

what the Border Patrol needs in order to secure the border, I am confident of our ability to get it done.

I will just relate the conversation I had with the Chief of the Rio Grande Border Patrol sector, Chief Manny Padilla. Chief Padilla long served in the Border Patrol in many different places along the border.

Of course, the border is very different in San Diego than it is in the Rio Grande Valley of Texas. For one thing, Texas has virtually all private property along the border and, of course, is separated by the Rio Grande River from Mexico.

What Chief Padilla has said to me, which I believe is absolutely the case, is that it takes three different things to secure the border. It takes infrastructure. You can call it fencing, like the Secure Fence Act that we passed a few years ago that almost all of our Democratic colleagues voted for. It takes things like levy walls, which we have in Hidalgo County and the Rio Grande Valley. But it also takes technology and personnel because we know that no piece of infrastructure alone is going to provide the security we need. But fundamentally we need to regain the people's trust and confidence that the Federal Government will carry out its primary responsibility to protect our citizens and defend our borders.

Border security is complex. It is multifaceted and requires an approach that includes air, sea, and land. That is why we need a multilayered approach to border security that includes infrastructure, like the President talks about frequently when he talks about the wall. It takes technology, and it takes the men and women in the Border Patrol who do the dangerous but important work of keeping our border secure and keeping our country safe.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, shortly we will be voting on cloture on the nomination of John Sullivan, the nominee to be Deputy Secretary of State, and as the ranking Democrat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I urge my colleagues to support the cloture motion and support the nomination of John Sullivan to be the next Deputy Secretary of State.

#### MANCHESTER ATTACK

Before I begin, I want to express that I strongly condemn yesterday's heart-breaking attack in Manchester. I want to express my sincere condolences to the families of those who lost loved ones, especially the innocent and defenseless children who were brutally killed. As a father and grandfather, I mourn with them, and I am praying for the recovery of the injured.

The United States stands in firm solidarity with our friends in the United Kingdom. The United States will provide the necessary assistance as British authorities work to bring those responsible to justice. I know I speak for all my colleagues in the Senate in our sol-

idarity with our friends in the United Kingdom.

Mr. President, in regard to Mr. Sullivan's nomination to be Deputy Secretary of State, he is well qualified for that position. He served in the Justice Department and in the private practice of law. He served as Deputy General Counsel at the Department of Defense. He also has been involved in the Department of Commerce, where he was General Counsel and Deputy Secretary. He is well familiar with government. He served in public positions and also brings private experience as a lawyer to the position of Deputy Secretary of State.

I do want to point out—as I pointed out to Mr. Sullivan and as most members of our committee did—that he will find himself home alone for a period of time, in that the Trump administration has not submitted to Congress nominees for important positions at the Department of State. Yes, I have confidence in the career people at the Department of State, but there are times that we have to have a confirmed person in control in order to advance policies. So it is important—from embassy security, to fighting terrorism, to helping with the humanitarian challenges we have around the world and the administration of our missions in all the countries around the world—that we have a team in place. The Trump administration has been slow in providing us with qualified individuals to fill these positions. Thus far, the administration has decided to treat the State Department as an inconvenience rather than as a critical national security asset.

Secondly, I want to express my concern about something that will make Mr. Sullivan's job a lot more difficult—the international affairs budget for fiscal year 2018 that the administration is unveiling today. Although we are still receiving details, as I look at the massive spending cuts to vital national security, it is impossible to conclude this is anything but an “America alone” budget—one that, if enacted, will have disastrous effects on our standing in the world.

Let me repeat one more time that the money we spend on development assistance, on diplomacy, and that we spend in regard to helping our allies around the world and countries around the world is part of our national security budget. It is part of our national security budget, and yet the President's fiscal year 2018 budget would compromise national security.

As Secretary Mattis has said—often quoted on this floor—if you don't give the Secretary of State and the State Department the resources they need, you better be prepared to give them more ammunition and more soldiers because it is going to be more costly for them to defend.

It is very disappointing that the budget slashes critical support to our allies in their efforts to defeat terrorism, including zeroing out counter-

insurgency support in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Pakistan. It will slash funds to support the defense needs of countless foreign partner countries and offer them the unpalatable option of going into debt to the United States to get the defense equipment and support they need. This is certain to damage our security, counterterrorism, and security interests with these countries and prove a golden opportunity for Russia and China to take the place of the United States. This is serious business. If we don't help countries that are part of our coalition against terrorism, if we don't give them the resources to help us, then, quite clearly, our enemies will move in. As we know, Russia has done many things against U.S. interests. The voids will be quickly picked up by Russia and China.

This is a budget proposal that cuts support to European allies to counter Russia's aggression—precisely when Russia's assault on our democracy and the democracies of our European democracies has reached a fever pitch. At a time when the United States should be standing up for our allies and partners in Europe, this budget zeros out the Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia—AEECA—account and eliminates the European Reassurance Initiative altogether. This was an initiative that was set up to counter Russia's influence in Europe, and we are going to zero that out?

This is a budget proposal that walks away from the promotion of democratic values. It slashes funding for human rights and democracy programs abroad and hollows out the ideas, initiatives, and institutions on which U.S. leadership and international order rests, like the United Nations Peacekeeping.

In his remarks in Saudi Arabia this past weekend, President Trump applauded Jordan, Turkey, and Lebanon for their role in hosting refugees. Yet draconian humanitarian funding cuts would harm these very friends and allies who are hosting millions of refugees. What an inconsistent message. It also eliminates the U.N. emergency food aid program at a time of famine in Africa and the Middle East. If these budget cuts are implemented, many people around the world will die as a result of diminished resources and support that would result. We can't let that happen.

It is a budget proposal that undermines our ability to deal with pressing national security challenges, including development assistance, humanitarian aid, and climate change. The administration's budget proposal slashes more than 30 percent from our foreign assistance budget and dramatically cuts support for critical programs to save the lives of mothers in childbirth, feed hungry children, educate young people, train farmers, and the like. These programs exemplify U.S. values and promote the power of democracy and the importance of protecting human rights.

America's trademark is its values, what we stand for, our leadership globally, and this budget would compromise our ability to promote American values.

This is a penny wise, pound foolish budget, as the security challenges that will grow from these humanitarian catastrophes will dwarf the cost of helping to address the challenges before they metastasize into failed states and havens for extremism. If we don't help, we will have to pay on the other end.

When we fail to help countries provide the stability they need to take care of their population, they become a breeding ground for terrorists. We then have to respond with the use of our military, and it is much more costly. It costs people their lives.

Climate change—perhaps the most pressing national security challenge that faces the globe in the 21st century—receives less than just neglect; this is a budget that actively provides a catastrophic effect on climate-induced instability. We will not be able to respond to our international obligations in regard to climate change.

I understand that for Mr. Sullivan, if confirmed, this is the budget proposal he has to accept and defend; however, both he and Secretary Tillerson should be put on notice that I—and I think I speak for a number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—consider this budget dead on arrival. I would call on him to consider how, if confirmed, he will work with the Senate to develop a more serious budget proposal over the coming months that safeguards and promotes American interests in the world, that deepens our partnerships and alliances, that is sufficient to meet the challenges of an increasingly aggressive Russia and increasingly assertive China on the world stage, that provides our Nation the tools it needs to address the pressing humanitarian crises and challenges, and that supports and defends our universal values in the best tradition of our Nation.

That is what we need to do as a Congress. We are the ones who will pass the budget. We are the ones who have the responsibility to make sure our budget speaks to our priorities, our values, and our national interests. Yet it is very disappointing to see the President of the United States submit a budget that is just the opposite of what it should be in regard to putting money toward American values and national security. We will be looking upon Mr. Sullivan, if he is confirmed, to work with us so we can develop a budget that really speaks to American values and American interests.

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

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

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant 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 John J. Sullivan, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of State.

Mitch McConnell, Cory Gardner, Tom Cotton, Roy Blunt, Jeff Flake, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, Ron Johnson, James E. Risch, Joni Ernst, John Thune, Mike Rounds, Orrin G. Hatch, Bob Corker, David Perdue, John Hoeven, James M. Inhofe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). 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 John J. Sullivan, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of State, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 93, nays 6, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 134 Ex.]

#### YEAS—93

Alexander	Flake	Murray
Baldwin	Franken	Nelson
Barrasso	Gardner	Paul
Bennet	Graham	Perdue
Blumenthal	Grassley	Peters
Blunt	Hassan	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Reed
Brown	Heinrich	Risch
Burr	Heitkamp	Roberts
Cantwell	Heller	Rounds
Capito	Hirono	Rubio
Cardin	Hoover	Sasse
Carper	Inhofe	Schatz
Casey	Johnson	Schumer
Cassidy	Kaine	Scott
Cochran	Kennedy	Shaheen
Collins	King	Shelby
Coons	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Corker	Lankford	Strange
Cornyn	Leahy	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Lee	Tester
Cotton	Manchin	Thune
Crapo	Markley	Tillis
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Daines	McCaskill	Udall
Donnelly	McConnell	Van Hollen
Durbin	Menendez	Warner
Enzi	Merkley	Whitehouse
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wyden
Fischer	Murphy	Young

#### NAYS—6

Booker	Gillibrand	Sanders
Duckworth	Harris	Warren

#### NOT VOTING—1

Isakson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 93, the nays are 6.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Utah.

#### THE INTERNET

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the Federal Communication Commission's welcome proposal to end utility-style regulation of the internet by reversing the 2015 open internet order.

Anyone who has followed the hyperbolic debate about net neutrality has likely heard that the FCC is moving to squelch competition, limit consumer choice, raise prices, and perhaps even destroy the internet. That is my favorite one. At least that is what some activists and crusading late-night comedians claim. But none of this is true—none of it.

Rather, the FCC is reviewing the light-touch regulatory environment that, from the outset, facilitated the kind of innovation that produced the internet and expanded internet access to millions of Americans over the course of many years.

In order to understand this complicated issue, we need to be honest about what led us to where we are today; that is, the FCC's 2015 open internet order. The Obama-era FCC claimed that its order implemented net neutrality, or the equal treatment of all data over the internet, but that isn't quite right. The actual change was far broader than that.

The FCC reclassified broadband internet access service as a title II telecommunication service, instead of a title I information service. That might sound like a small change, but this soundingly small—some might even say soundingly innocuous—change applied a whole host of New Deal era regulations that were meant to apply to monopolistic telephone companies, monopolistic utility companies, and they applied those to the internet.

It subjected 21st century technology to the same rules that governed rotary telephones in the 1930s. Why, then, did the FCC do this? It wasn't because a free and open internet was harming Americans. The activists and entertainers clamoring for more government control of the internet claimed that it was under attack by predatory internet service providers but, strangely enough, none of them actually provided evidence for that very serious assertion.

If you are going to make that claim, back it up, point to evidence. Instead, they speak about imaginary or hypothetical harms. The 400-page order uses words like "may," "could," "might," or "potentially" not just here and there, not just a few times but several hundred times. Nor did the FCC issue the open internet order because Congress told it to.

On the contrary, nearly 20 years ago, our colleague Senator WYDEN, along with then-Senator John Kerry and others, expressly argued against the drastic action that would later be taken by the FCC in 2015. After passing the bipartisan Telecommunications Act in 1996, this group of Senators affirmed