



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 2017

No. 156

Senate

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session for the consideration of the Erickson nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Ralph R. Erickson, of North Dakota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 10:30 a.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

If no one yields time, the time will be charged equally.

The Senator from Oregon.

NOMINATION OF AJIT PAI

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the President's nomination of Ajit Pai to head the Federal Communications Commission.

My view is that, Mr. Pai will do an enormous amount of damage to one of the foundational principles of the internet—net neutrality. I am going to outline why that would be a horrendous mistake for our country.

After we came to use the internet and see what an extraordinary asset it would be to our country, really beginning in the late 1990s, and early 2000s, we laid out what I still consider to be the legal foundation for the internet.

On a bipartisan basis, there was a big effort in the Senate and the House to really lay out what were the foundational principles of the net, and there were a variety of them. We wanted to make sure that folks were not hit with multiple and discriminatory taxes, and that they were not taxed on access to the internet. We wrote the digital signatures act, which is of enormous benefit to people, for example, in the Presiding Officer's home State of Nevada, where they are making business transactions. We made a judg-

ment, which some have said has led to \$1 trillion worth of private wealth for our economy, whereby we said that we were not going to expose the small entrepreneur—the person who is getting started in the garage—to needless litigation.

One of those core principles was net neutrality, which, in my view, for the reasons that I am going to describe this morning, I think Mr. Pai would work long and hard to try to undermine.

Because so much of the telecommunications debate sounds like a lot of complicated lingo, I want to try to describe in something resembling English what "net neutrality" is. Essentially, "net neutrality" means that after you have paid your internet access fee, you get to go where you want, when you want, and how you want. In a sentence, that is what net neutrality is all about, and it is a bedrock principle for internet users in the Presiding Officer's home State of Nevada and in Oregon and all across the country.

It locks in equal treatment to accessing the internet.

We are not going to have some kind of information aristocracy in our society whereby the affluent have access to some kind of technological treasure trove, and folks who do not have much are kind of stuck with what almost resembles dial-up. That is not what we want for communications policy in America. We want to give everybody a chance to get ahead so that the kids in rural Oregon and rural Nevada have the same kind of opportunities as youngsters in Beverly Hills or the Gold Coast of Chicago or Palm Beach. We want to make sure everybody has a chance to get ahead.

Mr. Pai says that he is for real net neutrality, and we have tried to pin him down on a whole host of policies that really get him to commit to the essence of it, but he mostly says a version of what the big cable companies say. The big cable companies have

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

God of grace and glory, lift us with Your might. You are our security, our hope for years to come.

Lord, give our Senators such confidence in Your power that they will celebrate the victories that are yet to be. May they never forget the inheritance that belongs to all who love and serve Your will on Earth. Provide them with the wisdom to know that You are the only sure foundation for all their strivings. Remind them that unless You protect the Nation, its leaders and citizens labor in vain.

Eternal Spirit, great and marvelous are Your works, just and true are Your ways.

We pray in Your Holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELLER). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S6193

come to say: We like net neutrality. We are not going to block anything. We are for the consumer; we are for the little guy. We just do not want a whole lot of government.

They say that what they really would like is voluntary net neutrality.

Let me tell my colleagues something. There is about as much likelihood that the big cable companies will voluntarily subscribe to net neutrality as there is the prospect that William Peter Wyden—one of my 9-year-old twins, the boy—will voluntarily limit himself to one dessert. It is just not going to happen. It is just not going to work. Mr. Pai is on the side of the big cable companies. He has a long history of putting those companies before the consumers—the big corporate players over the small businesses—and pay to play over a free and open internet.

I introduced the first strong net neutrality bill here in the Senate in 2006. We all know that back then we were just starting the debate about technology policy. The Senate was getting ribbed pretty seriously by the late night talk show hosts who said that the internet was a series of tubes. So, as I have indicated, what we have tried to do is to make sure that if you pay your internet access fee, you get to go where you want, when you want, and how you want.

Net neutrality has been the law of the land, and our economy has grown around this leading principle with respect to equal access to information and customers. Mr. Pai has said that he wants to take a “weed whacker” to the strong, enforceable net neutrality rules. Right away, with his quotes that are on the record, he is talking about blowing up this notion of a level playing field, which is so crucial to innovation and free speech online and that allows the startups to get out of the garage to become the next YouTube and Google and eBay.

I want to emphasize that point.

People talk a lot about technology policy.

To my colleagues, this tech policy debate is about the little guy who wants to be able to get his business out of the garage so that he can become the next big guy. Net neutrality gives us the opportunity to create opportunities for that small entrepreneur, the person who is a small entrepreneur with big dreams.

Net neutrality prevents your internet service provider from favoring one type of content over another. As an example, suppose your internet provider has a financial stake in a third-party content site. It could ensure that content goes to your home faster and clearer than to the homes of its competitors if you did not have real net neutrality—enforceable, real net neutrality, not something like Mr. Pai wants, which is, oh, we will kind of pay lipservice to net neutrality but not make it enforceable.

For example, you could have AT&T deciding to provide free data for cus-

tomers streaming HBO, which would cause more folks to subscribe to that service over its competitors and starve other creators of the subscribers necessary to create new and innovative content. That is the kind of thing that happens if we do not have real net neutrality.

It even holds true for telehealth providers. Telehealth depends on reliable, fast, and low-cost internet coverage to transmit critical health information, especially in rural and remote areas—for example, the remote monitoring of blood glucose levels in diabetes patients. Net neutrality prevents the internet service providers from viewing this lifesaving service as a cash cow, thus charging rural hospitals and community health centers a premium fee to deliver critical and timely healthcare services.

Not long ago, the Federal Communications Commission adopted a strong legal framework that would make sure that the Federal Communications Commission had the tools to protect the open internet, and the reality was that, then, the Federal Communications Commission and a gentleman named Mr. Tom Wheeler, who had a background in the industry, used their experience in how companies operated and how they treated consumers to make sure that we had constructive, real, and concrete consumer protections.

The reason I feel so strongly about Mr. Pai's nomination is that Mr. Pai made it clear with his comments about taking a weed whacker to anything enforceable. He is going to roll back the rules, and then he is going to claim to be fixing a problem that doesn't exist.

The reality is that we have strong net neutrality protections in place right now. If you vote for Mr. Pai, make no mistake about it, you are voting to roll back consumer protection. You are voting to take a big step backward for the internet. You are going to hurt the people—the small business people, the startups—who are dreaming in their garage of the chance to be big and who are going to have a lot more problems if there is a telecommunications policy that doesn't give them a fair shake.

As I indicated, this notion of a voluntary solution to net neutrality is absurd. I talked about it in the context of my own son. It would be hilarious if I even suggested to my son that I am going to let him, William, voluntarily limit himself to one dessert. He would smile and wait until I got out of the room, and he would dig in for some more. That is going to be the same thing if we embark on a net neutrality policy that says: Let's just trust the big cable companies; the cable companies, in their heart of hearts, are all about the little guy. They are just going to voluntarily go along with net neutrality because they are just that kind of good folks who want to make sure that the little guy gets ahead. The fact is, Chairman Pai's track record

demonstrates that he is not in the consumers' corner.

Last year the Federal Communications Commission acted on the responsibility given to it by the Congress to protect browsing history, favored applications, and even the location of broadband users from the ISP. During that vote, Mr. Pai voted no. He was, again, with cable companies' profits over the American consumers' privacy.

During the August recess, Mr. Pai began an attempt to really backdoor a proposal that would lower the acceptable standard speed of internet access in rural areas. That is just wrong. Rural areas are already facing huge broadband challenges. Last Saturday night, I was in Oak Ridge, OR, which has a population of a little over 3,000. Earlier that day, I had been to La Pine, OR, in Central Oregon. Right on the top of their agenda is trying to find ways to expand opportunities for better communications in rural areas and more opportunities for broadband.

So in the August recess, when communities like Oak Ridge and La Pine want more opportunities in rural communities, we had the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission trying to sneak through a proposal that would lower the acceptable standard speed of internet access to rural America and hurt rural America. Make no mistake about it. That would hurt rural America—the Oak Ridges and La Pines. It is just wrong. The Congress mandated that the FCC expand access to high-speed internet to every American, and Mr. Pai basically said: No, slower internet speed is good enough.

As I indicated, just this last weekend, on Saturday night, we had a town-hall in Oregon. I am telling you what these small communities are telling me about their current frustrations with slow and unsatisfactory internet speeds. Mr. Pai is giving a big gift to the powerful interests, and their internet speeds are going to get slower rather than what rural America wants, which is faster internet so that they have more opportunities to participate in the global economy and more opportunities to help their kids with their homework. Congress and the Federal Communications Commission ought to be working for all to have access to high-speed internet and not telling folks in rural America that what they have is just good enough.

Mr. Pai has repeatedly failed on another matter, and that is to act even in the face of clear danger to the security of America's mobile phones. Despite years of warnings about well-known weaknesses in mobile phone networks that allow hackers and spies to track Americans' phones, intercept calls and messages, and hack the phones themselves, Mr. Pai has taken a hands-off attitude. His Federal Communications Commission says it is not going to force wireless carriers to fix the weaknesses, and—what a surprise—his traditional answer is that “voluntary measures are going to do enough.” I disagree because they haven't worked.

We always talk about the role of government. I think this is an area that really lends itself to thoughtful discussion because, obviously, we don't want government if you can figure out a way to solve a problem without it. The voluntary measures have not worked here on these basic security issues I have described. The self-regulation approach has failed. The Federal Communications Commission has to force the carriers to secure their networks and protect America's critical communications infrastructure. The failure to act on this security issue means that the American people are going to be less safe.

I close by saying that my view is that net neutrality has sparked the flames of innovation and commerce on the internet. Net neutrality has been one of the foundational principles that we started working on in the late 1990s and in the early part of this century. It was up there in terms of importance, like trying to prevent multiple and discriminatory taxes on electronic commerce, particularly taxing internet access, and the digital signatures law, making sure that you couldn't hold somebody personally liable if they were to invest in a website or a blog. These were foundational principles that have been of enormous benefit to our country, and net neutrality was one of those. I guess it would be the fourth in the list of foundational principles that we talked about and have been talking about for well over a decade.

We should be building on net neutrality, not walking it back. I believe that what Mr. Pai is talking about is a significant retreat from the freedom and openness that the internet is all about.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the confirmation of Mr. Pai. Vote in favor of a truly open internet.

I yield the floor, as I note the Democratic leader is here to speak.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PORTMAN). The Democratic leader is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first I ask unanimous consent that I be able to speak in leader time, and, after my remarks, that the Senator from North Dakota be recognized to speak on the judge nomination and be given the time she wants, about 10 minutes, and that we move the vote to immediately thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Hearing none, it is so ordered.

THANKING THE SENATOR FROM OREGON

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, let me thank my friend from Oregon for his outstanding remarks. He has been a leader in keeping the internet open and free and making sure that this new highway system, in effect, is as free as our old highway system, or the existing highway system, to let the big guy

and the little guy compete on equal terms. That is all we want, and Mr. Pai doesn't seem to get that.

There is a whole round of appointees from this administration who simply side with big corporations no matter what, and this is an example of just that.

So I thank my friend from Oregon for his remarks.

Mr. President, I have three topics this morning—briefly, healthcare, then, Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, and, finally, taxes.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. President, on healthcare there is a bit of good news. I just spoke with Senator MURRAY this morning. I saw Senator ALEXANDER in the gym, as I do just about every morning. Both are two of about the best negotiators we have in this body. Both have come to agreements across the aisle on many other occasions. They both inform me that they are on the verge of a bipartisan healthcare agreement to stabilize markets and lower premiums.

Now, we have had some bipartisan sprouts on healthcare recently. It is time for those sprouts to flower, and I am hopeful they will. I told PATTY MURRAY that she has my faith and confidence. She has the freedom to cut the best deal she can, and I hope the leadership will tell the same to Senator ALEXANDER.

It was widely reported, before the Graham-Cassidy bill was withdrawn, that there was pressure on Senator ALEXANDER to pull back. Well, that is over. Let's all come together. Our healthcare system needs it, and our constituents need it. They don't want premiums to go up and coverage to go down, and it would be a great start for some bipartisanship in this place, which I hope we can continue on more issues.

PUERTO RICO AND U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS RECOVERY EFFORT

Mr. President, on Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, we know about the crisis. Just looking at the pictures breaks your heart. We hear the stories of people desperately needing their medicine and diabetics needing insulin, which can't be refrigerated because there is no electricity to keep the refrigeration going. There are people dying right now because they can't get the medical attention they need, and, of course, there is a need for food, water, power, and transportation. It is awful.

Yesterday, Leader PELOSI and I met with Gen. Lori Robinson. It felt nice, amid this devastation, to see a woman have four stars on her shoulder. She is a four-star general in the Air Force, and she is head of the U.S. Northern Command. She is the military person in charge.

We met with her to get an update on the Department of Defense's work in assisting the islands. It was evident from our conversation that, while the military is increasing the amount of resources it is sending to the island,

there is a lack of command and control about how those resources are distributed. In other words, they probably have enough food, they probably have enough gasoline—that is what the Governor of Puerto Rico said today—but they can't get it to the places it needs to go. Part of it is because they need transportation—trucks and things—but a lot of it is because there is no one there to make sure. Puerto Rico's command and control has been decimated by this storm as well. People can't get to the places they are supposed to go. They don't have their phones, et cetera.

I spoke with Senator RUBIO this morning in the gym as well. He had just recently visited Puerto Rico. He had seen the devastation firsthand, and he told me the same—that Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are struggling, and they need help fast. His visit to Puerto Rico confirmed this idea that we really need command and control.

Well, there is no better command and control organization than our military, and we need our military to start aiding Puerto Rico in the command and control sense, as well as in the shipping of supplies, food, and the other kinds of things they need.

Puerto Rico needs help fast. They need personnel to direct the supplies and resources on the ground. All the aid in the world will be ineffective if it doesn't go where it is needed to go. So I joined Senator CANTWELL, the ranking member on the Energy Committee, which has jurisdiction in many ways here, and Senator NELSON, who cares a great deal about Puerto Rico and is from Florida, nearby, and 30 other Senators in sending a letter to the Trump administration that contains a list of needed resources and personnel to coordinate our relief efforts.

It appears there will not be a request for emergency supplemental appropriations this week. We hope it comes very soon.

Mr. President, we cannot forget the utter devastation facing the 3.5 million American citizens in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. I have been on this Earth now for quite a few years, and I have never seen such devastation anywhere in the United States or its territories. So we need to act, and we need to act quickly. Command and control, which our military can help supply, should be at the top of the list.

TAX REFORM

Finally, Mr. President, on taxes, yesterday President Trump and Republican leaders laid out their tax plan, sharing the first sketchy set of details with the American people about what they want to change in our Tax Code. Any serious analysis of their proposal will leave you with one conclusion: President Trump and the Republicans have crafted a massive tax break for the very wealthy in our country.

Welfare is supposed to take care of the poor. This plan takes care of the rich. Plain and simple, the Republican plan is "wealthfare," the opposite of

welfare. It is designed to take care of the rich. It repeals the estate tax, which goes to so few people in such large amounts of money, slashes the corporate rate, creates enormous tax loopholes for wealthy hedge fund managers in the form of a rate cut on passthroughs, and it lowers the rate, amazingly enough, on the top bracket of the wealthiest Americans while raising the tax rate on those at the bottom of the income scale. Who would have thought?

Secretary Mnuchin, Gary Cohn, and the President himself have said: We want to help the middle class. Then the first thing they come out with—again, we don't know all the details—lowers the top rate on the wealthiest and raises the bottom rate on the working families, which is the opposite of what they are saying.

On the estate tax, the bottom line is that only people whose estates are above \$10 million pay a nickel of estate tax—only those. It is a handful. We are compiling how many people in each State have paid the estate tax for the last 5 years. Everyone in their State will see how few people are affected. You know, if someone has a big farm and maybe it is \$12 or \$15 million and they don't want to sell it—pass it onto their kids—I am willing to make an exception for that. I think most people will, but that doesn't justify repealing the entire estate tax.

Moving on to corporate taxes, there is a difference between the big corporations and small corporations. The big corporations right now are making record profits. Let's say the thousand biggest are making record profits. They have more money than they have ever had. According to a study—I believe it is by Goldman Sachs, which is hardly a leftwing think tank—they are paying the lowest percentage of their profits as taxes in a very long while. Big corporate America is flush with money. They are not using it to create jobs. Why in God's Name anyone thinks, after giving them more money through a tax break, all of a sudden they are going to start creating jobs when they are not doing it now is beyond me.

It is different for small businesses. We Democrats understand that small businesses need a break. We will work with our colleagues to do it. But even this passthrough—the biggest benefit is going to be wealthy lawyers and hedge fund managers, who will then pay an individual tax rate of 25 percent while so many others who have much less wealth are paying more in taxes.

So the President gets up and says this is a tax break for the middle class. I believe he said this morning that he will not benefit from it. Please, let's have some honesty here. If you really believe giving tax breaks to the wealthiest people and the biggest corporations is going to create jobs, then have the courage to say it. Don't fudge it.

President Trump said that his plan would create a middle-class miracle. I

think it would be a miracle if it helped the middle class, given the numbers I have seen. While the tax plan doubles the standard deduction—that is one of the points where they say they help the middle class—it eliminates the personal exemption. The standard deduction is \$12,500; personal exemption is \$6,000. Figure it out, my friends. If you are a family of three or more, you lose, not gain. Three times \$6,000 is \$18,000; that is opposed to a \$12,500 standard exemption. It doesn't make sense.

Oh, and how about this one: The personal exemption is not the only one gone. State and local deductibility—I predict that is going to be a downfall of this plan. I know the ideologues say: Let's go after the States that charge taxes. Let me tell you, there are 40 or 50 Republican Congressmen from well-to-do suburban districts in high-tax States—New York, California, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Maryland—whose constituents will be clobbered by removing State and local deductibility. They will be clobbered. The \$12,500 they gain in the standard deduction, minus what they lose in the individual deduction, is far less than they pay in State and local taxes in those districts.

We are going to be watching them like a hawk. I will tell my New York Republican friends from those well-to-do suburban and upstate districts: You are going to be hurting your constituents if you vote for a plan that gets rid of State and local deductibility. The eyes of America will be on you, and certainly the eyes of each State.

How about this one: They eliminate the deduction for extraordinary medical expenses. If you have a child with cancer, it is hard to pay for it, and your insurance covers some, but you are not going to get a tax break for shelling out money for that extra medicine or that extra MRI scan—no.

So the Republican game plan gives a few crumbs to the middle class—and many in the middle class will pay more in taxes, a few hundred off taxes maybe—and at the same time gives a huge break to corporations and the superwealthy. The American people will not buy it. This is not 2000 or 1982, my Republican friends. We have huge problems where the wealthy are doing great, and the middle class and the poor are doing badly.

The American people will not buy tax breaks for the rich. They will not buy it. Seventy percent of Americans already think our system favors the wealthy, and the Republican tax plan drops an anvil on the scales of our tax system, tipping them even further in favor of the wealthy. The American people will not be for that.

What about the deficit? We hear about deficits every time there is a new program. This dwarfs any spending program in terms of the deficit that we have enacted over the last several years—\$5 to \$7 trillion of deficit. What has happened to all the Republicans who talk about wanting to be deficit neutral when it comes to spending? Is that out the window? We will see.

Let me tell you something that really got under my skin—sorry to my colleague from North Dakota. I am just agitated about this in a good way.

This morning, the chief economic adviser to President Trump, Gary Cohn, said the administration believes it "can pay for the entire tax cut through growth" by using a dynamic scoring model. Gary Cohn comes from Goldman Sachs. If he used that funny kind of math at Goldman Sachs the way he is using it here in Washington, he would have been kicked out of that firm a long time ago. Gary Cohn should know better; Gary Cohn does know better.

Let me repeat what I said yesterday: Dynamic scoring is fake math. Paying for tax cuts with growth is fake math. We know it is fake math; we have real-world examples. The 2001 and 2003 Bush tax cuts were promising they would pay for themselves through economic growth. It is the same thing you hear from the Club for Growth and some of my colleagues.

Some dynamic scoring models at the time predicted the 2001 and 2003 tax breaks would grow the economy so much it would nearly wipe out the national debt, but what happened? I heard the Club for Growth leader get on TV and say: Well, there may be a deficit in the short run, but after 10 years it will all be taken care of. Ten years after the Bush tax cut, CBO estimated the Bush tax cuts added \$1.6 trillion to the deficit.

How about the example of the great State of Kansas? Governor Brownback slashed the top rate. He exempted passthrough businesses. It was a real-life experiment in a Republican State, similar to what President Trump announced. Brownback's backers used dynamic scoring models to estimate that his tax cuts would generate \$323 million in new revenue by 2018. Guess what happened. It added so much money to their deficit over 4 years that they have had to figure out ways to raise taxes now, just as Ronald Reagan did in 1986. So this idea that the administration can pay for a \$5 to \$7 trillion tax cut through growth is simply selling a bill of goods using fake, fake math.

I yield the floor

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to give my strong support and ask my colleagues to support the confirmation of Judge Ralph Erickson to fill the North Dakota vacancy on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit. This is a seat that the U.S. Judicial Conference has deemed a judicial emergency, as it has been empty for almost 900 days. Being nominated to a seat on the U.S. circuit court of appeals is an honor and a privilege, virtually unmatched in the legal profession.

After reviewing Judge Erickson's record and talking to his colleagues and the people who have worked with

him and appeared before him back in North Dakota, I am very proud to come to the floor this morning and offer my strong support for his nomination to the Eighth Circuit. When Judge Erickson was nominated and confirmed to his current seat on the U.S. District Court for North Dakota, it was with the support of our two great former Senators and my good friends, Byron Dorgan and Kent Conrad. Judge Erickson has certainly upheld their faith and trust in his abilities as a district court judge, and I am confident he will uphold my faith and my trust in his ability as he moves to the Eighth Circuit.

Judge Erickson has a long history of commitment to the legal profession and the State of North Dakota, first through his service on the State court and, since 2003, as a judge on the U.S. District Court for the District of North Dakota. Very few lawyers can make such a long-term commitment to public service, and his record certainly reflects his belief that when a lawyer is called to serve for the greater good, they should answer that call. I hope Judge Erickson is able to instill this sense of commitment to public service in aspiring young lawyers whom he will come to meet and whom he will be able to influence through his example.

A nominee for the North Dakota seat on the Eighth Circuit must have experience in working with Indian Country, given the number of Tribes and the Indian land that are contained within the jurisdiction of the Eighth Circuit. During his career and at his hearing before the Judiciary Committee, Judge Erickson has shown an in-depth understanding of Tribal sovereignty issues and a recognition of the challenges and disparities in the treatment of Native Americans under the law when they are arrested and charged for crimes in Indian Country.

Judge Erickson has been an advocate for equal treatment of Native Americans under the law. He also serves as the chair of the U.S. Sentencing Commission's Tribal Issues Advisory Group. I have no doubt that Judge Erickson will bring this knowledge and understanding of Tribal issues, sovereignty, and treaties with him to the Eighth Circuit.

The best judges always have been people who can truly understand and bring to the bench a sense of empathy. Judge Erickson has used some of his own struggles and challenges during the course of his life to inform his own views and to give counsel to those who come before him as he uses his own personal struggles as an example. It takes a really big person to recognize and learn from their failings and to use them to help others. I admire him greatly for that.

During his confirmation hearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee, Judge Erickson showed an openness and frankness in responding to questions and discussing his past struggles. That was refreshing, illuminating, and

honestly all too rare here. I believe he impressed my colleagues on that committee greatly with his willingness to be so forthcoming and so honest. That is why they unanimously reported his nomination out of the committee.

It is a tremendous honor to be on the floor of the U.S. Senate before Judge Erickson's confirmation vote. I am here today to give my highest recommendation in support of his nomination to the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit. I, again, urge all of my colleagues' thoughtful consideration and evaluation and favorable endorsement of his confirmation.

Thank you so much.
I yield the floor.

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 Ralph R. Erickson, of North Dakota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, Orrin G. Hatch, James Lankford, Jerry Moran, Johnny Isakson, John Thune, Thom Tillis, Shelley Moore Capito, Mike Crapo, James E. Risch, Mike Rounds, John Barrasso, John Cornyn, Chuck Grassley, John Boozman, John Hoeven, Rob Portman.

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 Ralph R. Erickson, of North Dakota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth 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 Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 95, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 206 Ex.]

YEAS—95

Alexander	Cantwell	Cortez Masto
Baldwin	Capito	Cotton
Barrasso	Cardin	Crapo
Bennet	Carper	Cruz
Blumenthal	Casey	Daines
Blunt	Cassidy	Donnelly
Booker	Collins	Duckworth
Boozman	Coons	Durbin
Brown	Corker	Enzi
Burr	Cornyn	Ernst

Feinstein	Lankford	Rubio
Fischer	Leahy	Sanders
Flake	Lee	Sasse
Gardner	Manchin	Schatz
Gillibrand	Markey	Schumer
Graham	McCain	Scott
Grassley	McCaskill	Shaheen
Harris	McConnell	Shelby
Hassan	Merkley	Stabenow
Hatch	Moran	Sullivan
Heinrich	Murkowski	Tester
Heitkamp	Murphy	Thune
Heller	Murray	Tillis
Hirono	Nelson	Toomey
Hoeven	Paul	Udall
Inhofe	Perdue	Van Hollen
Isakson	Peters	Warner
Johnson	Portman	Whitehouse
Kaine	Reed	Wicker
Kennedy	Risch	Wyden
King	Roberts	Young
Klobuchar	Rounds	

NAYS—1

Warren
NOT VOTING—4

Cochran
Franken

Menendez
Strange

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 95, the nays are 1.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1808

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, in 2 days, unless Congress acts, the Federal Perkins Loan Program—the Nation's oldest Federal student loan program—will expire, leaving thousands of students with one fewer option to help them afford a higher education.

Since 1958, the Perkins Loan Program has existed with broad bipartisan support and has provided millions of students a stronger path to the middle class.

In the 2016 to 2017 academic year, the program has served more than 770,000 students with financial need across more than 1,400 institutions of higher education. In my home State of Wisconsin alone, Perkins provided aid to more than 23,000 students who are working hard to achieve their dreams.

Colleges and universities are invested in Perkins. This program operates through campus-based revolving funds that combine prior Federal investments with significant institutional resources. While Congress stopped appropriating new funds for Perkins more than a decade ago, these schools continue to invest in this program because they know it works, and the campus-based nature of the program allows them to target aid to students they know are in the greatest financial need.

I am here to call on all of my colleagues to join me in supporting the extension of this critical program and investment in our students across America.

Two years ago, we allowed this important program to lapse, but thanks to the tireless efforts of students, institutions, advocates, and a bicameral, bipartisan majority in support of Perkins, we were able to advance a compromise that ensured that this source of support continued to be available to students in need.

Once again, we are facing a deadline. Once again, there is strong bipartisan

support for extending the Perkins Loan Program. Last week, Senators PORTMAN, CASEY, and COLLINS joined me in introducing the Perkins Loan Program Extension Act, which would provide for a 2-year extension. My fellow Wisconsinite, Representative MARK POCAN, together with New York Representative ELISE STEFANIK, have introduced a House companion bill that is supported by over 225 of their colleagues—a bipartisan majority in that Chamber.

I am here to call on my colleagues to act once again and support a 2-year extension of the Perkins Loan Program. And while I look forward to a broader conversation about improving Federal supports for students as we look to reauthorize the Higher Education Act, we cannot once again sit by and watch it expire as America's students are left with uncertainty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the HELP Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1808, a bill to extend the Federal Perkins Loan Program for 2 years; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration and the bill be considered read a third time and passed, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to explain my reason for the objection.

First, I would like to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I am grateful for her work on the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, where she is a valuable, diligent, and constructive member. We work on a great many things together and have agreed to very many things. However, we disagree on this one, and here is why. Let me summarize it at the beginning of my remarks and then explain it with a little more detail.

No one who has a Perkins loan today loses that loan, period. So if you are a student anywhere in the country and you have a Perkins loan for this year, you don't lose that loan, period.

Second, no one who has a Perkins loan for next year loses that loan because no one has one. They were ended 2 years ago. Every student was told in his or her financial aid information that the Perkins Loan Program ends this year, so no one could expect to have one next year. No one has been granted one for next year, so no one who has a loan is losing a loan.

Why did we, in December of 2015—2 years ago—reach a bipartisan agreement to sunset, or end, the Perkins Loan Program in 2 years, which is the end of this week? In that agreement, we allowed graduate students to receive Perkins loans for 1 additional year and undergraduates to receive Perkins loans for 2 additional years. It

was made clear at that time—2 years ago—that this was the last time the program would be extended, but we wanted to have a smooth transition, and we did not want students and colleges and universities to be surprised. That agreement, therefore, included many requirements for institutions of higher education to inform students over the last 2 years that the Perkins Loan Program would end on September 30 of this year, which is the end of this week. That agreement also set policies to make the sunset of Perkins loans as smooth as possible for students. The expiration of this loan program was not and should not have been a surprise. It has not received any appropriation since the year 2004, and the U.S. Department of Education reminded institutions that it was ending the program this year.

Now, why? Why are we ending the program? Why did we agree to do that 2 years ago, and why have the last three Presidents recommended that we end it—President Obama, President Trump, and President Bush?

The Department of Education estimated that in the 2016 to 2017 school year—that is the school year that just ended—the Perkins Loan Program provided less than \$800 million in new Perkins loans to about 300,000 recipients. That may seem like a lot, but by comparison, the Department estimated that the Federal Government disbursed over \$22 billion to almost 7 million undergraduate students in the Stafford Subsidized Loan Program, or the regular Direct Loan Program. The Perkins loan—a separate loan—provides an average loan of roughly \$2,000, and it illustrates the complicated mess in which students find themselves because of our Federal student aid system today.

The Perkins loans have a higher interest rate than other loans that are available to students today. The interest rate is 5 percent, compared with 4.45 percent for undergraduate loans. And students who have a Perkins loan aren't eligible for certain programs that exist for students with other loans, such as the income-based repayment programs and the public service loan forgiveness programs, which help students manage repayment of their loans. Those aren't available to students with a Perkins loan. The default rate for Perkins loans is higher than for the Stafford loan.

The bill which the Senator from Wisconsin has offered would cost taxpayers, according to the Congressional Budget Office, \$900 million for a 2-year extension. If we were to extend the program over 10 years, it would cost \$6.5 billion, according to the Congressional Budget Office. The bill does not have an offset, so these billions of dollars would only serve to add to the \$20 trillion Federal debt we already have.

I object because I think it is time for our country, through legislation by this Congress, to move on to a simplified Federal student aid program

that has only one Federal loan for students, one Federal grant for students, and one work-study program for students.

As I have spoken often about on this floor, along with Senator BENNET from Colorado, we would like to reduce the application form for those Federal grants and loans called FAFSA—the dreaded FAFSA which 20 million students and their families fill out every year. We would like to reduce that from 108 questions to 2 or 5 or 10 questions.

We need a much simpler program for Federal student loans, and the end of the Perkins Loan Program is a small step toward that end.

As I mentioned, President Bush recommended that the program end, President Obama recommended that the program be changed and folded, in effect, into the regular Direct Student Loan Program, and President Trump has the same position.

I look forward to working with my colleagues, including the Senator from Wisconsin, on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act later this year, when we can work together to improve our Federal student loan programs and our grant programs, find ways to simplify them, make it easier and cheaper for students to attend college, and to help students pay those loans off, after they get them, in a fair and simpler way.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I am certainly disappointed that my effort to extend the Perkins Loan Program today was just blocked by my Republican colleague, but I want to say that it is an honor to serve on the HELP Committee, where we do some very impressive bipartisan work.

I understand the Senator's concern about the program and his belief that we must simplify. I share his desire to work on a broader reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, and I look forward to that broader conversation about our Federal financial aid programs. However, I do not think it is right or fair to end this program, with nothing to replace it, to the detriment of students in need.

Also, I cannot agree that the compromise we hammered out 2 years ago was an agreement to wind down the program. I guess it is the perspective that we each bring to this subject, because I believed we were acting to ensure that the Perkins Loan Program could continue until we could discuss changes, improvements, and reforms to it and all Federal financial aid programs as part of broader legislation to improve higher education. We have yet to get to that bigger conversation, and it would once again be unfair to let this program end now without the benefit of a holistic assessment of the many ways the Federal Government helps to make college affordable for students across this country.

I will continue to fight to extend this support for America's students, and I hope the chairman of the committee will once again work with me and the bipartisan supporters of this program to find a path forward for the Perkins Loan Program.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I will conclude my remarks because I see the Senator from Mississippi is here.

Of course I will be glad to work with the Senator from Wisconsin. The fact is, 2 years ago we agreed to end the program. The graduate loans ended last year, and the undergraduate loans end this year. Everybody was told about it.

Every student who wants a loan can get a direct student loan from the government at a lower rate, with better repayment programs and better payment provisions than the Perkins loan. So no one is losing a loan, and everyone can get a better loan if they apply for a direct loan.

We do need a simpler program, and we need to simplify the application process for applying for the loans and grants and for paying them off.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

NOMINATION OF AJIT PAI

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, later on today, the Senate will move to a vote to advance the nomination of Ajit Pai to become Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. I rise today in strong, enthusiastic support for confirming Chairman Pai as the permanent Chairman of the FCC.

In the 9 short months since Donald Trump chose Mr. Pai to serve as the FCC's Acting Chairman, he has restored confidence in the agency's ability to do its work on behalf of the American people and within the rule of law.

He is working to establish the light-touch regulatory framework that allowed the internet to become the marvel of the modern age, keeping it free and open for consumers, innovators, and providers. Internet technology will continue to thrive if we keep the heavy hand of government away from the controls.

Chairman Pai recognizes the need to close the digital divide between our Nation's rural and urban communities. I am working closely with him and with other members of the Commission to remove barriers to internet connectivity that exist in my home State of Mississippi and across the country. Without broadband access, these rural communities could lose out on critical jobs, economic development, and many other opportunities borne out of the thriving internet economy.

Mr. Pai has already proven he is capable of being an exemplary FCC Chairman who will fight for the unserved and underserved Americans.

As Acting Chairman, Mr. Pai has overseen the adoption of Mobility Fund Phase II rules supporting universal service. He has sought the advice of experts for the most effective broadband deployment, and he has encouraged the development of better networks, lower costs, and relief from regulatory burdens.

Americans are being well-served by a leader like Chairman Ajit Pai, who understands the strong connection between technology and innovation. Mr. Pai understands how high-speed internet can revolutionize small businesses and benefit local economies. He understands the importance of consumer protections and has already instituted proposals and rules that would benefit public safety.

I hope Mr. Pai will also continue to hold the FCC to the highest standards of transparency. His decision to make proposals and orders accessible to the public prior to the Commission's vote on them was a positive action.

The FCC will continue to be in good hands with Mr. Pai as Chairman and when the Senate votes later on today to move this nomination along. I urge my colleagues to vote yes and eventually to vote yes for his confirmation.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, at 12:15 p.m., all postcloture time be considered expired on the Erickson nomination and that, 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; further, that the Senate then resume consideration of the Pai nomination and the time until 1:45 p.m. be equally divided prior to a cloture vote on the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, 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. 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.

NOMINATION OF AJIT PAI

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, today we begin debate on a position in our government that impacts the daily lives of every single American. If you use a telephone, connect to the internet, watch television, and pay a big cable company to do all of those things, then you need to know who Ajit Pai is.

President Trump nominated Ajit Pai to be the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. While Ajit Pai has devoted many years to public service, I cannot support his nomination. Under Mr. Pai's short tenure, he has made the FCC stand for

"forgetting consumers and competition."

Let's take a look at who is getting a piece of the FCC pie under Chairman Pai. It is American consumers on the one hand versus big corporations on the other hand. Let's take a piece of this pie and determine who is getting that first slice of what is going on at the Federal Communications Commission.

Let's look at net neutrality. Net neutrality is the basic principle that says that all internet traffic is treated equal. Net neutrality ensures that internet service providers like AT&T, Charter, Verizon, and Comcast do not block, slow down, censor, or prioritize internet traffic.

If Ajit Pai gets his way, a handful of big broadband companies will serve as gatekeepers to the internet. Fewer voices, less choice, no competition, but more profits for the big broadband companies—that is Pai's formula. Yet it is today's net neutrality rules that ensure that those with the best ideas, not merely the best funded ideas, can thrive in the 21st-century economy. It is net neutrality that has been the internet's chief governing principle since its inception.

Consider that today essentially every company is an internet company. In 2016, almost half of the venture capital funds invested in this country went toward internet-specific and software companies. That is \$25 billion of investment. Half of all venture capital in America went toward internet-specific and software companies—half of all venture capital.

To meet America's insatiable demand for broadband internet, the U.S. broadband and telecommunications industry invested more than \$87 billion in capital expenditures in 2015. That is the highest rate of annual investment in the last 10 years.

So we have hit a sweet spot. Investment in broadband and wireless technologies is very high. Job creation is very high. Venture capital investment in online startups is very high. That is why more than 22 million Americans wrote to the Federal Communications Commission to make their voices heard about net neutrality. They do not want it repealed. Yet Chairman Pai's proposal would decimate the FCC's open internet order.

Chairman Pai has said: "We need to fire up the weed whacker" to net neutrality rules. Do we really want a leader at the Federal Communications Commission who, ultimately, is going to implement the agenda of the big broadband companies, which want to crush competition, reduce choice, and then make consumers pay more?

So the first slice of this pie of killing net neutrality goes to the big corporations, and the losers are the consumers.

Let's go to the next slice of the FCC pie. Let's see where that goes as these decisions are being made. The next issue is, in fact, broadband privacy.

Chairman Pai has actively supported efforts to allow broadband providers to use, share, and sell your sensitive information without consumer consent. In 2016, Chairman Pai voted against commonsense broadband privacy protections that gave consumers meaningful control over their sensitive information. When he assumed the FCC chairmanship, Ajit Pai stopped the implementation of data security protections, which would have ensured that broadband providers better protect the information they collect about their users. Can you imagine that? Chairman Pai stopped protections that would improve data security.

I have 143 million reasons as to why that was a bad idea. Just this month, Equifax was subjected to a cyber attack that compromised the personally identifiable information of 143 million consumers. The American public wants more protection, not less. Yet what does Chairman Pai do? He effectively eliminates the very data security protections that consumers need to protect their sensitive information. That is just plain wrong.

Just a few weeks later, Mr. Pai supported congressional Republicans' efforts to rescind the Federal Communications Commission's broadband privacy protections. Now your broadband provider can relentlessly collect and sell your sensitive web browsing history without your consent.

You may wonder why Chairman Pai would actively support efforts to undermine the privacy of American consumers. The answer is simple. He wants that slice of the pie to go to the biggest corporations. How do they use it? They take that data—your personal data, the information you put online—and just sell it without your permission in order to make money for the big corporations. Once again, rather than consumers, the big corporations get the benefit of that decision at the Federal Communications Commission.

Let's take a look at the next issue. The next issue goes to the question of mergers, the mergers of big telecommunications companies.

The Sinclair deal has led to a proposal to merge with Tribune Media, granting one company an unprecedented market power of over 200 broadcast stations around the country. In order to help Sinclair, Ajit Pai reinstated what most consider to be an antiquated rule, the UHF discount, to pave the way for the merger. The UHF discount makes the FCC count only half of the stations on certain frequencies toward companies' ownership percentages. This merger would allow Sinclair to reach into 72 percent of American households, but with the discount, the FCC counts it as only 45 percent. Putting this discount back on the books is Chairman Pai's first step to helping Sinclair stay within the national ownership cap of 39 percent.

What will be the impact of this massive telecommunications mega-merger? Less local news, sports, and weather

that millions of Americans count on today. It will lead to the continued squeezing out of independent programmers, and it will mean higher prices for consumers. What signal does approving this merger reveal? It reveals that the FCC and Ajit Pai have put out the welcome mat for the consolidation of other communications companies.

So this third slice, once again, goes to corporations and not to consumers. They are left out in the cold.

Let's look at the fourth slice and see what happens with that at the Federal Communications Commission under the approval of Ajit Pai's nomination on the floor of the Senate. The next slice is one that deals with the education rate, or the E-rate.

The E-rate has proven to be exceptional in linking up schools and libraries to the internet. We went from a country in 1996 in which only 14 percent of K–12 classrooms had internet access to a near ubiquitous deployment today. The E-rate has ensured that students from working-class neighborhoods can connect just like students from more affluent communities. The E-rate democratizes access to the opportunities and technologies that lead to bright futures. Over \$44 billion to date has been committed nationwide.

Again, Ajit Pai does not take that perspective. At his confirmation hearing in July, I explicitly asked him whether he would commit to preserving the success of this bipartisan program and protecting the funding level or whether he would make programmatic changes that could undermine or weaken the E-rate. He would not make this commitment to maintain current funding for E-rate.

Students and library users around the country will not be able to afford this slice of the pie. Once again, consumers will lose and corporations will win.

Now we go to the final slice of that communications pie at the FCC.

Telecommunication is the great equalizer, but a household with no access to basic telecommunications services could lose educational and employment opportunities as well as emergency services. That is why the FCC's Lifeline Program is truly a lifeline for millions of Americans who are able to connect to the world. In Massachusetts alone, more than 180,000 low-income Bay Staters rely on the Lifeline Program to access voice and internet service.

The value of this universal service has always been a bedrock of our telecommunications policy. Yet one of Ajit Pai's first actions as FCC Chairman was to undermine Lifeline and make it more difficult for low-income people to access affordable broadband. I was dismayed by his decision to abruptly revoke the recognition of nine additional companies as Lifeline broadband providers just weeks after they were approved. Mr. Pai's action did nothing but unfairly punish low-income consumers by limiting choice.

So the final slice, again, goes to the Federal Communications Commission's supporting corporations and not supporting consumers.

That is the pie—the FCC pie—as it is put together on net neutrality, on privacy, on mergers, on E-rate, and on Lifeline. It is all the same. The FCC winds up standing for forgetting consumers and competition. That is the era that we are now in, and it will only intensify as each day, week, and month goes by. That is why I am recommending a “no” vote on Ajit Pai as the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission.

Which side are we going to be on—that of the consumers or corporations? Are we going to side with innovators? Are we going to side with those who are trying to continue to take these platforms of dynamic change in our society for consumers, for entrepreneurs or are we going to allow for a closing of this revolution?

This is the era in which we live in the 21st century. This is the choice that people must make. In which direction are we going?

I urge a “no” vote by my colleagues on Ajit Pai's nomination. Of all of the things that we are going to do this year, this is very near the top of the list. In many ways, this telecommunications revolution is the organizing principle of our lives here in the United States and around the planet, and we have to make sure that we are heading in the right direction—more openness, more competition, more consumer protection, more privacy protection, and more access in libraries and schools to these technologies, not fewer and fewer and fewer and fewer. It is just the wrong direction to head in. I urge a “no” 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. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

PUERTO RICO AND U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS

RECOVERY EFFORT AND FAA REAUTHORIZATION
Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President,

the people of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands have been hit especially hard by powerful hurricanes. As I said earlier this week, the Senate will continue to work with FEMA, the Department of Defense, and the rest of the administration to help in the recovery, just as we have in Texas, Florida, and across the Southeast. We are eager to hear more soon about what additional resources will be necessary.

The American people are stepping up, too, just as they always do, and so are the brave men and women of our military.

This week, 70 soldiers and 8 aircraft from Kentucky's own 101st Airborne Combat Aviation Brigade deployed from Fort Campbell to Puerto Rico to support hurricane relief operations. These soldiers will join the larger joint force effort, which includes elements of the 26th Marine Expeditionary Unit, medical support teams, medevac aircraft, and elements from the Army Corps of Engineers.

Kentucky is similarly proud of the men and women of its Air and Army National Guard who have worked to provide relief in the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, as well as in Texas where, according to recent reports, their efforts helped save more than 300 lives in the wake of Hurricane Harvey.

We are all proud of their efforts, but we should not forget that disasters of these proportions typically require a response from nearly every arm of the Federal Government. The FAA plays a critical role as well.

As we all know, the FAA's authority to collect and spend money from the aviation trust fund is set to expire on September 30, this week. These are the resources that fund repairs and replacement parts for our air traffic control system. Even absent a crisis, it would be irresponsible to let this lapse.

We have read in recent days that air traffic in and out of Puerto Rico has already been limited because of damage done to radar, navigational aids, and other equipment. The Governor of Puerto Rico reports that air traffic control capacity is only at about 20 percent of normal.

This critical air safety equipment needs repair. The FAA reports that failure to act on the reauthorization would leave them without sufficient funding in the accounts necessary for replacement parts, equipment, and supplies. They would have only enough funding to cover salary costs for these workers for about 1 week.

These American territories are suffering. What they need right now is aid and assistance from the air, not a manufactured crisis from Washington on top of everything else. The House of Representatives will soon pass legislation that reauthorizes the FAA. It will help open up the air space to that aid so that it can get to where it is needed most.

The House bill goes further by authorizing tax relief for individuals and businesses affected by the recent hurricanes in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and Texas and Florida, as well, because these disaster victims should not suffer a tax bill on top of their losses. We need to pass that legislation here in the Senate without further delay.

NOMINATION OF AJIT PAI

Madam President, on another matter, the Senate is considering two qualified nominees today. One is the sitting Chairman of the FCC, Ajit Pai.

Chairman Pai has led a fascinating life, one punctuated by hard work and success. It had its beginnings in Buf-

falo. It traced a line through Canada. It unfolded in the small town of Parsons, KS, where Chairman Pai grew up with his parents, first-generation immigrants from Southern India. It was on to Harvard after that and then the University of Chicago for his law degree.

Pai's résumé prior to his appointment as a member of the FCC is as varied as it is impressive. He clerked for a Federal judge. He worked in the Justice Department's Antitrust and Legal Policy Divisions. He gained practical experience in the private sector. He served here in the Senate as committee staff. He even won a Marshall fellowship. He also worked in several positions within the FCC itself.

When President Obama nominated Pai to serve as an FCC Commissioner back in 2011, the Senate confirmed him by a voice vote.

When the Senate considers his nomination again today, I hope Senators will come together to give him strong support one more time. After all, it is no wonder why President Trump chose to elevate him to FCC Chairman earlier this year. He understands the communications industry from nearly every angle, considering his impressive resume. He understands the needs of rural communities in States like Kentucky, thanks to his own rural background. His dedication to bringing more openness and accountability to an agency that is too often known for secrecy is commendable. The same can be said of his advocacy for Americans' First Amendment rights.

I look forward to advancing and then confirming his nomination to a new term.

Madam President, one other nominee we are considering today is district judge Ralph Erickson of North Dakota, who is the nominee before us to fill a vacant seat on the Eighth Circuit. He is clearly qualified. He deeply respects the rule of law. He was confirmed by the Senate to his district judgeship by a voice vote. He enjoys the support of both of his home State Senators, Republican Senator HOEVEN and Democratic Senator HEITKAMP.

When his nomination came before the Judiciary Committee recently, every single member of the committee voted to approve him—every single Republican, every single Democrat. This includes the top Democrat, Senator FEINSTEIN, and the Democratic leadership's second-ranking officer, Senator DURBIN. So you would think his nomination would be as noncontroversial as it gets. You would be right.

Yet Democrats still chose to erect another pointless procedural hurdle before we can actually confirm him. We will probably do so overwhelmingly, given that the Senate just voted 95 to 1 on this pointless cloture motion—a pointless cloture motion on a nominee who nobody opposes.

Until now, our friends across the aisle have thrown up one unnecessary procedural hurdle after the next on even the most uncontroversial of nomi-

nees. As I have noted before, the opposition they have shown to these nominees most of the time seems to have little to do with the nominees themselves nor whether Democrats even support them. Our Democratic colleagues actually do support the nominees, just as they do now.

This really has to stop. It is time to end these silly games. It is time to confirm Judge Erickson, a dedicated jurist who is going to make a great addition to the Eighth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

TRIBUTE TO MARY JO BROWN

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I rise today to honor a proud educator, a dedicated public servant, a beloved native of my home State of West Virginia, and my very dear friend, Mary Jo Brown. Words cannot express my gratitude for Mary Jo's service and friendship.

Since my days as Governor, Mary Jo has gone above and beyond to uphold the standards not only of professionalism, loyalty, and dedication but also of what it means to be born in the Eastern Panhandle of West Virginia.

Mary Jo has always had a noble passion for education. She worked for Berkeley County Schools as a teacher, a library media specialist, director of public affairs, and finally as principal of Burke Street Elementary School, where we first became acquainted.

Upon her retirement from Berkeley County Schools, I invited Mary Jo to work with me as a regional coordinator, a role she kept through my entire time as Governor and now as U.S. Senator. Her warm personality and sense of humor truly have a way of making you feel at ease—laughing quite frequently at not only her but yourself.

I have heard many times from members of the Eastern Panhandle community that when she is out meeting with elected officials, business owners, and fellow West Virginians, she provides every confidence that their voices are being heard, and I can assure you, they are. She gets in contact with me immediately.

When Mary Jo is given a task, she doesn't take no for an answer. She is the most tenacious person I have ever met. She gives each project or challenge her all because it is for the good of her community, our State, and her hometown.

It would be difficult to find anyone as knowledgeable and dedicated to our home State as Mary Jo. Among her many contributions to the Eastern Panhandle, together with her loving husband Walter, was founding the Walter and Mary Jo Ziler Brown Fund in 2006 to help Eastern Panhandle students study animal husbandry, agriculture, and veterinary medicine.

We bonded over our passion for public service, inspiring the next generation of leaders, and we share the common goal of helping the rest of the country discover all that our great State of West Virginia has to offer.

Now that she is retiring after a long career of teaching, public service, and more than a decade of Federal service, I know that Mary Jo will carry the same passion for the Eastern Panhandle and for West Virginia that she always has, and she will continue to make a difference wherever she may be and wherever she goes—always for the State of West Virginia and her community.

It is my greatest honor to extend to her and to Walter my very best wishes in the days and years ahead.

Thank you, Mary Jo, and God bless you for everything you have done for me, for our office, and, most importantly, for our State of West Virginia and the Eastern Panhandle. God bless you.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks.

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

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I am honored to come to the floor today to express my support for the President's nominee to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, Judge Ralph Erickson.

Judge Erickson is a longtime North Dakotan and has been a tremendous public servant in his current capacity as Federal district court judge in Fargo, ND. He has made our State proud, and I am confident he will be an excellent addition to the Eighth Circuit Court.

Judge Erickson has a distinguished legal career which spans over two decades. After working in private practice for 10 years, he served as a magistrate judge for Cass County and then as a State district judge for the East Central Judicial District Court. In 2003, Judge Erickson was nominated by President George W. Bush to the U.S. District Court for the District of North Dakota and was quickly confirmed by the Senate unanimously.

Throughout his tenure, Judge Erickson has demonstrated deep respect for the Constitution and the rule of law. His judicial experience ranges from overseeing routine civil cases to cases involving extreme criminal violence. Throughout all of these cases, Judge Erickson practiced a measured and prudent legal approach that is necessary for a position on the second highest court in the United States.

Judge Erickson has also proved to be a champion for Indian Country. He serves as the Chair of the Tribal Issues Advisory Group on the United States Sentencing Commission, where he works to preserve Tribal sovereignty. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, I believe Judge Erickson's expertise on this issue will be a valuable asset to the Eighth Circuit Court.

Madam President, part of our duty as Senators is to evaluate the qualifica-

tions of the President's appointees and to vote on their nominations accordingly. This is a responsibility that I take very seriously, and I have no doubt that if confirmed, Judge Erickson will be an excellent circuit judge. I am honored to be here to support his nomination and to urge my colleagues to vote yes.

I would also like to note that in the Gallery today we have his daughter Elizabeth joining us. I think it is wonderful that she could be here to see her father's confirmation vote. She is a sophomore at Catholic University and just an outstanding young person, and there is no doubt that she is extremely proud of her father today. So it is wonderful to welcome her here for this momentous occasion.

With that, Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

Under the previous order, all time having expired, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Erickson nomination?

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 207 Ex.]

YEAS—95

Alexander	Flake	Murphy
Baldwin	Franken	Murray
Barrasso	Gardner	Nelson
Bennet	Gillibrand	Paul
Blumenthal	Graham	Perdue
Blunt	Grassley	Peters
Booker	Harris	Portman
Boozman	Hassan	Reed
Brown	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heinrich	Roberts
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Cardin	Hirono	Sanders
Carper	Hoeven	Sasse
Casey	Inhofe	Schatz
Cassidy	Isakson	Schumer
Collins	Johnson	Scott
Coons	Kaine	Shaheen
Corker	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	King	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Tester
Crapo	Leahy	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Daines	Manchin	Udall
Donnelly	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	McCain	Warner
Durbin	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Merkley	Wyden
Feinstein	Moran	Young
Fischer	Murkowski	

NAYS—1

Warren

NOT VOTING—4

Cochran
Menendez

Strange
Tillis

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.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the Pai nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Ajit Varadaraj Pai, of Kansas, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of five years from July 1, 2016.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 1:45 p.m. will be equally divided.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I want to speak on the renomination of Ajit Pai to serve as Chairman of the FCC, the Federal Communications Commission, to serve for a term of 5 years.

Under the previous administration, the FCC always had the consumers' back. Back then, that administration's FCC strengthened consumer protections. It furthered competition, it protected public safety, and it pushed forward to ensure universal service for all Americans.

Ultimately, the success or failure of the FCC rises and rests not on the fulfillment of special interest wish lists but on the treatment of those who are least able to protect themselves and whether their First Amendment rights, including those of journalists, are vigorously protected.

Chairman Pai has been a vocal and excessively partisan and often hostile opponent of pro-consumer steps taken by his colleagues on the FCC. We have seen that time after time in the previous administration.

Since becoming Chairman of the FCC this year, he has systematically undercut much of the work done over the past 8 years. I want to give you several examples.

He has acted to prevent millions of broadband subscribers from receiving key information about rates, terms, and conditions of their service. This is called disclosure. He has threatened the expansion of broadband into the homes of low-income Americans by limiting the effectiveness of the new Lifeline Program reforms. If that is not enough, he has proposed sweeping limits on the ability of States and localities to review and improve the installation of certain types of wireless equipment. Furthermore, he has supported the moves by the GOP Congress to eliminate commonsense privacy rules for broadband services.

If all of that is not enough, he has eliminated several media ownership