people may think.

In fact, the issue of background checks—which I understand may not have been dispositive on what happened in Las Vegas last night but might have reduced the likelihood that another 80 people died from gun violence over the course of Sunday—is supported by 80 percent of Americans.

Most polls will suggest that a majority of Americans support the other sweep in law changes that I talked about as well.

In fact, many of the first steps we would take as a body—saying that people on the terrorist watch list can't buy guns, tightening up the law to make sure people who are mentally ill can't buy guns—are supported by 80 to 90 percent of our constituents, no matter whether they live in a blue State or a red State. The question of making sure that only the right people own guns is actually one of the least controversial issues in the American public today. Why don't we start by finding that common ground? Then maybe after that, we can find other common ground.

This is going to keep happening. This is going to keep happening over and over again. I know the answer can't be that we are powerless, as a body, to do something about it. I personally just can't bring that answer back to the families of Sandy Hook for another year.

I don't want to speak for them, but I have a feeling that the delegation from Nevada is going to have a hard time bringing that answer back to the victims in Las Vegas as well.

This is a growing fraternity—a tragic, awful fraternity—of Members of Congress who represent States and have gone through these horrific mass executions. I had too many phone calls from Senators, Representatives, who were already part of that club when Sandy Hook happened. I got to make that call this morning, as well, to offer whatever advice I could on how to help the community heal.

But this silence has become an unintentional endorsement. It has become a kind of sick complicity, and I hope that in the coming days we can come together—Republicans and Democrats—to start talking about, at the very least, some baby steps to show the people of Las Vegas, to show the people of Orlando, to show my constituents, my friends from Sandy Hook, that silence is no longer an option.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me thank my colleague from Connecticut.

He sponsored a filibuster on this issue, I believe it was last year. I participated in it, as did many Members of our caucus.

Both he and Senator BLUMENTHAL bring a special perspective to this issue of gun violence, representing the State of Connecticut and the families who lost their first graders. I believe they were first graders who were shot down, 20 of them killed in their classrooms.

I remember, when I heard that story on how those children died and their teachers died, I thought to myself: This must be the moment that will motivate America to finally do something if innocent, first grade children can be shot down in their classrooms in this fashion.

The honest answer is that we have spoken a lot about the issue, but we have done little or nothing to change the circumstances that led to their death.

If that were the only case, it would be bad enough, but the Orlando nightclub—I believe 49 were killed there. Some crazed person went there and killed innocent people gathered at that nightclub.

As Senator MURPHY has said, when you go through the litany, it is an endless litany of victims of gun violence—and last night in Las Vegas, NV, the worst gun crime in the modern history of the United States of America, the worst.

Estimates now, which I saw as I came to the floor, are that 58 have died and over 500 were seriously injured. I don't know what the ultimate numbers will be, but those numbers, in and of themselves, are incredible.

Last night, we witnessed what was the worst mass shooting to date in the Nation. This gunman, supposedly, at 10 p.m. last night in Las Vegas local time, began firing from a room on the 32nd floor of a hotel into a crowd of people gathered for a country music festival. He supposedly was holed up in his hotel room with at least 10 guns and obviously fired hundreds of rounds of ammunition.

As I mentioned, 58 people have been reported to have died, and over 515 injured. Those are staggering and horrifying numbers.

There are literally hundreds of families tonight and communities who have been changed forever by this horrendous crime. Our prayers, obviously, naturally, go out to them in this moment of loss and uncertainty.

During and after the shooting—as we expect but should never take for granted—law enforcement, first responders, acted like the heroes that they are, working to stop the shooter, securing the scene, helping the victims, saving lives. We are grateful to these first responders, who so often are called to run to the sound of gunfire to keep us safe, not to run away.

It is unthinkable that this type of shooting tragedy could happen in the United States of America, but I am sorry to say it is becoming a regular

occurrence. This was the worst, but yesterday, October 1, was also the 2-year anniversary of the mass shooting in Roseburg, OR, when a gunman killed eight students and a professor at a community college.

Also, this past weekend, at least 33 people were shot in the city of Chicago. At least four died. The relentless toll of gun violence never seems to stop.

The American Medical Association has declared that gun violence is a public health crisis in America. On an average day, 300 Americans are shot. On an average day, 300 Americans are shot. About one-third of them will die from that gunshot.

Mass shootings, as Senator MURPHY said earlier, have become a daily occurrence. If our critics would say "Please, don't exploit the event of a mass shooting by speaking on the floor," as Senator MURPHY has made clear, then we wouldn't be able to speak any day of the year because they are so common.

We can't let this become the new American normal. We can't just shrug our shoulders when we see over 30,000 Americans shot and killed year after year after year. We can't sit back and do nothing while hundreds of our fellow Americans are shot in one night simply because they went out to hear a music concert.

Just this last week, I was at a concert in Nashville, TN, at the Ryman, the site of the Grand Ole Opry; 2,000 people gathered there. They were mainly folks from the Midwest, many of them retired, who love country music. I am sure, as the people in Las Vegas did. When I heard about what happened in Las Vegas, I thought: Well, what if someone had walked into that theater and opened fire? It could have, sadly, happened there.

What are we going to do about it? Certainly, there will be outrage at the death. There will be grief over the loss. But then what? That is what Senator MURPHY challenges us to think about.

We serve in the U.S. Senate. We are not just casual observers of this violence. We are supposed to pass laws to make America safer. What will we do because of what happened in Las Vegas last night? That is the question that brings me to the floor this evening. If we have a responsibility to keep our families and America safe, what are we prepared to do?

For the gun deaths in Chicago, there are some things that I would do instantly. Background checks—I don't believe we should be able to walk into a gun show and buy a firearm or more than one, incidentally, and take them out of the back door without somebody asking: Who are you? Do you have a criminal record? Would you be disqualified from buying these same guns at a licensed gun dealer?

Currently, the law is riddled with loopholes, and those loopholes lead to death, death on the streets of Chicago.

We also have these purchases being made by straw purchasers. In other words, the girlfriend, who has no criminal record, who walks into the gun

shop in the suburbs of Chicago and buys the gun for her boyfriend outside in the car, who is going to use it that night to shoot up a rival gang member or some other criminal activity. Those are two very obvious things I would push for instantly: Close the gun show loophole; make sure we do something about straw purchasers so that the penalties are serious enough that they will never do it again.

There is more. This morning, I was on a radio show in Chicago, one of the most famous ones, I guess. I listened to a fellow named Steve Cochran celebrating his 1,000th show on the air. This was the topic we talked about.

Steve asked me: Well, what can we do? I said: Steve, we have to rely on people who honor the Second Amendment and believe it is an important part of our Constitution to stand up and lead. I am talking about members of my family who are hunters and sportsmen. I have been out hunting myself. We have to have people who are concerned about guns for self-defense stand up and say: We have to draw a reasonable line. There is no reasonable line under the Second Amendment that would allow what happened in Las Vegas last night.

To think that someone could injure over 500 people and kill 58—what kind of weaponry did he use? We will know. We will find out the details, but it certainly goes beyond any reasonable weaponry needed for self-defense, sport, or hunting purposes.

Can we not at least appeal to those who honor the Second Amendment to join us in drawing a reasonable line so combat and military-style weapons that can lead to such carnage are not considered to be normal or acceptable? Decades ago we did when it came to machineguns. Decades ago we said this is a weapon no one should have, period, except for the military and perhaps law enforcement. Can we return to that conversation? We are going to need the leadership from people who believe in the Second Amendment to make it happen.

We have seen Democrats and Republicans join together to pass meaningful laws to deal with public health crises like opioid addiction. We have to do the same for this public health crisis.

I am sorry to report that a recent nominee for Surgeon General of the United States was almost denied that opportunity because he was bold enough to say that gun violence is a public health crisis. It certainly is.

There is no single law or policy that will prevent every tragic shooting, just as there is no single law or policy that will end heroin overdoses, but let's start working together to do something.

We can't stop the shootings that have already happened in Las Vegas, Chicago, Roseburg, OR, and across the Nation. We failed to respond in time for those victims and their families. But if we work together, we can stop shootings in the future. That is something we should all strive to do.

We must do all we can to spare families the unimaginable pain so many in Las Vegas are feeling today in the aftermath of this horrible tragedy. I hope we will.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I commend the words and the determination for action that were expressed by the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Illinois. Like them, and like so many people across the country, I start with condolences and prayers and commendations. I offer condolences to the families—the names and the families we don't know yet—of this most recent tragedy, but we do know they are not only worthy of our expressions of condolence but will be in need of our prayers. Then, I offer commendations, of course, to the first responders and the law enforcement officials who responded as they always do, running toward the danger, running to help. We can't say enough about the work they do.

If we stop at expressing condolences and offering prayers and commending those who take action, like first responders and law enforcement—if we stop there, I don't think that is an adequate response to this tragedy, just like it wasn't an adequate response in connection with the Pulse Night Club or the tragedy in December of 2012 in Newtown, CT. It is nowhere near an adequate response when we consider the enormity of this problem.

I believe we have to take action. I will talk about that in a moment. Action must start with what happens on this floor. It is difficult to take action necessarily if there isn't time for debate, time for collaboration on legislation, and ultimately consideration of legislation on the floor of the Senate and I would hope in the U.S. House of Representatives.

The enormity of this tragedy is almost hard to comprehend when we think about it, not just in terms of the number, which at last count was 58 killed and over 500—over 500—injured. Those numbers are almost too large to comprehend; that one person with one weapon or maybe several weapons was able to inflict that kind of carnage in one place at one time. I don't know how long it took, but he wasn't shooting for many hours to kill that many people. He did it in a short timeframe.

When we consider those numbers, I have to ask—I don't know if we went back and compared a similar day or a similar timeframe, comparing the loss of life in the context of war, but I am sure there were plenty of days of conflict where Americans were on foreign soil in a battle, in a war, where we would have lost even less lives on a particular day or a portion of a particular day. The scale of this is almost unimaginable.

Then, we need to consider what has been happening on our streets. Every State, every community has their own

numbers. I can point to Pennsylvania. Just since 2014, thousands of shootings—by one estimate I think over 7,700—but then, of course, the more ominous number is the number of people killed as a result of those shootings. In Pennsylvania, since 2014, some 2,072 people have died as a result of that larger number of shootings.

I think for the Nation, and I think, certainly, undoubtedly for me, maybe the most important or the most seminal day in this debate was in December of 2012 at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, CT. The distinguished Senator from Connecticut, who joins us on the floor and started tonight with his remarks, remembers it better than probably any other Member of the Senate, other than his colleague in Connecticut and others who lived through it.

One of the questions I asked myself at the end of that weekend, after watching hours and hours of television coverage and reading a lot about it and then watching a news report on Sunday evening which tracked the pathway of the killer going to one classroom and killing 20 children—6-year-olds, 7-year-olds, first graders—after he had done that, he was on his way to another classroom. So I concluded from that, if he had more time, in addition to the 20 killed in one classroom and the adults who were killed, we would have been reading about potentially hundreds of children killed in one school in even less—a lot less than a day, maybe an hour or two or three, but that didn't happen. He took his own life.

So I began to ask myself not only what should we do in response to this—and I had concluded at that point to support legislation—but a larger question kept coming to mind. If one person, with one weapon or a few weapons and unlimited ammunition—if one person cannot only kill 20 children in Connecticut, I guess almost 50 people in Florida, and now we know from Las Vegas at least 58, and I am sure some who were injured will die—but if one person can do that, we have to ask ourselves, Is there nothing we can do? Because that becomes part of the debate, right?

One side says: Let's take action by way of legislation or take some action that would reduce the likelihood that we have more tragedies like this, more mass shootings, but the response immediately comes back that the other side says: We agree it is tragic, we agree we want to prevent it, we agree we want to reduce the likelihood, but there is nothing we can do legislatively to reduce the likelihood or to prevent it.

I don't think anyone would argue that a law that passes in the aftermath of this Las Vegas tragedy or a law that passes even in the aftermath of Sandy Hook Elementary School—if the law, the proposals, the bills, really, that were voted on in the Senate in 2013, if they had passed, no one can argue with certitude or with scientific precision

that if you pass this law, this many lives will be saved. After Newtown and after this tragedy, I come back to the same question: Is there nothing we can do legislatively? We are the most powerful country in the world. We led the world in winning World War II, a war that was not on its way to winning until we got involved, until we were forced to respond because we were attacked. We are the country that has cured disease and built the strongest Republic in the history of the human race; that has the strongest military, without a doubt; that has the strongest economy, without a doubt; that has so much in ways that we can point to of American exceptionalism and strength and achievement—achievements that are unmatched anywhere in the world in almost any part of American life that one can point to. Is that same country completely disabled from taking an action that would reduce the likelihood—and we would hope substantially reduce the likelihood—that we will not have another Las Vegas or another Orlando or another Newtown, and go on and on from there, all of these tragedies in all of these places? Is that really what our answer is going to be?

We take action when we are attacked, to fight back and to prevent it from happening again. We take action when there is an epidemic. We take action when there is a crisis. We take action when there is a natural disaster. We are seeing some of that most recently. We take action as a government. The Congress takes action. The executive takes action. Yet, in this circumstance, what can only be described as an epidemic—that might be an understatement—where we are losing more than 30,000 people a year, are we saying that there is nothing we can do legislatively to reduce that likelihood? I don't think any American, if they think about it, would conclude there is nothing we can do.

So when I considered that in the context of Sandy Hook, I had to ask myself: Are you saying to yourself that you are going to vote no on what became three bills, vote no on them because you believe there is nothing you can do? That is what your vote is going to be? That is going to be your response? As a legislator with the opportunity to cast a vote in a body of 100 people, you are going to say no three times, as it turned out in 2013, to legislation because you believe there is nothing your vote and nothing this legislative body can do?

Well, I decided to vote yes, at least, but even that is not enough. We haven't had votes in years on these issues. Here we are, almost 5 years later—in December it will be 5 years, half a decade—since Newtown, CT, since the massacre at Sandy Hook.

I have a page from the Wall Street Journal that was printed within a couple days of that tragedy. It had very small color pictures and very small biographies of those very small people,

those 6-year-olds and 7-year-olds. It has been on my desk all of these years, and it is a very yellowed copy of a newspaper article. I often think about what those families have gone through all of these years.

The great recording artist Bruce Springsteen had a song after September 11. The name of the song is "You're Missing." The refrain in that song, of course, is "You're missing," talking about someone, of course, who lost a loved one on 9/11. He says: "You're missing when I turn out the lights, you're missing when I close my eyes, and you're missing when I see the sun rise." The same could be said of those Newtown families, the same could be said of those families in Orlando, and now, unfortunately and tragically, the families in the Las Vegas area—and maybe well beyond Las Vegas—who were there for that concert.

I hope this will be an occasion not just for speeches and expressions of condolence and commendation for those who showed such bravery in this tragedy, or prayers and solidarity, but that this will be a time for action, meaning action in the context of debate and action in the context of legislation.

I think there are a number of steps we can take—I will not outline them all now—a number of commonsense steps we can take that are entirely consistent with the Second Amendment but would reduce the likelihood over time of having more and more of these tragedies or maybe, just maybe, taking action that will reduce the number of deaths. Even that would be substantial progress. I just cannot accept the idea that there is absolutely nothing we can do legislatively to reduce the likelihood—and I would hope substantially reduce the likelihood—of these tragedies so that we can prevent or at least reduce the number of tragedies.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

RECOGNIZING NORTHERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY'S SALMON P. CHASE COLLEGE OF LAW

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today I wish to celebrate a special anniversary in my home State. The Salmon P. Chase College of Law at Northern Kentucky University, NKU, is marking

its 125th year of educating students and helping them follow their dreams in the legal field.

Chase's story is one of transformation and innovation, and through it all, the school has produced graduates prepared to excel in the legal field. Originally founded in Ohio, Chase was only the third law school in the Nation to offer night programs. Since then, Chase has crossed the Ohio River into Kentucky, joined with NKU, and continued to find the best ways to grow as a respected institution.

Named after Salmon P. Chase, the sixth Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, the college is known as the Lawyer's School for its commitment to helping students be practice-ready upon graduation. Today Chase is a proud part of Kentucky's legal community. With graduates in a wide range of careers, including serving as Federal judges and as Members of Congress, Chase's impact has grown considerably since its founding. It is also the proud home to a nationally recognized moot court team and has led the Commonwealth in the bar exam passage rate in recent years.

These successes wouldn't be possible without the dedicated work of Chase's faculty, staff, and administration. I would like to extend my sincere congratulations to Jeffrey Standen, who serves as dean and professor at Chase. Under his leadership, Chase has continued its growth, innovation, and achievement. The school's distinguished faculty come from some of the highest levels of the bench and bar with the experiences and passion to prepare students for success in their careers. The school's alumni, more than 5,000 and counting, are using their skills in more than 47 States, in Washington DC, and around the globe.

I would also like to thank NKU's interim president Gerard St. Amand, a current professor and former dean of Chase himself, for his commitment to the university and his willingness to help guide the community.

Each time I have had the opportunity to engage with Chase students, I have noted their intellectual curiosity and their passion for the law.

The Chase College of Law has grown so much in the last 125 years, and it has become an integral part of Kentucky's legal community. I am proud to join with the Chase students, faculty, staff, administration, and alumni to commemorate this occasion. I urge my colleagues to help me celebrate Chase's quasiquintennial anniversary, and I look forward to many more years of accomplishments.

CONFIRMATION OF HEALTH TARBERT AND CFIUS REFORM

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would like to take a few moments to congratulate Heath Tarbert, who was confirmed by the Senate last Wednesday and will soon be serving as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for International Markets and Development,