

Incidentally, those who come to the United States on visa waivers from 38 countries around the world can currently legally buy firearms. What is that all about? Our law prevents foreign visitors who come in on a visa from buying firearms, but a loophole allows those who qualify under the Visa Waiver Program to come as visitors to buy a firearm. I think we can do better there as well.

Let's tighten up the Visa Waiver Program, and make sure we do the proper checks so dangerous people don't ever get on the plane to come to the United States. Let's make sure as well that if you have a visa waiver and you come to the United States as a visitor, you are not going to be purchasing firearms. Finally, if you are on a suspected terrorist no-fly list, you should be disqualified from buying a gun or an explosive, period. Those are three practical steps. I think we ought to move forward and do that on a bipartisan basis. It will be something to keep in mind and make America much safer.

In closing, some of the suggestions being made as these Republican Presidential candidates try to out-trump one another are very sad. They reflect the ignorance of history and a willingness to ignore the values of this country. When I hear some of the awful things being said about people of the Islamic faith—I think about a dinner I went to Saturday night. It was in Chicago; it was by the Children's Heart Research Foundation. They were saluting a number of doctors in the Chicago area who were extraordinary in saving the lives of children. One of them is a current surgeon. He started with Children's Memorial Hospital; he is now with the Advocate hospital system. He is considered to be the best in Chicago. If your baby—and 1 out of 100 are—is born with a congenital heart defect, this is the doctor you want to see the child; this is the surgeon you want to save your child's life. This doctor is a Muslim. He is an American. He is an important part of America. Those who are making negative statements about all people in the Islamic faith, calling for registration or exclusion or whatever it may be—their statements and views are not consistent with who we are as Americans. The President said as much last night, and I agree.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

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. McCONNELL. Madam President, 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 MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2359

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I understand there is a bill at the desk due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2359) to restore Second Amendment rights in the District of Columbia.

Mr. McCONNELL. In order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

PRESIDENTIAL STRATEGY TO DEFEAT ISIL

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, last evening President Obama addressed the Nation concerning the threat ISIL poses to our people. Unfortunately, the American people did not hear of a strategy or a plan to defeat and destroy this terrorist army. Instead, they heard a restatement of a military campaign crafted to contain—contain—ISIL within Iraq and Syria.

Following the attacks in Paris and California, and the downing of a Russian airliner, about 60 percent of the American people disapprove of the President's handling of terrorism. Nearly two-thirds disapprove of his handling of ISIL.

The American people understand intuitively that ISIL and the wider terrorist threat have not been contained but, rather, that they have evolved into something increasingly more serious and more challenging. Americans also know that the operational concept ordered by the President is insufficient to defeat ISIL. It is not just the American people saying this. It is not just Republicans saying it, either. President Obama's last Defense Secretary recently criticized his approach; so have several other former Obama administration officials.

Here is a sampling of what they have said over just the last week or two: One called on the Obama administration to "wake up" to the threat. Another said that the Obama administration "seems to be really flailing and tone deaf to this latest challenge." A third called on the President to "change your strategy" because "by any measure, our strategy in Iraq and Syria is not succeeding." And then there is President Obama's former Secretary of State, Secretary Clinton, who put it plainly: "We're not winning." Hillary Clinton said: "We're not winning."

The President had a real opportunity last night to show the American people that defeating ISIL is his priority. He had an opportunity to demonstrate his willingness to adapt to the threat. He had an opportunity to explain how he can better prepare our Nation for a fight that will inevitably be passed on

to his successor, but he didn't do that. He didn't do it last night.

The American people were looking for a serious strategy and a real vision last night, not a recap of an approach that clearly hasn't worked. Last night was only the President's third Oval Office address, and by any measure a missed opportunity.

Look, throughout his time as Commander in Chief, President Obama has shown an inflexible adherence to policies he advocated as a candidate for office in 2008, most specifically to end our Nation's War on Terror. In his first days in office he issued a series of Executive orders designed to weaken the ability of our warfighter and intelligence community to gather targeted information, to capture terrorists, interrogate, and detain them to advance our understanding of terrorist networks and plans, as well as to protect the American people. Although the President conceded that the complete withdrawal of our forces from Afghanistan would be harmful to our national security interests and slowed our withdrawal in the face of Al Qaeda and Taliban resistance, he inflexibly clung to a fixed date for our drawdown of forces in Iraq, which allowed for the growth of ISIL. As the President inflexibly pursued an end to the War on Terror, the terrorist threat evolved and adapted as Al Qaeda affiliates advanced in presence and capability and Al Qaeda in Iraq grew into the terrorist army we now know as ISIL. ISIL's use of social media and encrypted communications burgeoned at the very moment the President and his allies were working to take away critical electronic surveillance tools from our intelligence community.

Here is what we need from the President now. What we need from the President is for him to clearly outline what it is he aims to achieve, how he aims to achieve it, and what authorities he thinks he will need to make that happen. He needs to match strategic objectives to the means to reach the goals. The President needs to tell us what authorities he needs to defeat encrypted online communications. The President needs to tell us what is needed to establish our capture, interrogation, and surveillance capabilities. The President needs to tell us how the coalition or NATO will forge a ground force capable of not only trying to contain ISIL but actually driving it from Raqqa. The President needs to tell us the force structure and the funding our commanders will need to rebuild our conventional capabilities so we can continue and expand this fight while facing other global threats. The President should also explain why he will not use the secure facility at Guantanamo Bay to safely hold and interrogate newly captured terrorists in order to help prevent the next plot against Americans.

These are the kinds of things the American people are looking for, and by leading on them, President Obama