

I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of Ms. Haspel's nomination.

REMEMBERING MICHAEL BEAVER

Now, Mr. President, on another subject—indeed, a deeply somber one—I would like to address a tragic loss we experienced in the Senate. Last week, Michael Beaver, a beloved member of the Senate family, passed away unexpectedly. We will all miss him dearly.

Michael served us as the Assistant Parliamentarian of the U.S. Senate, following a prior record of accomplishment in his legal career and a vibrant life which was tragically cut short at the young age of 39.

I am sure I speak for all of us in saying our hearts go out to Michael's family, including his beloved wife, young children, and parents.

Michael was known and admired by us all for his legal and parliamentary talents, as well as for his sharp wit and humor. Parliamentarians in the Senate work hard for the American people and often face long hours and extended debates. They are an integral part of the fabric that holds the Senate in order and allows us to achieve results. With Michael's talents and demeanor, our accomplishments were made all the more rigorous and our work all the more pleasurable.

It was not unusual for Michael to provide comment or advice on Senate work in progress that included a unique and brilliant mixture of insight, wit, and humor. Succinctly stated, working with Michael was refreshing.

Michael engaged with my staff and Members of the Senate on a daily basis when the Senate debated healthcare reform and then tax legislation. There were many late nights, and work often spilled over into the weekends. Michael was always there to help us through and would often make us smile with his ever-present sharp wit.

Without the dedication of public servants like Michael, it would simply be impossible for the rest of us in the Senate to function as we should.

Michael's passing is hard on all of us, from his colleagues in the Office of the Parliamentarian to every committee in the Senate, and to those of us who saw him regularly seated directly below where the Presiding Officer sits. We all benefited from his counsel.

My heartfelt condolences and prayers go out to Michael's family in their time of grief. He will be sorely missed. 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. PETERS. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. PETERS. Mr. President, competition is the lifeblood of the American economy. Competition is what makes capitalism work. It is competi-

tion that has established the United States as the world's dominant economic force for over a century.

American competition is driven by innovation. We created the light bulb, the automobile, and the internet.

We all know that the internet has revolutionized the way we communicate, learn, and do business. A free and open internet allows students in Houghton, Lansing, and Mount Pleasant to access research and to collaborate internationally. A free and open internet allows startups in Detroit, Grand Rapids, and Flint to reach customers across the globe. A free and open internet allows a small bed and breakfast in Traverse City or Muskegon to reach millions of potential guests that they couldn't otherwise reach.

While the internet has been a potent force for innovation and economic growth in recent decades, our economy has been facing some serious headwinds. I am deeply concerned that we are seeing increased business consolidation—big firms are getting bigger—and we are seeing fewer new small businesses and startups. A recent study found that across 900 different industries, over two-thirds have become more concentrated in the past decade. The formation of new companies is falling. The number of jobs created by new businesses has fallen, even as our workforce has grown.

We have seen a large national internet service provider acquire a similarly large media company. We have recently seen the largest online retailer acquire one of our Nation's most successful grocery chains. Now we are seeing two of the four largest wireless carriers making preparations to merge.

Certainly, consolidations and mergers are a part of our economy, but we need rules of the road to level the playing field, to help small businesses and startups to compete, and to drive innovation. This is exactly why we need net neutrality.

Net neutrality protections prevented internet service providers from blocking, slowing, or prioritizing web traffic for their own financial gain. Without net neutrality, we could be subject to a two-tiered internet. Without net neutrality, large corporations, which keep getting larger and larger, can pay for a fast lane and buy the power to slow down or to block content. Without net neutrality, consumers, small businesses, and startups can be forced into the slow lane. Simply put, net neutrality keeps America competitive.

Unfortunately, net neutrality is under attack by the Trump administration. In December, the FCC voted to repeal crucial net neutrality protections, despite the fact that 86 percent of Americans wanted the rules to stay in place. The decision to scrap these net neutrality protections is anti-consumer, anti-innovation, and anti-competitive. It disadvantages small businesses, startups, and families all across our country.

While the FCC vote to repeal net neutrality rules is over, we are still here in the Senate fighting. In fact, we are closer than ever to reinstating the rules of the road that will keep the internet free, open, and competitive.

Fifty Senators, including the entire Democratic caucus, have signed a petition that would force a vote on legislation that would reinstate these crucial protections. With 51 votes, we could overturn the FCC's original repeal and move one step closer to restoring fairness.

Students, artists, advocates, entrepreneurs, and other visionaries who could be inventing the future and creating the next big thing could once again be on an equal playing field with multinational corporations when it comes to using the internet.

We need net neutrality to keep our economy dynamic, growing, and innovative. We need net neutrality to keep our startups and small businesses competitive.

Five months ago, I stood here in this Chamber urging the FCC to abandon their dangerous vote. Now I stand here urging my colleagues to reverse this dangerous and disastrous decision.

We have the power to do it, and we must. We need one more vote.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Engelhardt nomination?

Mr. INHOFE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 87 Ex.]

YEAS—62

Alexander	Blunt	Capito
Barrasso	Boozman	Cassidy
Bennet	Burr	Collins

Coons	Inhofe	Perdue
Corker	Isakson	Portman
Cornyn	Johnson	Risch
Cotton	Jones	Roberts
Crapo	Kennedy	Rounds
Cruz	King	Rubio
Daines	Klobuchar	Sasse
Enzi	Lankford	Scott
Ernst	Leahy	Shelby
Fischer	Lee	Sullivan
Flake	Manchin	Tester
Gardner	McCaskill	Thune
Grassley	McConnell	Tillis
Hatch	Moran	Toomey
Heitkamp	Murkowski	Warner
Heller	Murphy	Wicker
Hoeven	Nelson	Young
Hyde-Smith	Paul	

NAYS—34

Baldwin	Harris	Schatz
Blumenthal	Hassan	Schumer
Booker	Heinrich	Shaheen
Brown	Hirono	Smith
Cantwell	Kaine	Stabenow
Cardin	Markey	Udall
Carper	Menendez	Van Hollen
Casey	Merkley	Warren
Cortez Masto	Murray	Whitehouse
Durbin	Peters	Wyden
Feinstein	Reed	
Gillibrand	Sanders	

NOT VOTING—4

Donnelly	Graham
Duckworth	McCain

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 Michael B. Brennan, of Wisconsin, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, John Hoeven, Johnny Isakson, James Lankford, Steve Daines, Ben Sasse, Mike Crapo, John Kennedy, John Barrasso, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, James M. Inhofe, Richard Burr, Mike Rounds, Shelley Moore Capito, Tom Cotton, Cory Gardner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 Michael B. Brennan, of Wisconsin, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit, 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 Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 88 Ex.]

YEAS—49

Alexander	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hatch	Roberts
Burr	Heller	Rounds
Capito	Hoeven	Rubio
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Collins	Inhofe	Scott
Corker	Isakson	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson	Sullivan
Cotton	Kennedy	Thune
Crapo	Lankford	Tillis
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	Young
Ernst	Murkowski	
Fischer	Paul	

NAYS—47

Baldwin	Heinrich	Peters
Bennet	Heitkamp	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Sanders
Booker	Jones	Schatz
Brown	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Smith
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall
Cortez Masto	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Durbin	Menendez	Warner
Feinstein	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Murphy	Whitehouse
Harris	Murray	Wyden
Hassan	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—4

Donnelly	Graham
Duckworth	McCain

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 49, the nays are 47.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Michael B. Brennan, of Wisconsin, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRING OF JAMES COMEY

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, 1 year ago today, the President of the United States did the unthinkable. He did at least what many people thought was unthinkable. He fired the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, James Comey. Shortly thereafter, he acknowledged the reason. He told NBC's Lester Holt that he fired James Comey because he was thinking about "this Russia thing" and how unjustified he thought the investigation was. He later told officials of Vladimir Putin's government in a private meeting in the Oval Office that this firing relieved him of the pressure that he was feeling as a result of the Russia investigation.

The 1-year anniversary of Jim Comey's firing might well be permitted

to pass without notice, but little did we know at the time that it would be part of a relentless and repeated denunciation of professional law enforcement at the Federal Bureau of Investigation, at the Department of Justice, even at the CIA, and law enforcement agencies all around the country. This concerted and coordinated attack on the FBI and Department of Justice is no accident. It is part of a strategy to undermine the credibility not only of the special counsel's investigation of collusion by the Trump campaign with Russia in its meddling in the 2016 election and the potential of obstruction of justice and coverup by the President and his administration, but it is also deeply alarming as an attack on professional law enforcement.

The President's attacks have become so numerous and so brazen that they have almost become the new normal. Likewise, the attacks by his sycophants and surrogates in Congress undermine the credibility and trust of the FBI and the Department of Justice. That is why I am here today—because words have consequences.

These attacks have ramifications for the FBI when it investigates a crime. The willingness of potential witnesses to talk to them may be undermined. Their ability to prevent crime may be undercut because of informants' lack of trust in them. And the credibility of FBI agents at a trial in a conflict of credibility with a defendant who is lying can be sabotaged by the President through these denunciations—far beyond the special prosecutor's investigation.

This attack on law enforcement has consequences for the safety and security of our Nation, indeed, our national security, because the FBI needs those informants, needs credibility as witnesses, needs the trust of the American people to do its job in keeping America safe from sabotage or subterfuge internally, as well as organized crime, drug dealing—the panoply of threats that exist to our safety.

It is no accident that terrorist attacks have reduced in severity since 9/11. It is no accident that crime is at lower levels than in recent years. It is no accident that Americans feel safer as they walk the streets and communities of America, rural and urban. It is because we have devoted resources to local law enforcement, as well as the Federal agencies that are vital to support local law enforcement with the information and data they need to do their job and with the enforcement they provide in solving crimes and making sure the bad guys are convicted and go away.

The best laws in the world are dead letter if they are unenforced. The new laws that we pass here will mean nothing without strong and effective law enforcement.

We should all be deeply alarmed and concerned about this new normal of a President of the United States—who is responsible for making sure the laws