

and for supporting my efforts to protect innocent people. They are not the only ones. Anybody who looks at this has to say: Are we going to send people to jail when they didn't know what they were doing was wrong? It makes anybody stop and think: Is that right? Should we do that? Is that fair?

Likewise, I wish to thank Senators RAND PAUL, TED CRUZ, MIKE LEE, and DAVID PERDUE for joining me as co-sponsors on this bill. Our bill sets a default intent requirement of willfulness for all Federal criminal offenses that lack an intent requirement. Additionally, the bill defines willfulness to mean that a person acted with knowledge that his or her conduct was unlawful.

Naturally, our bill does not apply to any offenses that Congress clearly intended to be strict liability offenses. Our proposal has garnered widespread support from a variety of organizations, including the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, Koch Industries, the Federal Defenders, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the Heritage Foundation—just to name a few.

Importantly, our bill does not remove any crimes from the books, nor does it override any existing mens rea standards written in statute. Moreover, it does not limit Congress's authority to create new criminal offenses, including strict liability offenses.

Mens rea really is a simple issue. Individuals should not be threatened with prison time for accidentally committing a crime or for engaging in an activity they did not know was wrong. If Congress wants to criminalize an activity and does not want to include any sort of criminal intent requirement, Congress should have to specify in statute that it is creating a strict liability offense.

I believe this simple legislative solution will go a long way in reducing harsh sentences for morally innocent offenders. It will also push back against the overcriminalization of innocent behavior. As I have said many times, any consideration of criminal justice reform or sentencing reform is incomplete without reforms to mens rea requirements.

FOREIGN JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS

Mr. President, on a final note, I wish to express my concern about a provision in U.S. law that allows foreign litigants to come into U.S. courts and gain access to documents and other evidence for use in foreign judicial proceedings.

Under current provision, 28 U.S.C. 1782, an American citizen can be subjected to invasive requests by a foreign entity even when the citizen has no ability under the laws of the foreign jurisdiction to obtain similar information from the foreign entity itself. This gives foreign entities an unfair advantage over their U.S. counterparts.

Equally problematic, U.S. persons may be compelled under Federal law to turn over business information or trade

secrets for use in Federal judicial proceedings without any guarantee that such information will be adequately protected in the foreign jurisdiction. This places U.S. businesses at risk and, again, creates an unfair playing field.

Such unfairness and lack of reciprocity is deeply concerning. Our laws should not disadvantage our own citizens and companies. Rather, we should ensure a level playing field.

In the coming weeks, I will be introducing legislation to do just that. These are important bills, and these are important ideas. I appreciate having this time to be able to express them for the country at large.

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

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

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, before my planned remarks on the Federal Communications Commission, I want to say a few words about the awful events that happened in Las Vegas. Our hearts are with the families affected by the tragedy and with the city of Las Vegas, and we do send them our best wishes and our prayers. But we can do more than send our thoughts and prayers to the grieving. We can do more than thank the first responders. We can do more than lower the flag to half mast.

We can take a stand against gun violence by passing commonsense gun safety laws. Otherwise, this becomes a ritual of mass murder, mourning, and moving on. Let's stop this awful ritual. Let's stop the violence. Let's do something about it.

Mr. President, I wish to talk about the nomination of Chairman Ajit Pai to lead the Federal Communications Commission for another 5 years. When it comes to Chairman Pai, personally and professionally, I want to say that I believe in his integrity as a public servant, and I believe he is smart and qualified. But the FCC is supposed to create competition and protect consumers, and Chairman Pai isn't doing that.

First, Chairman Pai's FCC is trying to get rid of net neutrality. Net neutrality is a Federal rule that says ISPs—internet service providers—must treat all content equally. They can't discriminate by making certain kinds of content slower, charging more for other kinds of content, or blocking some content altogether.

That is the basic premise of the internet. Once you pay for your broadband internet access and then you jump on a browser, everything comes down to the same speeds. It is so foundational to the way we use the internet that it is actually hard to describe a future without net neutrality,

but it could be that you pay your ISP, and certain websites download fast.

Certain websites are almost impossible to find. For certain websites, you have to pay a premium just to be able to capture their content. Forget what you may have to pay Hulu, Netflix, and others. The ISP will essentially control your access to the internet. That is why net neutrality was so important. It is not that, in that moment, things were necessarily undermining the current internet but that, without a firm rule, these companies may have incentives to change the internet as we know it.

When Chairman Pai announced that the FCC would review the rules on net neutrality, he said: "This is a fight we intend to wage, and it is a fight that we are going to win." But that is not how the FCC is supposed to work. This is a quasi-judicial agency. They are supposed to propose a rule, allow the public to weigh in, and then the agency considers the comments before making a decision. Chairman Pai had made it clear from the beginning that he had already made up his mind. Even though there were 22 million individual comments from American citizens about what we should do with the free and open internet, he had decided in advance of that.

Unfortunately, this is part of a pattern. Right after Congress took away the FCC's ability to protect people's privacy online, he wrote an op-ed that essentially read that this is good news. It is pretty unusual to have a chairman of a quasi-judicial body weigh in on something that the legislative branch does or to completely disregard the process for public input. Chairman Pai has not yet demonstrated a willingness to stray from the party line.

One of the things I like about him is that I know that he has a big brain. We have talked policy, and when we have had private conversations, I have seen that he has liked the engagement, that he likes the job, and that he likes public service. The challenge is that there has been no instance in which he has done anything that was other than predictably Republican. That is OK for now, as it has been a relatively short tenure, but what we need in an FCC Chairman is someone who takes his own views and the facts, as the record becomes established, and makes up his own mind. He is not a Republican while he is on the FCC. His job is to apply the facts and his own judgment.

During the confirmation hearing, I asked him about the President of the United States calling the media the "enemy of the state." He would not say one way or another what he thought of those comments or how he would guide the FCC based on those comments. At some point, he needs to demonstrate some independence from his party and from the President.

With this vote, the Senate has a chance to say that the person who leads the FCC should understand, at a bare minimum, how to run a quasi-judicial agency in a nonpartisan fashion,

that he or she should value public input, and that he or she should not simply go along with what the party is asking and implement it no matter how it stacks up against the statute.

Here is another example. Earlier this year, Chairman Pai rolled back a rule in order to allow local TV stations to be bought up without any limits by one single company. This decision seemed to be for the benefit of one company, the Sinclair Broadcast Group, which just happens to be a company with strong conservative leanings. Sinclair is already the largest owner of local broadcasting stations in the United States, but now it is trying to buy another company, Tribune Media, which would expand Sinclair's reach into 72 percent of the households.

For decades, both Congress and the FCC have taken steps to protect local broadcasting because it has benefited the public interest. So, under normal circumstances, Sinclair would not be able to buy up these other stations, but Chairman Pai has changed the rules so that this company will have even more power and reach. The secondary beneficiary of this change will be the Republican Party, because Sinclair has a decades-long history of pressuring its local stations to broadcast certain news that helps the Republican cause.

We need an independent Chairman at the helm of the FCC. We need someone who will make decisions based on statute, not based on political affiliation. That is why I will vote no on Mr. Pai's nomination, but I hope that I will be proven wrong.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

THANKING THE SENATOR FROM HAWAII

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, let me thank my friend from Hawaii for his words.

I will make a statement for the record with regard to Mr. Pai, as I agree with Senator SCHATZ' vote and will be voting no, but I want to first speak about the horrible situation in Las Vegas.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Mr. President, there are precious few words for days like this. Last night, as everyone now knows, at a concert in Las Vegas, NV, a gunman opened fire on a crowd of 22,000, killing at least 58 and sending hundreds more to the hospital. It was the deadliest mass shooting in the history of our country.

Our collective hearts, so hardened now by the absurd frequency of these mass shootings, are broken once again. We mourn for the families of the fallen, and we pray with the families of the wounded. We have the deepest gratitude for every first responder, cop, and firefighter who rushed to the scene, as their heroism in the moment of this national tragedy has been an inspiration. Yet today we are filled with shock and horror, with sadness and rage.

The horrific massacre was perpetrated by an American on his fellow Americans and the visitors from every corner of the world, who are the very lifeblood of Las Vegas. We are left with many questions, the answers to which we will seek in the coming days and weeks.

How did this monster acquire the arsenal that he used to rain down death on a crowd of innocents? Were these guns purchased and compiled legally? What was this person's perverted motive? Was there any history of mental health issues?

What circumstances could lead a man to commit such violence upon his fellow human beings—complete strangers—what twisted reasoning, what demented logic?

There is much more that we do not know than what we do know. Some of the questions that we have today will not have clear answers. Others are, perhaps, beyond our fathoming. Yet some will have answers, and we will have to reckon with the fact that this man was able to assemble an arsenal of military-grade weapons.

As much as we might hope to, we cannot banish evil from the Earth. Congress cannot do that, and the President cannot do that. What Congress can do and what Congress must do is to pass laws that keep our citizens safe, and that starts with laws that help prevent guns, especially the most dangerous guns, from falling into the wrong hands.

We will take care of the injured—their bodies and their hearts—and nurse them back to health. We will mourn those lost with all of our collective love and support. We will bind up this new national wound. Then, we will aggressively ferret out the facts, and based on that reality, we will confront—we must confront—the deeply troubling issues that have been raised by this atrocity.

PUERTO RICO AND U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS
RECOVERY EFFORT

Mr. President, our friends and relatives and fellow Americans in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands should know that, even while we mourn and process the incomprehensible events in Las Vegas, we remain laser-focused on the needs of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, and we will continue our advocacy for a more comprehensive, more sure-footed, and better coordinated response to their crisis.

Mr. President, shortly the Senate will vote on the nominee to be Chairman of the FCC, Mr. Ajit Pai.

I cannot support this nominee for the office of Chairman. The FCC is tasked with the critical role of protecting consumers and promoting innovation in the telecommunications and technological fields that are becoming more and more integral to our day-to-day lives. However, over his time at the FCC and particularly in his tenure as Chairman so far, Mr. Pai has established a clear record of favoring big corporations at the expense of con-

sumers, innovators, and small businesses.

He supported congressional attempts to reverse the FCC's 2016 broadband privacy rule, which would have prevented big cable and internet companies from profiting off of personal internet data. Now, internet service providers no longer have to obtain consumer consent before they sell or share sensitive personal data.

Most disturbingly, Chairman Pai is currently attempting to dismantle the open internet order, the net neutrality rules under which millions of consumers currently have access to a free and open internet. Net neutrality has had a huge impact on everyone who uses the internet—on communities of color, on small businesses, on schools, on civic engagement, and on our economy.

Net neutrality is not the only issue where I disagree with Chairman Pai's agenda. In his first 2 weeks on the job, Chairman Pai stopped 9 companies from providing discounted high-speed internet to low-income individuals, and he jammed through nearly a dozen industry-backed actions, including some to begin curtailing net neutrality. The most alarming part: these clandestine moves to clip the public's fundamental right to a free and open internet were done without seeking public comment first.

It is no surprise, therefore, that Chairman Pai would be willing to further undermine the FCC's protection of net neutrality, notwithstanding the views of the nearly 22 million American citizens who have commented in opposition to his net neutrality proposal.

The open internet order is working well as it is and should remain undisturbed. Mr. Pai, however, seems bent on rolling back the open internet on behalf of a few corporate friends, rather than serving the American consumer and the American economy by keeping the current protections in place.

For these reasons, I feel very strongly that I must oppose his nomination; I cannot support this agenda, which I believe imperils consumers and the internet itself.

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. MORAN. 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. MORAN. Mr. President, thank you very much.

Today, I am here to speak on behalf of a good friend and an exceptional public servant, Chairman Ajit Pai of the Federal Communications Commission.

I have admired his work throughout his service within the Commission, which dates back to 2007, when he was in the Office of General Counsel. Over