

great example—a woman started this business at her kitchen table. She had such bad internet access in Ada that she has to have her 2-person sales force located in Fargo—and that is a long way away. But if you look at her whole business model, it is about marketing on the internet. She has taken that business from the kitchen table to one that has 20 employees and is shipping her products—that would be chain jewelry—all over the country.

Well, without unrestricted access to the internet, entrepreneurs may be forced to pay for equal footing to compete online. So if it isn't bad enough that she doesn't have access right where her business is and has to have her employees located off campus—way over, actually in another State—now, if you get rid of net neutrality, she will not be able to have an even playing field at all. She will be in the slow lane.

This proposal will hurt the very people creating jobs and keeping our economy competitive. That is why I have joined my colleagues who push for a vote on Senator MARKEY's resolution to repeal Chairman Pai's plan and protect net neutrality rules.

Over the next few days, we need to keep the pressure on because the vote will have a major impact on the future of the internet. This repeal is part of a larger trend of helping large companies push out their competition. The fight to protect net neutrality is far from over, and we need to make our voices heard.

Mr. President, I rise to join many of my colleagues who have come to the floor to speak about our country's third branch of government—our courts—as well as to express my opposition to the nomination of Michael Brennan to the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I am very disappointed that the Senate has decided to abandon the blue-slip tradition for circuit court judges. The blue-slip policy held true throughout the entirety of the previous administration, including when Republicans ran the Senate and when Democrats ran the Senate. This is for good reason. The blue slip is a key check and balance. In my view, it has promoted cooperation, as well as resulted in better decision making for judges across party lines.

Senators have a solemn obligation to advise and consent on the President's nominees to the Federal courts, and I take that obligation very seriously. I know my colleague Senator BALDWIN also takes that responsibility very seriously. That is why she had a bipartisan process in place through which she worked with Senator JOHNSON in an effort to produce consensus nominees.

This nominee did not gain sufficient support from the Wisconsin judicial nominations commission. So it is unfortunate that we are considering his nomination on the Senate floor.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. President, I also want to take a moment to discuss the Iran agreement and the President's decision. Yesterday, the President announced the United States will unilaterally withdraw from the JCPOA, commonly referred to as the Iran agreement.

In 2015, I supported the Iran agreement—although I may have negotiated differently—but we had the agreement that was before us. I supported it because I believed it was the best available option for putting the brakes on a nuclear weapon for Iran. I still believe that today. We cannot allow Iran to obtain a nuclear weapon. In this critical time, as we head into negotiations on North Korea's nuclear weapons, we cannot be backing away from international agreements and nuclear inspections.

Preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon is one of the most important objectives of our national security policy. I strongly advocated for, and supported, the economic sanctions that brought Iran to the negotiating table and the subsequent sanctions passed last year to address Iran's destabilizing activities and promotion of terrorism.

Unilateral withdrawal from the agreement has resulted in a splintered international partnership with our European allies that has been critical to preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. We should, instead, be negotiating a more comprehensive agreement that includes Iran's nuclear ambitions today and in the future, ballistic missile tests, and destabilizing activities that pose a direct threat to Israel and other allies.

We can conduct those negotiations with our allies as part of a team without withdrawing from the existing agreement.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The Senator from New Hampshire.

NET NEUTRALITY

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues on the floor to very strongly support the Congressional Review Act resolution to restore net neutrality and maintain a free and open internet. I applaud Senator ED MARKEY for his leadership in introducing this Congressional Review Act resolution.

Restoring net neutrality is especially critical to small businesses and startup companies in New Hampshire and across the United States. Small businesses are the backbone of our Granite State's economy. They represent 99 percent of our employers. The internet continues to provide opportunity for these small businesses because it levels the playing field. It makes it easier to find new customers and grow online, but that level playing field is now in jeopardy because of the Federal Communications Commission's decision to end net neutrality protections.

Last Thursday, I convened a field hearing of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

at the University of New Hampshire. I wanted to hear concerns of our small business owners about what the net neutrality rollback would mean to them. In particular, they are concerned that net neutrality will impede their ability to expand and create jobs.

In conversations with small business owners and leaders across my State, they tell me this rollback is a direct threat to their businesses. They say it would be like watching their large competitors take the highway while they are forced to take the slow roads. Without net neutrality, broadband providers could charge more for fast lanes—a cost that many small businesses simply can't afford. This would put them at an even greater competitive disadvantage vis-a-vis large corporations that have the resources to pay for those fast lanes. In the digital age, speed is critical.

Witnesses at our field hearing pointed to research showing that even small delays of a second or less—just think about that, a second or less—can lead to the loss of significant sales. Customers today expect a fast, easy online experience. It is clear, small businesses operating at slim margins would lose out to big firms that can afford the fast lane.

Josh Cyr, who testified at our hearing, is an executive with Alpha Loft. Alpha Loft is a startup incubator that is based in Manchester and Portsmouth, NH. At the field hearing, he had a stark warning. He said:

The repeal of net neutrality protections enables a small handful of very powerful internet providers tremendous control over what is delivered to consumers' homes and the speed with which it is delivered. Without net neutrality, the power and control these internet providers have will allow them to create artificial market barriers.

The repeal of net neutrality would pose even greater challenges for small businesses in rural areas. As Senator KLOBUCHAR said, she has a lot of rural areas in Minnesota. Well, so does New Hampshire. A 2015 survey by the University of New Hampshire showed that nearly 40 percent of New Hampshire residents who were polled said they were using their current provider because it is the only option available to them. Many rural small businesses will have nowhere else to turn if their broadband provider decides to charge more or slow down the connection. Our witnesses noted that net neutrality could heighten the rural urban divide, making it more challenging for small businesses and rural communities to reach customers, attract workers, and stay connected.

One of the other people testifying at the hearing was Nancy Pearson. She is the director of the New Hampshire Center for Women and Enterprise. She testified that net neutrality is a matter of equality. She said:

New Hampshire small businesses and microbusinesses rely on the equalizing force of the internet, and just to put that in perspective, women start businesses at five times the rate of any other entrepreneur—

and for minority women and veterans, that number is even higher. So when we start putting barriers in the way of these entrepreneurs, it can have a significant and, I think, disastrous effect.

The FCC's rollback of net neutrality rules is also creating tremendous uncertainty, especially for startup businesses that are looking to plan ahead. It could have major ramifications on sales, marketing, and internet costs that small businesses just can't predict.

Participants at the field hearing warned that the FCC's decision will affect not only businesses but also institutions of higher education. It will also negatively impact efforts to provide telemedicine consultations to patients who don't have access to services locally. Again, we have a big rural population in New Hampshire—well, a small population but a lot of rural areas.

I am concerned, for instance, about the impact on the Veterans' Administration's outpatient clinic in Littleton, NH. It relies on telemedicine to provide psychiatric care to veterans in remote locations. What will happen if they can no longer provide that service because they don't have the ability to pay for those lanes anymore?

Small businesses, consumers, and all Americans who care about a level playing field on the internet have every reason to be concerned by the FCC's repeal of net neutrality protections, but their ill-considered rollback doesn't have to be the last word. We can bring to the floor a bipartisan resolution to prevent the FCC's rollback from going forward.

A coalition of more than 6,000 small businesses across the country sent a letter to Congress asking us to protect them by overturning the FCC's decision to repeal net neutrality. Further, at my field hearing last week, Granite State small businesses offered compelling testimony about the importance of net neutrality to their competitiveness and their ability to expand and hire new workers. We must not ignore this groundswell of opposition to the FCC's rollback of rules that ensure equal access to the internet.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the Congressional Review Act resolution. Let's restore net neutrality protections and ensure a free and open internet, with access on equal terms, for all businesses and consumers.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I am proud to stand with my good colleague from New Hampshire and all of my colleagues today in defense of net neutrality.

Net neutrality has leveled the playing field for every American consumer, allowing everyone to access and enjoy an open internet. Thanks to the internet provided by schools and public libraries, students have been able to utilize information available online to en-

hance their education or help them do their homework.

I have heard from librarians and library administrators from all across Nevada expressing their concerns about the direct negative impact net neutrality's repeal would have on Nevadans. They told me that repealing net neutrality would hamper their ability to provide Nevadans with essential services. According to the Pew Research Center, "Library users who take advantage of libraries' computers and internet connections are more likely to be young, black, female, and lower income."

In Nevada, I know students who don't have access to internet at home now go to the library to do their homework. Nevadans applying for jobs currently use the internet in public libraries to connect with employers to submit resumes and job applications. Many Nevadans use the internet and internet access to learn new skills through training resources that are available online.

In November of last year, I received a letter from the Las Vegas-Clark County Library District strongly opposing the repeal of net neutrality. The Las Vegas-Clark County Library District is the largest in the State and serves over 1.6 million people. The letter reads:

Many of our customers, even in the urban areas of the county, are not able to afford access to the internet at their homes at all, and rely on public libraries to complete their school work, research information about starting small businesses, and whatever else they need to do on the internet.

Limiting the ability of public libraries to provide fast, reliable internet service means limiting opportunities for Nevadans to thrive.

Through simple online marketing or by using online sales platforms, small businesses have the opportunity to improve their visibility and expand their customer base.

It has become possible for startup companies to get a fair chance at competing in highly saturated markets because of internet accessibility.

It is true in Nevada and all across the country that the internet has opened doors for jobs, businesses, education, innovation, and technology, and net neutrality protections have allowed the country to continue opening those doors.

As access to the internet has exploded, more and more Americans have been empowered to start their own business ventures. More specifically, there has been a sharp growth in women business owners due in large part to a freely accessible, fair and open internet.

As you have heard, between 2007 and 2016, women-owned firms grew at a rate of five times the national average, mirroring the emergence of the internet as a platform for economic growth. For example, Etsy, an online shopping platform, caters to small businesses, 87 percent of which are owned by women.

Just last week, I held a roundtable in Reno with women entrepreneurs. One

of their biggest concerns was the repeal of net neutrality and how that would adversely affect their business's profitability and success.

With net neutrality's repeal, business owners, like Katie, who cofounded a tech company in Reno, would have to go up against large corporations that can afford to buy faster internet speeds. This would stifle competition, and it would cripple the growth of small businesses like hers. Katie told me:

It would really be a stifling situation for us, not only financially, but from an innovation standpoint. Your dollars have to go to furthering your business, not paying to deliver it.

Nevada's economic growth depends on the small business owners, like Katie, who invest in our communities, and that is why we can't afford to repeal net neutrality.

Chairman Pai's misguided decision to repeal net neutrality protections threatens to change the internet as we know it. It threatens our small businesses, access to online education, job growth, and innovation by giving those who can afford to pay more the ability to set their own rules.

Nevada's small businesses, local hospitals, public libraries, and disadvantaged communities, among many others, will bear the burden as they become subject to the whims of broadband providers that now have the ability to elevate their own content and pick and choose which websites Nevadans can have access to.

The FCC has a longstanding responsibility of protecting American consumers and the public interest. While Chairman Pai refuses to properly do his job, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of the CRA and stand with all Americans, regardless of their income.

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. BROWN. 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. BROWN. Mr. President, when we look at what this body has done over the past year and a half, when we look at what the U.S. Senate stands for and what the 100 Members of the Senate have done in the last 18 months, unfortunately, one thing is really clear: Corporations get handout after handout while ordinary Americans get the shaft.

Corporations are doing really, really, really well, especially those companies that shut down production in places like Mansfield, Toledo, Lima, and Gainesville and moved production overseas; those companies are rewarded. They are rewarded because down the hall, often in the dead of night, lobbyists gather in the majority

leader's office and write tax legislation, write healthcare legislation, and write consumer legislation that always helps the richest and the biggest and the most profitable in our country and leaves out the middle class, working families, and low-income Americans.

We saw it with the tax bill. Eighty percent of the benefits over the course of this bill—80 percent of the benefits, \$4 out of every \$5—go to the top 1 percent of earners in this country. Reports show that corporations have funneled their tax savings to executives and investors over workers by a three-to-one margin.

The people who wrote this tax bill promised us that the money saved by large corporations—their tax rates were cut from 35 to 22 percent and other kinds of tax goodies were bestowed on the largest corporations in this country. They promised the tax savings would go to higher wages for workers and investments in communities that produce more jobs. Do my colleagues know what happened not too many weeks ago? General Motors near Youngstown, OH, announced they were laying off 1,500 workers.

General Motors saved billions of dollars under the tax bill, but that money didn't go to Youngstown or Ohio or the workers, and it didn't go to investments in communities; it went to the executives in higher compensation. Right before the tax break, the five top-earning executives at General Motors brought home \$100 million last year. That was before the tax cut, before taxes were raised on all of you in the middle class. Taxes are raised on working families over time, and the tax breaks go to the richest people in this country.

We saw it with the tax bill. We saw it with the rollback in protections for consumers. It is easier for big banks and payday lenders to take advantage of their customers and deny those customers their day in court when they are cheated.

We see it in healthcare legislation when Members of this body—well-paid U.S. Senators, well-paid, get good benefits, good healthcare coverage—were willing to vote time and again to take that healthcare coverage away from consumers. In Ohio alone, 500,000 people right now—over the course of the last few years—have gotten opioid treatment for their addiction because they had insurance under the Affordable Care Act. These Members of the Senate have tried to take it away from them.

Now the question is: Are we going to see it again? Are we going to see the bias in this body for the wealthiest, largest corporations on a tax bill, on a bank bill, on a healthcare bill—are we going to see it again with net neutrality? Are my colleagues going to allow corporate special interests to shut down the free and open internet or, for once—for once—is this body going to stand for the people we serve?

Net neutrality rules keep the internet free from corporate interference.

Protecting those rules is vital to protecting free speech and consumer choice and access to public information.

But last December, the FCC—the Federal Communications Commission—on a party-line vote, where there is a majority of Republicans on this Commission, voted to repeal those rules by one vote, allowing internet providers to slow down internet speeds and offer better connectivity to the highest bidder.

I don't know any individual in Dayton or Cincinnati or Gallipolis or Belaire, OH, who has said to me: I don't want net neutrality; I want corporations to be able to charge different rates and stick it to people with low incomes and offer something better to those people who are wealthy. I have never heard anybody say that.

I know companies that benefit from changing the net neutrality rules; I don't know any individuals who want to do that. But it is not individuals and the middle class that control this body or control the Federal Communications Commission. It is the people who represent the largest corporate interests.

We know that without net neutrality rules, broadband providers can charge customers more for faster speeds, squeezing out startups, squeezing out nonprofits and rural consumers—consumers who can't afford to pay an extra fee. They could be forced to pay for internet packages the way we do cable packages—paying more for popular sites and to have pages load faster. Anyone who has ever been on the phone negotiating packages with their cable company knows how frustrating it can be and knows where this could be headed.

High-speed internet is expensive enough as it is. Customers already have too few choices. In some cases in Ohio, for instance, people in my State have no choice at all. I will never forget that not too many years ago I was talking to a high school sophomore who told me she lives in very hilly Appalachia, Southeast Ohio, and she told me that she can't really study at home because she doesn't have access to the internet, to any kind of high-speed internet, because she lives in a valley. She goes to her grandmother's up on a hill to study so she can do her school work the way she needs to. If we don't stand up to the Federal Communications Commission, if we don't stand up to these big telecommunications companies, if we don't stand up and do the right thing here, that will continue to be a problem and increasingly be a problem for far too many Ohioans. A free and open internet that levels the playing field for entrepreneurs and startups to compete with big corporations is what we need to have.

So many of my colleagues love to talk about their support for business, but the question is which businesses. It is small businesses that drive job creation. It is small businesses that create

two-thirds of all net new jobs. These are the companies that will be hurt the most if the biggest corporations—again, in this Senate—are allowed to gouge them for internet fees.

This shouldn't be partisan. Nobody separates themselves as Republicans and Democrats out in my State on these kinds of issues, but here it is partisan. Here it is partisan because, first of all, the administration looks like a retreat for Wall Street executives, with this huge—this very decided bias toward the wealthiest people in this country. We know that on issue after issue, this body always sides with the largest corporations, but small businesses will be the ones that are hurt the most, as I said.

It shouldn't be partisan. We know the internet is vital to modern life and modern businesses.

Today I spoke to a woman from Cleveland, OH, a small business owner named Helen Quinn. She and her husband, Jesse Mason, started Mason's Ice Cream as a food truck that would go to local farmers markets. Using tools from Google and others, they were able to grow a following for their business. In 2014 they had reached a point where they had been successful enough that they were able to buy an old, iconic walkup ice cream shop in Ohio City, a neighborhood west of downtown Cleveland, not far from where I live. They are now operating full time. They employ local Clevelanders. They partner with other small businesses in the neighborhood.

This Friday, Helen and Jesse will join me in Cleveland for the Grow with Google summit to talk to other small businesses and entrepreneurs and job seekers about the best techniques for using the internet to grow businesses and find jobs. I would bet any amount that there will not be one person there—not one entrepreneur, not one job seeker, not one business owner—who says: Oh, I want to relax these net neutrality rules. I want to side with the big corporations instead of allowing free and equal access to the internet.

Why would we want to make that harder and more expensive? Rolling back these net neutrality rules will hurt the very people all of us claim we want to help—small businesses, startups, students, Americans looking for jobs. Those are the people who will get hurt.

Many large corporations will do well under this bill. That typically is the motive and mission for people who come out of the majority leader's office, these lobbyists who are always working on these issues to help corporate America. But rolling back these rules will hurt those very people we claim to want to help—again, small businesses and startups and entrepreneurs and students and Americans looking for jobs. That is why today we are filing a petition to get moving on a bill to overturn this disastrous decision and reinstate net neutrality rules.

It is another question fundamentally, as pretty much every debate here is, of whose side you are on. Are my colleagues going to stand, again, with the biggest telecom corporations as they stood with the big corporations that outsourced jobs, as they stand with Wall Street, as they stand with Big Tobacco, as they stand with the Koch brothers, as they stand with the big healthcare companies that deny insurance and deny healthcare to working families? Are they going to stand with them—with big telecom companies that slow down the internet, slow down the economy to pad their own bottom lines? Are we going to stand with the people we serve—with hard-working Americans and small businesses and students and entrepreneurs who need access to the internet?

The internet doesn't belong to a wealthy few. This Senate too often belongs to a wealthy few. It shouldn't. A lot have opposed those efforts. We know, though, that the internet should not belong to a wealthy few. The internet belongs to the people we were sent here to represent.

I hope my colleagues will join me and sign this petition to protect a free and open internet.

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, at 12 noon, on Thursday, May 10, all time be considered expired on the Brennan nomination and the Senate vote on confirmation with no intervening action or debate; further, that following disposition of the Brennan nomination, the Senate vote on cloture on Executive Calendar No. 729, the Carson nomination; further, that the cloture vote on Executive Calendar No. 777, the Nalbandian nomination, occur at 1:45 p.m.; and that if cloture is invoked on both nominations, debate time run concurrently. Finally, I ask that with respect to the Brennan nomination, if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 828; that the nomination be confirmed; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon

the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

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

The nomination considered and confirmed is as follows:

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following named officer for appointment as Commandant of the United States Coast Guard and to the grade indicated under title 14, U.S.C., section 44:

To be admiral

Vice Adm. Karl L. Schultz

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

TRIBUTE TO LEO MONTOYA

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, as we move through life, certain people leave a lasting impression, and I rise today to recognize one of them. Leo Montoya, a citizen of Utah, is an exceptional man who has impressed me with his commitment to family, faith, and community.

In 1928, the year Alexander Fleming discovered penicillin, Leo was born on June 4 as the seventh of nine siblings to Epifanio and Decideria (Gutierrez) Montoya. Decideria's family roots were in New Mexico, where she raised her family as head of household in La Jara and Lumberton. Decideria worked outside the home, so her daughters took care of their youngest siblings while the older brothers contributed to support the family any way they could. The family lived under extreme poverty and hardship in La Jara until Leo's 14-year-old brother, Candido, traveled 90 miles north to find work in the Lumberton coal mines.

Candido saved his meager earnings to buy a small ranch to support his mother and siblings with the help of his younger brothers, Jose and Eudoro, who also worked in the mines. Jose had only one arm but loaded coal shovel-for-shovel against any other worker. Both Candido and Eudoro served in the military during WWII, and Leo, Tony, and Elisandro served during the Korean war. Leo's oldest child, Tereso, was born during the Korean war.

It is Utah's good fortune that the entire Montoya family eventually settled in Utah. They are hard-working, honest, and enterprising people who value God, family, and country above all else. Leo is the last of them, and it is fitting that his achievements and con-

tributions to Utah are recognized. Leo is a true American success story.

While serving in the Army, Leo met the love of his life at a small town dance, Rebecca Manzanares, of Monticello, UT. They were married in the Glendale neighborhood of Salt Lake City and together raised 11 children: Leona, Jay, Guy, Luben, Jim, Tanya, Reba, Leo, Max, Toni, and Belen. Leo worked at Hall Process Company for \$1.45 an hour, but he and Rebecca still managed to invest a small fortune in real estate.

Where some saw oppression and exploitation, Leo and Rebecca saw opportunity and fortune, teaching their children that they could obtain and achieve anything America offered if they worked hard, became educated, and stayed out of trouble. Their children succeeded in different ways and remain powerfully united as a loving and supportive family unit.

Leo also contributed to the Salt Lake community. Beginning in 1965, he began encouraging young boys to discipline themselves through sports in his Glendale neighborhood. At first, Leo trained young boys on a punching bag hung under a tree in his side yard, where he could keep an eye on them while he worked. By 1970, boys started showing up in larger numbers, many of them troubled youth from broken homes, so Leo began holding daily practice in church and school gymnasiums to give the boys something to do after school.

By 1975, his boxing team had more than 20 members that he took to compete in tournaments throughout the intermountain area and beyond—all at his own expense. By 1980, Leo knew he needed something more permanent for the boys, so he bought an old second-hand store in Salt Lake's Guadalupe neighborhood and converted it into the Leo Montoya Boxing Club, which still welcomes young male and female boxers.

Leo supports his Guadalupe neighborhood in other ways as well. In the winter, he plows the sidewalks of the Boys and Girls Club on 600 West and 300 North, as well as the sidewalks for his elderly neighbors. Leo regularly patrols the Guadalupe neighborhood in his golf cart to keep his community clean and safe. Virtually every resident and businessowner in the neighborhood appreciates Leo's vigilance.

In 2012, Leo was celebrated in one of Utah's major newspapers under the Salt Lake Tribune headline: "In His West-side Gym, Leo Montoya Turns Boys Into Men." In 2013, Leo's contributions to the neighborhood were featured on the front page of the Deseret News under the headline: "Community Celebrates Boxing Coach's 85th Birthday, Impact on Neighborhood." A quote in the Tribune article might have best captured what makes Leo unique and such a treasure as he contemplates: "It makes me feel great that I've been accomplishing something nice (and helped) somebody . . .