

be Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.

Mitch McConnell, Chuck Grassley, Mike Crapo, John Cornyn, John McCain, Pat Roberts, Steve Daines, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Lee, John Boozman, Lindsey Graham, James M. Inhofe, Cory Gardner, Jeff Flake, John Thune, John Barrasso, Orrin G. Hatch.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Lee Francis Cissna, of Maryland, to be Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 214 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Alexander	Flake	Murkowski
Barrasso	Gardner	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Perdue
Boozman	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Capito	Heitkamp	Roberts
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rounds
Collins	Inhofe	Rubio
Corker	Isakson	Sasse
Cornyn	Johnson	Scott
Cotton	Kennedy	Shelby
Crapo	Lankford	Strange
Cruz	Lee	Sullivan
Daines	Manchin	Thune
Donnelly	McCain	Tillis
Enzi	McCaskey	Toomey
Ernst	McConnell	Wicker
Fischer	Moran	Young

NAYS—43

Baldwin	Harris	Reed
Bennet	Hassan	Sanders
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schatz
Booker	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Stabenow
Cardin	Klobuchar	Tester
Carper	Leahy	Udall
Casey	Markey	Van Hollen
Coons	Menendez	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden
Franken	Nelson	
Gillibrand	Peters	

NOT VOTING—3

Cochran	Cortez Masto	Heller
---------	--------------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 54, the nays are 43.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Lee Francis Cissna, of Maryland, to be

Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Cissna nomination?

Mr. WICKER. Mr. 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 bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 215 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Alexander	Flake	Murkowski
Barrasso	Gardner	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Perdue
Boozman	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Capito	Heitkamp	Roberts
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rounds
Collins	Inhofe	Rubio
Corker	Isakson	Sasse
Cornyn	Johnson	Scott
Cotton	Kennedy	Shelby
Crapo	Lankford	Strange
Cruz	Lee	Sullivan
Daines	Manchin	Thune
Donnelly	McCain	Tillis
Enzi	McCaskey	Toomey
Ernst	McConnell	Wicker
Fischer	Moran	Young

NAYS—43

Baldwin	Harris	Reed
Bennet	Hassan	Sanders
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schatz
Booker	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Stabenow
Cardin	Klobuchar	Tester
Carper	Leahy	Udall
Casey	Markey	Van Hollen
Coons	Menendez	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden
Franken	Nelson	
Gillibrand	Peters	

NOT VOTING—3

Cochran	Cortez Masto	Heller
---------	--------------	--------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

TAX REFORM

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, not too long ago—I believe this was 2011—a President came to a joint session of Congress and before the American people, he said what needed to be said about our Tax Code. He was pretty blunt. He said that our Tax Code is “rigged.” He said: “It makes no sense, and it has to change.” Of course, you can imagine, that was met with bipartisan applause in the House Chamber and across the country.

The same President called on Democrats and Republicans to “simplify the system, get rid of the loopholes, and . . . lower the corporate tax rate”—one that, I might add, ranks among the highest in the industrialized world.

That President, like the rest of us, knows that our business tax rate is a self-inflicted economic wound because businesses figure out, How can I move money offshore and my headquarters offshore, and if I earn money overseas, how can I avoid bringing that back to the United States for better wages and more jobs and to build the business? That is all because of our self-destructive Tax Code.

But the President's name—and I gave it away by saying the year the speech was given. The President's name might surprise you, given the nature of the current debate in Washington. It was Barack Obama who said that, and the straight talk came from his 2011 State of the Union address.

Let's fast forward a few years. We have a new President from a different party beating the same drum. President Trump has called our Tax Code a relic and a colossal barrier standing in the way of America's economic comeback. He is right, of course, but so was President Obama.

Tax reform doesn't have to be partisan. In fact, it shouldn't be because the ramifications are much more important than just the politics and the scorekeeping of the day. The job creators in my State of Texas are the ones who really understand what is at stake because they are living it. They are the ones who are getting slammed by our current system.

Take Lisa Fullerton, for example, who owns a small retail business in San Antonio, my hometown. Ms. Fullerton is an accountant with 33 years of experience, who used to handle her own business's tax compliance in-house. Eventually, though, the code became too complex, and enforcement became too punitive, and she couldn't take that risk anymore. She said that her outsourcing of tax and employment functions now costs her small business roughly \$280,000 more per year than it did in 2000.

Lisa is far from the only one who is frustrated. Kurt Summers is the President of Austin Generator Service, a small residential power company in the Texas capital. For him, a lower tax rate would mean the difference between his company turning a profit or

a loss. It would literally make the difference between being able to keep the doors open or have to lock them up permanently. He explained that any extra profits realized through tax savings might enable his company to grow more aggressively. To him, the need for change is very simple. It means more hiring and more jobs.

So Texans, like Alaskans and like all Americans, get the picture. But the picture is pretty messed up, and it doesn't make any sense.

Greg Brown, President of W.W. Cannon, an industrialized storage company in Dallas, says that compliance has gotten to be a truly herculean tax. It has gotten so difficult that he has had to outsource that to a CPA—again, because it is so complex and people don't want to risk the burden of not doing it right because of the punitive nature of the penalties.

Darryl Lyons, CEO of PAX Financial Group, has done the same thing. He is harmed each year by the passthrough taxes on his small business income, which impair his ability to save for business emergencies, as well as to pay off his company debt.

Lastly, in terms of my stories here, Andy Ellard, the owner and general manager of a machine company in Dallas, regularly purchases expensive computer numerical controlled equipment to stay competitive in his industry. I have no idea what that is—computer numerical controlled equipment. He said that the tax ramifications of every purchase have to be considered. Almost every day, he asks: Can we expense it? Do we have to depreciate it? And if we do, over how long?

Mr. Ellard isn't shy with his words. He calls the complicated deduction scheme for business expenses "chaos."

Clearly, something needs to change. As I said at the outset, that has been acknowledged on a bipartisan basis by the current President and the past President. I even brought out some quotes yesterday or the day before from the Democratic leader, Senator SCHUMER, making exactly the same argument. The ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee, the Senator from Oregon, said that lowering the corporate tax rate will make America more competitive globally and will bring money back home for jobs and investment in our country. So it is important for us to be consistent and, unfortunately, they haven't been.

Things are starting to change. Last week, the so-called Big 6—led by Speaker RYAN; Treasury Secretary Steve Mnuchin; KEVIN BRADY, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee; and the Finance Committee chairman, ORRIN HATCH—released a unified framework that contains core principles for reform. Among them are a simplified rate structure, the elimination of the alternative minimum tax, and many itemized deductions and incentives for companies to keep jobs on American soil. Perhaps most importantly, the framework rec-

ommends what is widely agreed upon as overdue, which is lowering our uncompetitive corporate rate, which puts American employers and workers at a disadvantage.

Today, it is sad but true that we are divided on many issues in America. But as President Trump and President Obama have suggested, tax reform does not have to be one of them.

I listened to our friend the Democratic leader, Senator SCHUMER, this morning, calling for bipartisan tax reform. They are going to have a chance to do that because, after we pass a budget resolution, I anticipate that in the Senate Finance Committee, Senator HATCH will call up a base bill known as the chairman's mark, which will be open for amendment in the Senate Finance Committee. That is what people have been asking for, a chance to participate in the writing of the legislation in the committee and then to have it come to the floor for open debate and amendment. It is what we call regular order around here. But what I am hearing from our Democratic colleagues is, yes, they want bipartisan legislation, but they don't want to participate in the process of writing. It strikes me as pretty hypocritical. This shouldn't be partisan, as President Obama and President Trump have demonstrated and as Democrats and Republicans alike have said time and again.

We in Washington have no magic wand that will make our Tax Code suddenly disappear, but that doesn't excuse us from working to make taxes and tax compliance a little less painful.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, last weekend a man camped out on the 32nd floor of the Mandalay Bay Hotel in Las Vegas. He stockpiled 23 weapons and hundreds of rounds of ammunition. He set up bipods and scopes. He brought a hammer to knock out the window. Then, on Sunday, he opened fire. He kept firing for 15 minutes, stopping only to reload and switch weapons. Over 15 minutes, he murdered 58 Americans and injured more than 500.

The day after the shooting, I was in Washington. I had seven or eight meetings, and not a single person in those meetings brought up the worst shooting in modern American history—not one.

I am not sure if it was two mass shootings ago or three when we started to accept this as a normal condition of American life, when we lost our belief that it was within our power to protect our fellow Americans at a country music concert or at a nightclub or at a movie theater or at a school.

I know there are strong beliefs about guns in America—principled beliefs—but there are also steps that the overwhelming majority of Americans want us to take. There are 90 percent of

Americans who think we need background checks for every gun sale, including 74 percent of NRA members. There are 89 percent of Americans who think we should prevent the mentally ill from purchasing guns. There are 82 percent of Republicans who want us to bar gun purchases for people on the no-fly or terrorist watch list. Yet Congress has done nothing to respond to the American people. We did nothing after Aurora, after Newtown, after Orlando—nothing.

Unlike Washington, in Colorado, after the two mass shootings in Aurora and at Columbine, our legislators rose to the occasion and made tough choices after we suffered two of the worst mass shootings in our Nation's history. After the massacre at Columbine, we closed the gun show loophole. After the tragedy in Aurora, we strengthened our background checks in a Western State. Last year, those background checks blocked 8,704 people from buying guns. That may sound like a lot, but 380,000 people applied for guns in Colorado last year. That means just 2 percent of those folks who applied were blocked and that 98 percent were able to buy guns without a problem.

Who were the 2 percent whom Colorado is blocking but whom this Congress fails to block? Among them were murderers and rapists and kidnappers and domestic abusers.

No one could come to this floor and tell me Colorado is worse off because we have kept guns out of the hands of those people. The average wait time for those background checks is 12 minutes. That strikes me as a fair tradeoff to keep guns out of the hands of murderers and kidnappers and rapists. Yet here in Washington, despite now an annual tragedy—tragedy after tragedy—Congress has done nothing. We haven't even done the simple things like close the gun show loophole or stop people on the terrorist watch list from buying weapons.

This is not about taking guns away from people who have them. It is about keeping guns out of the hands of people who nearly everybody agrees should not have them. It is about stopping more people like the Las Vegas killer from modifying his rifles to become almost fully automatic and far more deadly. I cosponsored a bill this week to ban those modifications, and I am encouraged that some of my Republican colleagues seem to be open to that idea.

I know we cannot stop every madman or every random act of violence in this country—we cannot—just as we cannot stop every murder from happening, but that does not mean we should not make them less likely or that we cannot take steps to limit their harm, steps that are backed by the overwhelming majority of Americans and that are fully consistent with the Constitution.

I remember, after the shooting at the Pulse Nightclub, I was supposed to take my daughter to camp that day.