

been all around the world, and her social media was plastered with pictures of her travels.

Her father, as any father would be, is absolutely heartbroken by her death.

He said:

She was just everything. She was everything to me. I know nobody's perfect—but from the time she was born, she had no faults.

For the Brown family, the grief surrounding LaQuita's death comes on the heels of LaQuita's brother dying from a hit-and-run driver 3 years ago. Her father said that LaQuita helped him through the grief. "She saved me," he said. "I wouldn't have made it through that [without her]."

In 100 days into the year, we have had 100 mass shootings. It doesn't happen anywhere else in the world except in the United States of America. We can't claim to be helpless, and we can't claim to have no solutions because, if it only happens here and nowhere else, then there must be something different happening here. We can learn. We can adapt.

It has now been 100 days since the House of Representatives passed a universal background checks bill, a universal background checks bill that is supported by 90 percent of Americans and would have a significant downward effect on the number of people who are shot in this country.

We tend to pay attention as a nation and as a body only when something like Virginia Beach happens, when there is a mass shooting of an epic scale—when 5 or 10 or 20 people lose their lives at one time. Yet, since the House passed the universal background checks bill, 10,000 people have been shot and killed in America. That is a stunning number.

There have been 10,000 people shot and killed in America in just the 100 days since the House passed the universal background checks bill, but the vast majority of these individuals were not killed in mass shootings. Most of these were suicides. Most of these were individuals who had taken their own lives with weapons. Others were accidental shootings. Many of them were homicides.

The grief and the pain that comes with all of those is no different than the grief that LaQuita Brown's family is feeling right now. We should care about every single one of these deaths.

The reason I pegged this to the passage of the background checks bill is that we know that background checks save lives in States that have universal background checks, meaning, if you are getting a gun in a commercial sale, you need to prove that you are not a criminal or that you are not seriously mentally ill. In the States that have universal background checks, you have fewer suicides, and you have fewer homicides.

Connecticut is a perfect example. The research shows that once we passed our universal background checks requirement—and we did it

quite a number of years ago—we saw a 40-percent reduction in gun homicides in our State. Similarly, when Missouri went from having a universal background checks requirement to its not having one, the State saw a 40-percent increase in gun homicides.

Not every single one of these 10,000 deaths was preventable, but many of them could have been. It is not that we don't know what to do, and it is not that we don't know what makes this country different; it is just that we are unwilling to take those steps.

Just this past weekend, 52 people were shot in communities across this country. There were 10 deaths from gunshot wounds in Chicago alone. These victims are just as worthy of remembering as the victims in Virginia Beach or in Sandy Hook or in Parkland.

#### REMEMBERING GWAIN BROWN

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, Gwain Brown was 16 years old. He was a sophomore in high school in Chicago, IL, and he was all hyped up to throw himself the biggest 16th birthday party that his friends had ever seen. At the end of April, he was going to throw down. Yet, on April 1, he was standing in front of a gas station when a gunman opened fire and hit Gwain in the leg and the chest.

One of his basketball teammates thought the initial news of Gwain's death was an April Fools' joke as it happened on April 1. So, when he heard about it, he just went back to sleep.

His friends said Gwain was the life of the party and was so energetic. "I was . . . with him . . . a week ago, and for that to happen in this time period, I'm just in shock."

At a vigil, his elementary school principal read an excerpt of something he had written well in school.

Gwain wrote: "I want to be a good son, always be there for my mom and always be there to take care of her."

#### REMEMBERING JAYLIN ELLZEY

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, a couple weeks ago, Jaylin Ellzey was a freshman at Fenger Academy High School in Chicago. According to his uncle, Jacob, he was an outgoing, kind-hearted kid. He lived with his mother. He had two sisters and three brothers.

Jaylin is not around anymore because he was one of those victims of gun violence in the city of Chicago.

His uncle said:

Summer in the city, it's just something different. Other kids look forward to going to summer camp. He was just trying to make sure he lived another day.

His uncle, Jacob, began tearing up as he recalled his favorite memory of Jaylin as a small child. Whenever Jaylin and his brother would come stay with their uncle, they would take a bath, and then they would nestle amongst the pillows and the blankets, waiting for their uncle to blast them with hot air from a blow dryer.

"He was just a lovable kid surviving his environment," said his uncle. "And he knew about family. Family was always instilled in him."

Since my life was changed in December of 2012, when 20 first graders were killed in Sandy Hook, I have tried to come down to the floor every couple weeks and tell the stories of victims of gun violence in this country to try to put some personality behind the 10,000 lives that have been lost in the last 100 days, and I told you about 5 of the victims this morning.

Our inaction is complicity. There are tough things, and then there are easy things. I get it that there are some anti-gun violence measures that I would support that are just too hot for some Republican Members, but I don't care what State you are from, 97 percent of your constituents, 80 percent of your constituents—the vast majority of your constituents—support expanding background checks to make sure that if you buy a gun online or you buy a gun at a gun show, you have to go through a 5-minute background check.

All of our constituents, no matter whether we represent a blue State or a red State, support extreme risk protection orders—the idea that you should be able to go to court when somebody is on the verge of lashing out against someone else or going to hurt themselves and take away their guns, at least temporarily. These are things that are not controversial anywhere, except for here, that we could pass.

Since the House passed the background check bill—by the way, with bipartisan support—10,000 people have died, but there have been 109 mass shootings. Thirty-one States have had a mass shooting; 166 kids have been killed or injured; 175 teenagers have been killed or injured.

I am on the floor today to send my heartfelt condolences to the families in Virginia Beach who continue to mourn yet another mass shooting. I express, as I always do, my condolences to the families of gun violence throughout this country. Eighty to ninety people lose their life every day from a gunshot wound.

I am also here today to ask my colleagues to think about why we continue to refuse to have a debate on a piece of legislation that the House passed 100 days ago in a bipartisan fashion.

Even if you don't love the version of the background checks bill that the House passed, bring your own version to the floor—bring a different bill that will address the epidemic of gun violence in this country. All I ask is that you don't do nothing; that you stop your absolute silence in the face of this epidemic of slaughter.

Let the Senate be the Senate. I heard there was a time some years ago when the U.S. Senate actually debated legislation. I have read in the history books that this is supposedly the greatest deliberative body in the world. We are doing no deliberation here. Bill after

bill passes the House of Representatives. None of them come before the Senate for a vote—no healthcare bills, no immigration bills, no anti-gun violence bills.

I get it that the bills that pass the House probably can't pass a Republican-led Senate, but why are we not even trying? Who is in charge here? The special interests who want nothing to happen, the gun lobby, the health insurance companies or are we in charge? We are the ones who were elected. We are the Members of the U.S. Senate. We could choose to have these debates, hash out our differences, and see if there is a proposal that 60 of us could agree on that would do something about this unacceptable level of gun violence that plagues this Nation on a daily basis.

I yield the floor.

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. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

#### TARIFFS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, yesterday on the floor I said I don't believe President Trump will follow through on his threat to impose tariffs on Mexico. Why? First, because the President has a tendency for bluster. There are many examples of the President taking a maximalist position before eventually backing off and announcing some different solution. Nine times out of ten, after a few months, everyone realizes that the so-called solution isn't real and doesn't work, but the President needs a way out of his bluster. That may well be true with the tariff issue.

Second, most Senate Republicans oppose the President's idea of slapping tariffs on Mexico. They know how that could destabilize our economy and Mexico's and that it could actually make the migration problem worse.

Publicly, the President has continued the tough talk on tariffs with Mexico—he responded to my statement on the floor with a tweet last night—but ultimately I continue to believe he will back off. That has been his MO. When he does, I would urge him to consider a real solution to the border problem, not some fake solution that he and the Mexicans announce, and then it does nothing—they don't follow through, it doesn't have effect, whatever.

Here is a commonsense policy that will actually reduce the problems at the border: Many of the migrants that

arrive at our southern border are fleeing untenable situations—gang violence, drug cartels, corruption, domestic abuse, economic depravity. If you are starving, if you are worried that your child will be mugged, if you are worried that your daughter will be raped, you ain't staying there. The governments of those countries have failed to provide safety or security for people living within their borders in Nicaragua, in Honduras, and in El Salvador. Their citizens—or some of them—feel compelled to embark on a dangerous 1,000-mile journey on foot rather than stay put because staying put is even worse for them.

These are not evil people. The President would like to make them all out to be drug dealers or criminals. Most of them are poor people who are trying to escape the dangers created by the problems of gang violence, economic hardship, social oligarchy.

We Democrats have crafted legislation that would help address the problems in those three Central American countries that are causing the migrants to flee in the first place.

First, we would allow asylum seekers to apply for asylum within their own countries. That thousand-mile trek across Mexico is dangerous. It is often expensive. You have to pay a coyote or buy off drug dealers or other criminals. Let them apply in Honduras, in El Salvador, in Guatemala and not amass at the border. Second, we provide significant security assistance to Central American countries to build their capacity, crack down on the gangs and drug cartels and human trafficking that is endemic in those countries, and we would increase the number of immigration judges and personnel to reduce the current backlog of cases at the border.

These policies make eminent sense, and unlike the President's plan to impose tariffs on Mexico, our proposals do not threaten the U.S. economy. We would urge our Republican colleagues to join us in this commonsense solution.

When the President inevitably retreats from his tariff threat—which may be as soon as this afternoon—we should proceed on these commonsense policies, not some fake thing that sounds good in an announcement and then goes away like we have seen over and over again when the President conducts foreign policy—North Korea being one of the most notorious examples.

Over the past year, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, despite some positive domestic reforms, has too often acted like a brute in the Middle East rather than a stabilizing force.

I understand that Saudi Arabia worries about Iran. I share those concerns about the Iranian Government, but the Saudis have all too often reacted in the wrong way. In Yemen, the Saudis are fighting a proxy war that has resulted in untold human suffering and the slaughter of innocents of many chil-

dren. Internally, the Saudi Government has conducted a widespread campaign of political repression, including the imprisonment of women's rights campaigners. We all know how the Saudis were responsible for the vicious torture and chilling murder of a journalist and American resident Jamal Khashoggi.

Despite these gross violations of international norms and values, the Trump administration has just cozied up with Crown Prince Muhammad bin Salman and offered almost no criticism.

We have just learned, according to reports, that the Trump administration approved seven transfers of American nuclear technology to the Saudis, including two after Khashoggi's murder. Now the administration is using its favorite tool, claiming emergency powers to justify another 22 arms sales to the Saudis and others, including precision-guided munitions for Saudi's operations in Yemen.

Has the Trump administration lost all perspective when it comes to Saudi Arabia—providing excuses and cover for the brutal murder of a journalist and American resident, aiding and arming the Saudis in a human rights tragedy in Yemen, which will only come back to hurt him in the long run. What are we doing here?

Congress has already voted, in bipartisan majorities, to unwind America's involvement in Yemen, which, of course, the President vetoed, and now we ought to vote to disapprove these arms sales.

The chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Senator GRAHAM, urged by our ranking member of Foreign Relations and our leader on this issue, Senator MENENDEZ, has thankfully announced the bipartisan effort to do just that. I strongly support that effort.

Let me say, my Republican friends, over the last years of the Obama administration, bitterly complained about the way President Obama used Executive authority. The amount of Executive authority used by President Obama could fit in a thimble compared to the abuse of Executive authority by President Trump. Yet it seems, in the past, our Republican colleagues who so criticized Obama for much less have been totally silent when President Trump abuses Executive authority, but now maybe there are some green shoots.

Maybe some of our Republican colleagues in the Senate are waking up to the idea that in America we have a three-branch government, not a one-branch government, and maybe some of our Republican colleagues are recognizing that and beginning to act—the possible green shoots. Two instances; one is tariffs. Our Republicans don't like these tariffs. Will they have the guts, if the President implements them, to oppose the President? We will see.

Now, on Saudi arms sales, a number of Senate Republicans are beginning to