

I yield the floor.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### NOMINATIONS OF RYAN NELSON AND SUSAN COMBS

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Western Caucus and as a Montanan, I am here to urge the swift confirmation of two outstanding nominations to serve in the Department of the Interior. The first is Ryan Nelson, a native of Idaho Falls, ID, as Solicitor of the Department of the Interior. The second is Susan Combs, a rancher from Big Bend, TX. She is nominated to be Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget.

Both of these positions are critical to managing our public lands and wildlife. Yet these two well-qualified individuals have been waiting in a bureaucratic limbo. Mr. Nelson was first nominated over 209 days ago, and Ms. Combs received her first nomination over 231 days ago.

Mr. Nelson is a great choice to serve as Solicitor. He is a westerner, and he spends time fishing and hunting with his family in Idaho. He understands our western way of life, and he has the work experience to make sure our public lands are managed and protected in the right way.

His service includes serving as clerk on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit, serving as special counsel for the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and as Deputy Assistant Attorney General in the Environment and Natural Resources Division of the Department of Justice.

At the Department of Justice, he worked to defend vital Federal programs and oversaw many complex cases involving our natural resources, wildlife, and environment. He also compelled polluters to limit harmful emissions into the air and worked with then-Solicitor of the Department of the Interior David Bernhardt on the listing decision for the polar bear. Like Mr. Bernhardt, Ryan is capable of upholding the law and the science, even when it is not easy.

If you want someone who values conservation, who knows the appropriate use of laws, like the Antiquities Act and the Endangered Species Act, then Ryan is your guy. The Department of the Interior needs Ryan's expertise to help make the best decisions possible for the benefit of our natural resources and the people and wildlife living around them. His confirmation must be prioritized.

Ms. Combs is also exactly the right person for the job to serve as the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Manage-

ment and Budget. Ms. Combs has had a long and successful career both in business and in public service, including as a member of the Texas House of Representatives, as Texas's agriculture commissioner, and as Texas's comptroller of public accounts. Her proven management track record in public service and in business is crucial to making the Department of the Interior more efficient and effective to help ensure the responsible stewardship of western lands.

Both Mr. Nelson's and Ms. Combs's nominations have been pending longer than any of their predecessors—now listen to this—over the past 25 years. This is not just bad governance; it is a complete lack of governance. Here is the problem. When you have qualified individuals like Mr. Nelson and like Ms. Combs who wait in this bureaucratic limbo for this long, it then puts them in a position to, maybe, find other employment. We need to find the best people who are willing to serve in these positions, and we need to give them the respect of moving them through quickly so that we can keep them with the thought of entering public service.

Colleagues, it is time to get the job done and move these critical nominations across the finish line.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

#### GUN SAFETY

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, this morning, I had the opportunity to meet with some extraordinary young people. These were students from Parkland, FL, who attend the school where the mass shooting took place 2 weeks ago. What was amazingly impressive about these young people is that in the midst of their grief, in the midst of the unbelievably traumatic experience that they went through in seeing their best friends being shot and wounded in cold blood and their teachers killed, they resolved not just to mourn and grieve for their friends and neighbors; they resolved to stand up and fight back and come to Washington, go to Tallahassee, FL, and go around the country to do everything they can to make certain that no more children—no more young people—are mowed down and slaughtered in schools.

Nobody thinks that the issue of gun safety is going to be an easy issue to solve. There are literally hundreds of millions of guns throughout this country, and there are 5 million assault weapons throughout this country today. Tragically, there are many thousands of people, I expect in every State in this country, who are walking our streets and are at their wits end emotionally, who are suicidal, who are homicidal. Many of those people have access to guns and guns of mass destruction. I think that in some respects, the slaughter at the high school in Parkland, FL, was kind of the straw that broke the camel's back.

Several months ago, the American people were stunned to see some very

sick person in Las Vegas break a window and start mowing down people. He killed some 58 Americans and wounded 500 people within a period of a few minutes. That was on top of Sandy Hook. It was on top of so many gun slaughters that, I think, what has finally happened—maybe because of the extraordinary efforts of these young people from Parkland—the American people are saying that enough is enough, that we have a difficult problem. We may not be able to solve it completely overnight, but we have a moral obligation to do everything we can to make certain that no more children—no more people in this country—are mowed down by some sick person with a weapon.

That is not just I who is talking, and it is not just the young people from the high school in Florida. It is pretty much what the American people want. Let me refer the Presiding Officer to a few polls that were conducted fairly recently.

A Quinnipiac poll was done on February 20, just a week ago. This is what that poll showed.

It showed that 97 percent of the American people support universal background checks, which is not a radical idea. What the American people are saying and what gun owners are saying is that we should keep guns out of the hands of people who are not responsible and should not own guns. Universal background checks are almost universally supported by the American people.

In that same Quinnipiac poll, 83 percent of the American people indicated support for a mandatory waiting period for all gun purchases. You don't want somebody who is angry, who is upset, or who had something terrible happen to go running to a gun store, buying a gun, and then going out and using it.

There are 75 percent who, basically, want the Congress to address the issue of gun violence and to start taking action.

There are 67 percent of the people polled by Quinnipiac who support a nationwide ban on the sale of assault weapons. They believe and I believe that assault weapons are designed as military weapons to kill human beings. That is what those weapons are designed to do. I believe and have believed for 30 years—and a majority of the American people believe—that we should end the sale and distribution of those weapons. That was in a Quinnipiac poll.

According to a CNN poll that was done more recently, just a few days ago on February 25, 70 percent of the American people want stricter gun laws. This is the highest number that CNN has registered since way back when the Brady Bill passed, in 1993.

According to CNN, 87 percent support laws to prevent convicted felons and the mentally ill from owning guns. There are 71 percent who support banning anyone under the age of 21 from buying a gun. There are 63 percent who

support a ban on the sale and possession of high-capacity magazines. There are 57 percent who support an assault weapons ban, and 56 percent say that stricter gun laws would reduce gun-related deaths.

We have a difficult issue which is not going to be solved overnight, and nobody thinks that it will. Yet the American people are demanding that we have the courage to stand up to the NRA and finally take some action that will move us in the right direction. Let me just suggest some of the ways I believe we should go forward in a bipartisan way.

Once again, the American people believe and I believe in universal background checks. That means, among other things, ending the so-called gun show loophole, because background checks don't mean anything if somebody can go to a gun show or on the internet and buy weapons without undergoing any background check. Overwhelmingly, the American people say that before somebody is able to purchase a gun, we need to know: Is the person a killer? Is he a person who has engaged in domestic violence? Is he somebody who has a history of mental health problems? If that is the case, that person should not be buying a gun.

I think serious gun safety legislation must include addressing the so-called straw man purchases. This is a provision by which people can legally go to gun shops, buy the weapons that they want, but then they are going to sell those weapons or distribute those weapons to people who should not be owning those weapons and who could not have purchased those weapons on their own. I have indicated it is my view that we should ban assault weapons in this country—weapons that are designed for no other purpose but to kill human beings.

Furthermore, I think it is clear that we are a nation that is facing a mental health crisis. I know that in my office—and I expect in the offices of other Senators—we get calls all of the time from people who say: I am worried about my husband. I am worried about my brother. He is at his wits end. I don't know what he is going to do to himself or what he is going to do to somebody else. We have been searching for mental health treatment, but we cannot find anything that is available now or that we can afford.

I believe we should be moving forward to pass legislation which says that Americans who suffer today from mental health crises should be able to get the mental healthcare they need now, not 2 months from now, because 2 months from now may be too late.

We also need to address the fact that, every year, women are being killed by their husbands or their boyfriends and that if somebody is a stalker, if somebody is convicted of domestic violence, if somebody is under a restraining order, we should be clear that that person should not be owning a gun. This is just some of what I think needs to be done.

We are at a moment when the American people have had it up to here. They do not want to turn on their TVs tomorrow or next week or next month and see the horrible, unspeakable things that we have seen in schools throughout this country.

At this particular moment in history, I hope that in a bipartisan way we can come together and do what the American people want us to do, which is to pass commonsense gun safety legislation that is supported by the overwhelming majority of the American people.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### NET NEUTRALITY

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I would like to speak on behalf of my constituents and the tens of millions of Americans who rely on a free and open internet.

Make no mistake, we are locked in a historic battle to preserve the core principles of competition, innovation, and consumer choice that have made the internet the world's greatest platform for commerce and communications; a historic battle to restore the hallmark of American innovation and democratization; a historic battle to protect America's innovation incubator and job generator—a battle for net neutrality.

In December, the Trump FCC, the Federal Communications Commission, eliminated net neutrality. These rules prevented your internet service provider—Comcast, Verizon, AT&T, and Charter—from indiscriminately charging more for internet fast lanes or slowing down or even blocking certain websites entirely, the very rules that allow inventors, entrepreneurs, and small businesses, the lifeblood of the American economy, to connect to the internet.

The reason why is simple. The Trump administration sides with the rich and the powerful first and consistently puts everyday American lives last. We have seen them wage an all-out assault on healthcare, on climate change, and now on net neutrality, but today the internet is fighting back, and we have a powerful tool at our disposal that will allow the average consumer to have their voices heard right here on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

Today I am officially introducing a CRA—Congressional Review Act—resolution that will fully restore net neutrality. The entire Senate Democratic caucus is now standing with the millions of Americans who want to reverse the FCC's partisan actions and restore net neutrality.

Net neutrality is not and should not be a partisan issue. I thank Senator SUSAN COLLINS for supporting my CRA, and I encourage other Republican colleagues to stand with all of us who support net neutrality. We are just one vote away in the Senate from restoring net neutrality. There will be a vote right here on the floor of the Senate sometime this spring. The clock is ticking. We just need a simple majority for passage, and that is just one more vote.

When we take that vote, every one of my colleagues will have to answer the simple question: Whose side are you on? Do you stand with hard-working American families for whom the internet is essential or do you stand with the Big Money corporate interests and their army of lobbyists? We should all be on the right side of history.

Millennials are motivated. Momentum is building. Citizens are joining together demonstrating, writing letters, calling their Members of Congress, and taking this message to social media. They are joined by groups that include Fight for the Future, Demand Progress, Free Press, the Center for Digital Technology, the Center for Media Justice, Color of Change, Common Cause, Consumers Union, Engine, the National Hispanic Media Coalition, the Open Technology Institute, Public Knowledge, and many others out across the country that are organizing right now as part of an effort that is going to bring millions of voices into the offices of every Senator and every House Member in our country.

This fight is not limited to the Halls of Congress. We are seeing a historic groundswell of activity at the State and local level. The Governors in Hawaii, New Jersey, Vermont, Montana, and New York have issued executive orders promoting net neutrality.

State legislatures in more than half of the United States are currently considering net neutrality legislation. Just today, 76 mayors across the Nation signed a letter opposing net neutrality repeal, and 23 State attorneys general have filed suit to reinstate the rule, and we plan to stand by them throughout this entire battle, in the court and out here on the floor of Congress.

We cannot let net neutrality be another example of Congress disregarding public opinion and putting donor interests first. Net neutrality is our 21st century right, and we will fight to protect it. In fact, 83 percent of all Americans in polling say they want to protect net neutrality. By the way, that is pretty much every millennial, because for millennials, the internet is like oxygen. I will say that if you are 35 years old or younger, the poll is at pretty close to 100 percent.

I can see all the pages nodding their heads as I am speaking. They know no life without a device that they are carrying around. This is the world in which we are living, and they do not want to have any discrimination introduced into the relationship they