

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	Hoeven	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	Markey	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

the internet's status as a free and open information service, stating that "nothing in the 1996 Act or its legislative history suggests that Congress intended to alter the current classification of Internet and other information services or to expand traditional telephone regulation to new and advanced services."

Finally, the FCC did not intervene because it had evidence of market failure. When the FCC issued its order, the internet was still an explosive source of growth and innovation throughout America and throughout the world—as it had been for decades—when greater and greater numbers of Americans gained access to the internet for the first time. Perhaps, because of this inconvenient fact, the FCC hardly considered the possible economic effects of its regulations. The FCC's chief economist at the time went so far as to say the rules were an "economics-free zone."

What the internet does need is regulatory certainty, which is why I recently introduced the Restoring Internet Freedom Act, along with several of my colleagues. This bill would fully repeal the FCC's 2015 internet takeover. More importantly, it would prevent the FCC from interfering with the internet in the future unless such actions were specifically authorized by Congress.

We shouldn't stop there. Instead of waiting for regulators and activists to find new excuses to restrict the internet, we should open it further to extend more choices to American consumers. In other words, we should ensure that Federal policy promotes competition.

As we know from experience, heavy-handed regulations like the FCC's order tend to favor large, deep-pocketed companies over startups that can't afford an army of lobbyists in Washington. Removing these regulatory barriers will allow upstart entrepreneurs to compete with incumbents for consumers' loyalty. Those consumers—ordinary Americans and their families—will benefit from the improved service and lower prices that this kind of competition inevitably creates.

Most American households currently have access to at least one internet service provider. Many have access to two or more, which might look like a competitive market exists for those households, but regulations can keep these different options from being adequate substitutes for one another.

The government restricts access to valuable resources that could be used for high-quality internet services. According to a 2012 report by the Obama administration, the Federal Government is sitting on upwards of 60 percent of the best radio spectrum, so-called "beachfront" spectrum, which could be put to use for commercial internet services like 5G wireless broadband.

Meanwhile, excessive permitting, licensing, and environmental impact

regulations delayed broadband deployment over Federal and public lands, especially in the West.

Finally, the Office of Management and Budget found that private parties spend nearly \$800 million each year to comply with FCC paperwork requirements. The bill for this ends up being paid entirely by ordinary American families.

Thankfully, my colleagues in the Senate have already identified many of these problems and have done work to address them. Senators KLOBUCHAR and DAINES have spent considerable time on policies to streamline broadband internet deployment through their "dig-once" proposals. Senator HELLER is a champion for reducing barriers for deploying broadband throughout the West. Senators THUNE and NELSON, the chairman and the ranking member of the Senate Committee on Commerce, have introduced measures in the past to free up radio spectrum held by Federal agencies and organizations.

These are just a few of the many thoughtful ideas to reduce barriers to entry and increase competition, which has the potential to improve quality and bring down prices. The bipartisan nature of these policies demonstrates a clear understanding that improvements can be made, and everyone should be able to agree that more competition is better for American consumers, especially those in rural or low-income housing.

Everyone should also be able to agree that consumers should be protected from unfair and deceptive business practices. Thankfully, the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission already enforce fair rules that protect Americans' enjoyment of a free and open internet.

The combination of competition and strong enforcement of antitrust and consumer protections provides the benefits of an innovative marketplace while avoiding problems that come from tired, anti-consumer, outdated regulations like title II and like the 2015 open internet order.

For the sake of American consumers and innovators—not for entrenched business interests—I hope to work with partners in the House, Senate, and the FCC to promote competition in the technology sector, including among internet service providers. If that means underperforming companies have to work a little harder for their customers, that is all the better, because the end result of lively competition is more investment and innovation by businesses, which translates into more choices and better service for consumers.

I encourage my colleagues, regardless of party or ideology, to work with me on this project. If they are truly interested in a better internet—not just government intrusion and control for its own sake—I am sure they can help me identify other barriers to entry to the information superhighway.

For now, a good start to ensure that American consumers and small busi-

nesses benefit from the internet is to repeal the FCC's 2015 internet takeover, enforce antitrust, unfair, and deceptive practice standards, and encourage competition among internet firms. Only then can we guarantee an internet that is free and open for everyone.

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

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

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

TRIBUTE TO BONNIE SEAMAN

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, today I wish to commend Bonnie Seaman, who has loyally served the people of Pennsylvania for more than 40 years, more recently as the director of constituent services for my Senate office. Bonnie has not only been a trusted member of my staff but a very close family friend.

Bonnie was born and raised on a turkey farm in Leck Kill, PA. She is the youngest of four children. She first began her public service career in county government at what was then known as the Northumberland County Mental Health and Mental Retardation Department, where she touched the lives of people in her community.

In pursuit of a college degree, Bonnie attended Indiana University of Pennsylvania and graduated cum laude with a degree in education. After graduation, she worked as a special education teacher.

Bonnie's passion for helping others steered her career to the Pennsylvania State Senate. While working in the Pennsylvania Senate, she was asked by her supervisor if she was interested in working on my father's transition team after he was elected Governor of Pennsylvania in 1986. This transition job offer was supposed to be temporary, but Bonnie would spend the next 30 years working in State government for both then-Governor Casey and then me, when I got to State government years later.

She worked as the Governor's executive assistant for 8 years, and of course she wore many hats, managing the Governor's staff, scheduling events, and resolving constituent issues, but her most important role was providing support to the Governor. Her dedication and loyalty earned her the respect of her fellow employees in the Governor's office as well as those she worked with outside of the office.

After working in Governor Casey's administration, Bonnie worked as well with my father on his autobiography entitled "Fighting for Life." In his book he pays tribute to her as follows:

I could never have made it through this project without my executive assistant,