

bill to expand access to breast cancer screening and treatment for veterans, helping ensure every VA patient can get the care they need. By passing the Honoring Our PACT Act, we can continue building on this progress and delivering for our veterans.

I would like to thank Chairman TESTER, Ranking Member MORAN, and Chair MARK TAKANO in the House for their leadership in this effort, and I would like to thank all the veterans and their loved ones who have shared their stories and advocated for so long to help us get to this moment.

This is an important and long-overdue step toward honoring our Nation's veterans, caring for them. I urge my colleagues to pass this bill without delay.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Florida.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF THE VICTIMS OF THE HEINOUS ATTACK AT THE PULSE NIGHTCLUB ON JUNE 12, 2016

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, nearly 6 years ago, our State, Nation, the city of Orlando, and Hispanic and LGBTQ communities were attacked. Forty-nine innocent and beautiful lives were lost. It was an evil and hateful act, an act of terrorism designed to divide us as a nation and strike fear in our hearts and minds. But, instead, we came together, we supported each other, and we persevered. We have proved to the world what we in Florida already knew: Floridians are resilient.

The days I spent in Orlando following the shooting will always be with me. I talked to parents who lost their children. I went to funerals and wakes. I sat in hospital rooms. It was one of the hardest things I have ever had to do. It was heartbreaking. But in this horribly dark time, the selfless courage of so many—from community members to law enforcement, to healthcare workers—provided a sense of hope. This incredible strength, love, and bravery lifted up Orlando and the State of Florida and helped us begin to rebuild.

This week, on the sixth anniversary of this devastating tragedy, the State of Florida comes together to honor the lives lost too soon, and we vow to always stand up and fight against evil and hatred in this world.

I was proud that last year Congress passed and the President signed into law legislation I introduced with Senator RUBIO and Senator PADILLA to designate the location of the Pulse nightclub in Orlando as the National Pulse Memorial, which will honor the memory of those we lost.

Today, I am requesting all my colleagues to join Senator RUBIO and me to pass a resolution honoring the memory of the 49 lives lost during the heinous attack at the Pulse nightclub. Let's come together now to say that our Nation will always stand against hate and evil in this world.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, this weekend will mark 6 years since 49 of our fellow Americans were killed in one of the deadliest attacks in our Nation's history.

It was a tragic, despicable terrorist attack on the Hispanic and gay communities in Orlando. Each person killed was a son or daughter, brother or sister, mother or father, husband or wife. They were part of our families and communities. The assault on Pulse was an act of pure evil that was and remains the worst terror attack on U.S. soil since September 11, 2001. And it was inspired by the same ideology of hate. But ultimately, that hateful ideology failed to tear apart our community.

June 12, 2016, is a day that I will never forget. The senseless, tragic loss of life will never dull with time, nor will the memory of how our communities came together in the days and weeks that followed. Pulse was a well-known nightclub in central Florida. It was part of the fabric of the local community, and that awful day struck a terrible blow. But the community awoke from the tragedy stronger and more united than it was before.

The terrorist would have been horrified to see the First Baptist Church in Orlando—another pillar of the local community—opening its doors to the LGBT community, welcoming them and their families, and holding services there. The terrorist would have hated to see Floridians from all across the State bringing food and water to support victims, families, and first responders. There were unending lines to donate blood. There were memorial services around the State. There was a sense that there was something greater than any one person worth sacrificing for; there was a sense of community, fellowship, and solidarity. This is the America I know and love, and it is our country at its best.

Sunday will be a day for reflection, for remembering those who lost their lives to an evil, hateful ideology. It will also be a day to acknowledge the tremendous impact their families and the survivors have had, not only on their community and State, but on our Nation.

And while the fight against evil and hate continues, we can and should take inspiration from their strength.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 663, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 663) honoring the memory of the victims of the heinous attack at the Pulse nightclub on June 12, 2016.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to,

and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 663) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

GUN SAFETY

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, when the Senate considers complex and profound issues of public policy, I am particularly reminded of the wisdom of our late friend, Mr. Mike Enzi, the Senator from Wyoming. Not long after I came to the Senate, I noticed how productive that Senator Enzi, one of the most conservative Members of the Senate, was working on the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions committee with Teddy Kennedy, the "liberal lion of the Senate." You had one of the most conservative Members of the Senate working with one of the most liberal Members of the Senate. But, amazingly, to me, they seemed to get a lot done.

So I asked Senator Enzi, I said: How is it that you, a staunch conservative, could work so productively with somebody with such different views? Senator Enzi told me: It is easy. I call it the 80-20 rule.

Well, the fact of life is we are not going to agree with everybody 100 percent of the time. And I sometimes say I don't agree with my wife 100 percent of the time, but she is always right.

But, seriously, if we are going to get things done here in the U.S. Senate for the benefit of the American people, we have to understand nobody is going to get everything they want. And I think for purposes of simplicity, an illustration of Senator Enzi's comments about the 80-20 rule are very helpful.

I have tried to employ that strategy many times since those days, and I hope we can apply that wisdom and strategy again dealing with this recent string of shootings, including Uvalde, TX.

Now this debate evokes strong emotions and strong opinions from people across the political spectrum, and it is an understatement to say that there are serious differences of opinion.

I start with the premise that I took an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States, and I

have no intention of violating that oath. That is where I start. Part of the Constitution is the amendments, including the first 10 which are the Bill of Rights that includes the Second Amendment, which provides a constitutional right to keep and bear arms for law-abiding Americans. I have no intention of violating my oath, and I have no intention of undermining the rights of law-abiding gun owners in America because it is a constitutional right.

It is no secret that when it comes to the culture in America, there are very different views ranging from, let's say, Connecticut, where Senator MURPHY comes from, to places like Texas, where guns are commonplace but people know how to use them and they use them responsibly and they are not a threat to public safety.

There are those who would like to restrict the rights of law-abiding gun owners because that is their view—they strongly hold that view, but I have been clear that is a nonstarter for me.

But to Senator Enzi's wise advice, rather than focus on the 20 percent we can't agree on, I have been trying to explore common ground with our colleagues on a bipartisan basis. These were devastating tragedies. We all agree with that. We all agree that no child should ever fear for his or her safety while sitting in a classroom.

I think we even all agree that there is a mental health epidemic in America today, and that is a piece of the puzzle. To me the shootings are a symptom of a larger problem, which is the failure of our mental health system in America, and it manifests itself in many different ways. Now, people suffering from mental health challenges, by and large, they are not violent, but a subset of them threaten their own lives with suicide. Some of them, even a subset of others, not only commit suicide by attacking a known armed police contingent, but they also engage in homicides, too, which is what happened with Salvador Ramos in Uvalde, TX.

I think there is a consensus in America that criminals and people experiencing severe mental health crises should not have access to guns. It is not just my opinion; it is actually the law. That is what the National Instant Criminal Background Check System is supposed to vet for—to make sure that people who have criminal records, people who have been institutionalized for mental health problems, people who are dishonorably discharged, people who are under a protective order, people who have committed felonies, people who have committed domestic violence, those are all people who now, if you went to buy a firearm and underwent a national instant criminal background check, you would not be able to legally purchase or possess a firearm because that is the law of the land and has been a long time.

With that in mind, Senator MURPHY from Connecticut, Senator TILLIS from

North Carolina, Senator SINEMA from Arizona, and I have been looking at these various factors and tried to come up with a targeted bill that might have prevented some of these tragedies. To me, that is the best way to look at this, is to say: If this had been in place, is it less likely that this tragedy would have occurred? Stated another way, if we do this, is there a chance or a probability that we could save lives in the future? To me, that should be our focus.

Instead of wasting time talking about what we don't agree on, I think it is productive for us to focus on this subset of issues where I believe there is room for a consensus because, of course, that is the only way to make progress and to get a result.

When the Constitution was written, it created three branches of government; but in particular, the legislative and the executive branch, with two branches of the Congress. They are very different in their nature. They made it difficult to pass legislation. It is hard. We do it, but it is hard. And it is hard because it takes consensus, and consensus sometimes takes time, particularly on issues that evoke such strong views and opinions and reflect, frankly, the diversity of this country.

I am glad to say, on this topic, we are making steady progress. It is early in the process, but I am optimistic where things stand right now. What am I optimistic about? I am optimistic that we could pass a bill in the Senate, it can pass the House, and it will get a signature by President Biden. It will become law of the land.

What is the test of that legislation? It is, to me, not whether it meets your ideological standard of what the bill should look like, but it is simply this: Will it save lives? If it will, it is worth all of our best efforts.

As I said, there is broad agreement about the mental health challenges, not only in our schools, but in our society at large and how that manifests itself. Sixty percent of the gun deaths in America are suicides. Don't we want to try to prevent those suicides? I think so. That is why the mental health issue is so important, among other reasons. And then, obviously, the school safety issues. We need to try to figure out ways to make our schools harder to get into for people like Salvador Ramos.

Unfortunately, the mental health challenges of young, disaffected, and alienated boys is a profile that is all too familiar. It is reflected in the shooter in Uvalde. It is reflected in the shooter in Sandy Hook, Adam Lanza. They came from much different places in terms of their socioeconomic, but in terms of their alienation and their developing mental illness and their willingness to not only take their own life but other people's lives, unfortunately, it paints an eerily similar picture.

The shooter in Uvalde was isolated and bullied at school. He had a record

of cutting his face—self-mutilation—and abusing and torturing animals, and he was known for fighting and threatening his fellow students with everything from assault to rape. He was a ticking time bomb, and many people—not all the people but many people in this small community of 15,000 people knew it. Certainly, his mother knew it. Unfortunately, his mother was a drug user, and he was living with his grandmother. But this is a young man who shot his own grandmother because she wanted him to go back to school because, of course, he had been out of the classroom because of COVID-19 restrictions. Frankly, that isolation just made his mental illness that much worse.

As I said, the shooter at Sandy Hook, Adam Lanza, experienced what was later described as "severe and deteriorating" mental health problems that went untreated, not because his parents didn't try—they did—but when he was prescribed medication to help him manage his mental illness, he refused to take it, and his mom finally gave up, exhausted, as you can imagine. It was a period of 3 years that he didn't see any mental health provider at all, sitting in his room, playing video games, killing people online virtually, becoming increasingly desensitized, and spiraling down that psychiatric, psychological, and emotional drain.

We need to equip all of our young people in America with the resources and the assistance they need in order to manage their emotional and mental health struggles. I think that is part of what we need to do.

School security, as I said, was also a glaring issue at Uvalde. The shooter was able to enter Robb Elementary School through a door that wasn't even locked. That is a problem. School districts need to be prepared for the worst-case scenario. They need to prepare for the worst and hope for the best. That means evaluating physical security, reviewing current protocols, developing best practices, and potentially adding or expanding the number of school resource officers. Those are law enforcement officers on campus.

I think there is a lot of common ground on things we can agree on here—safer schools, better mental health resources, and coming up with additional assistance that will harden our schools and provide greater deterrence and protections for our students.

The Senators whom I have been talking to—including the group of four but even the larger group today at noon—we have been talking about other things we might do to keep individuals who are already prohibited by law because they have a criminal background or they have mental health adjudications and problems.

How do we keep guns out of the hands of criminals and those who are undergoing mental health crises? That is an area of common ground. This is not about creating new restrictions on

law-abiding citizens; it is about ensuring the system we already have in place works as intended.

One idea we have discussed is, because this young man in Uvalde turned 18 and because there was no look back at his juvenile record, he passed a background check. It is as if he was born on his 18th birthday and nothing that happened before was important. That is obviously a problem. So we are looking at taking steps to encourage States to upload juvenile records into the National Instant Criminal Background Check System. This is standard practice in some but not most States, and it is easy to see why it is important. If we are uploading information about adults' mental health adjudications but we don't have access to juveniles' mental health adjudications, to me, that is a problem. If a 17-year-old, for example, is convicted of aggravated assault, the record should show up in his background check if he tries to purchase a gun when he turns 18.

I think this is a commonsense way to make sure the National Instant Criminal Background Check databases are complete and they are accurate. That is not about expanding the system; that is about making sure the system we have actually works.

I want to make sure that we are committed to providing due process protections for citizens in all circumstances. Again, this is part of our Constitution, due process of law—the right to appear, the right to contest a decision by the government and to produce evidence and to cross-examine witnesses. That is an essential aspect of due process. When you talk about depriving somebody of a constitutional right, it is even more important.

The goal here is to make a law; it is not to make a political statement. As I said, I am encouraged by the progress we are making, but I don't think artificial deadlines are useful. The majority leader, Senator SCHUMER, has threatened to schedule votes if an agreement isn't reached by a certain time. I don't think that is particularly helpful.

Again, my goal and I think most Senators' goal here is to come up with a bill that can pass; otherwise, we might as well move on to other topics. But I sense a feeling of urgency and a desire to actually get things done. Around here, if you know people have the will, there is a way, and I believe there is a collective bipartisan will. So far, everybody, I believe, has been working in good faith. We all understand the differences that we have regionally and culturally when it comes to things like the Second Amendment. We understand the different politics in different States. That is the genius of the Senate that brings us all together. It doesn't make it easy, but it makes it possible for us to try to find some common ground.

The most common cry you hear today when it comes to incidents like Uvalde is to do something. I think we agree with that, but what that some-

thing is is not easy, but it is important, and we need to try. Again, I am optimistic because of the progress we have made so far that we will do something here that is important that will save lives. To me, that is the goal. And I think all 100 Senators would agree, if we can achieve that goal, then our efforts will have been worthwhile.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). The clerk will call roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

VOTE ON HARPER NOMINATION

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

Mr. RUBIO. 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 senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 221 Ex.]

YEAS—59

Baldwin	Heinrich	Portman
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Risch
Booker	Kaine	Rosen
Brown	Kelly	Sanders
Cantwell	King	Schatz
Capito	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Scott (SC)
Carper	Lujan	Shaheen
Casey	Lummis	Sinema
Collins	Manchin	Smith
Coons	Markey	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Tester
Crapo	Merkley	Van Hollen
Daines	Murkowski	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warnock
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Feinstein	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Graham	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Peters	

NAYS—40

Barrasso	Hagerty	Rounds
Blackburn	Hawley	Rubio
Blunt	Hoeven	Sasse
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Braun	Inhofe	Shelby
Burr	Johnson	Sullivan
Cassidy	Kennedy	Thune
Cornyn	Lankford	Tillis
Cotton	Lee	Toomey
Cramer	Marshall	Tuberville
Cruz	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Fischer	Paul	
Grassley	Romney	

NOT VOTING—1

Gillibrand

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). 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 clerk will report the next nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Amy Loyd, of New Mexico, to be Assistant Secretary for Career, Technical, and Adult Education, Department of Education.

VOTE ON LOYD NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Loyd nomination?

Mr. LEAHY. 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR).

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

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 222 Ex.]

YEAS—57

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Kaine	Rounds
Booker	Kelly	Sanders
Brown	King	Sasse
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schatz
Capito	Leahy	Schumer
Cardin	Lujan	Shaheen
Carper	Manchin	Sinema
Casey	Markey	Smith
Collins	Menendez	Stabenow
Coons	Merkley	Tester
Cortez Masto	Murkowski	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murphy	Warner
Durbin	Murray	Warnock
Feinstein	Ossoff	Warren
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Portman	Young

NAYS—42

Barrasso	Graham	Moran
Blackburn	Grassley	Paul
Blunt	Hagerty	Risch
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Hoeven	Rubio
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Johnson	Shelby
Cramer	Kennedy	Sullivan
Crapo	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Tillis
Daines	Lummis	Toomey
Ernst	Marshall	Tuberville
Fischer	McConnell	Wicker

NOT VOTING—1

Burr

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 actions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Georgia.