

to be able to hire illegal immigrants, to take jobs away from Americans and pay them submarket wages.

What about discouraging illegal and highly dangerous border crossings?

To get back to chain migration, do we really want a system in which green cards are given out by random chance? Because that is what we have not just in the diversity lottery but through chain migration. Today, you can get a green card in this country simply because someone in your extended family happened to immigrate to this country 20 or 30 or 40 years ago, irrespective of your ability to stand on your own two feet in our economy, to get a job and pay taxes and not take welfare, to assimilate into our culture.

Shouldn't we have an immigration system that focuses on the needs of America's workers and the American economy, not one that gives out green cards by random chance the way we have today? Shouldn't we be focused on the jobs and the wages of American citizens? After all, they are who elected us to come here to represent their interests.

I don't think this is unreasonable, and, frankly, I don't think the Democrats do either. They have supported the BRIDGE Act. They have supported reform of other immigration programs—temporary visas—because they worry about the impact of immigration on lower wage, blue-collar workers.

Now, the Republicans have stepped up and done exactly what the Democrats have said they wanted: We have offered a real, long-term solution for persons who have received a DACA work permit. All we are asking for in exchange are commonsense reforms to prevent another situation, like the one happening now, in the future. So it is time for Democrats and Republicans to come together and support this bill.

If you are serious about helping these DACA permit recipients, you should vote for this bill now. It is good for those DACA recipients, it is good for American workers, it is good for our communities, and it will be a good first step toward lasting pro-American, pro-worker immigration reform.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ENZI. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back.

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

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

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea."

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 62, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 305 Leg.]

YEAS—62

Barrasso	Gardner	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Perdue
Boozman	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Reed
Capito	Heitkamp	Risch
Carper	Heller	Roberts
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rounds
Cochran	Inhofe	Rubio
Collins	Isakson	Sasse
Coons	Johnson	Scott
Corker	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	King	Strange
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Crapo	Lee	Tester
Cruz	Manchin	Thune
Daines	McCain	Tillis
Donnelly	McCaskill	Toomey
Enzi	McConnell	Warner
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Murkowski	Young
Flake	Nelson	

NAYS—37

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Peters
Bennet	Harris	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hassan	Schatz
Booker	Heinrich	Schumer
Brown	Hirono	Shaheen
Cantwell	Kaine	Stabenow
Cardin	Klobuchar	Udall
Casey	Leahy	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Markey	Warren
Duckworth	Menendez	Whitehouse
Durbin	Merkley	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	
Franken	Murray	

NOT VOTING—1

Alexander

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). 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.

The Senator from Alabama.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. STRANGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to 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.

Mr. STRANGE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 455.

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

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Emily Webster Murphy, of Missouri, to be Administrator of General Services.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, 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 question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Murphy nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 501.

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

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Glen R. Smith, of Iowa, to be a Member of the Farm Credit Administration Board, Farm Credit Administration, for a term expiring May 21, 2022.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, 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 question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Smith nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader, the Senate proceed to executive session for consideration of Calendar No. 321, the nomination of Joseph Balash to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior. I further ask that there be 1 hour of debate on the nomination, equally divided in the usual form; and that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on confirmation with no intervening action or debate; 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.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to 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.

NET NEUTRALITY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, next week, the Federal Communications Commission, FCC, will consider a proposed rule, that, if approved, will end net neutrality as we know it and will threaten the foundation of a free and open internet. Net neutrality is the simple proposition that internet service providers should treat all internet traffic the same; they should not be able to exploit their power to charge for preferred treatment, allowing big corporations to dominate the internet.

The Chairman of the FCC, Ajit Pai, wants the FCC to undo its protections for net neutrality. His proposed ruling is perversely styled as "Restoring Internet Freedom," when in fact it would do the opposite. It would allow internet service providers to decide which websites will be privileged and which will be throttled or even blocked. Make no mistake: This will mean that the big firms that can afford the "fast lane" will be protected, while harming consumers, startups, and potentially even freedom of speech online.

Alarming, Chairman Pai has decided to ignore millions of comments submitted by individuals across the country, citing concerns that they are not "unique." As a Member of Congress accountable to my constituents, this is a particularly offensive posture. Unique or not, comments and concerns submitted to my office by Vermonters

are treated with the same weight and value as any other. Until the FCC fully and meaningfully considers the more than 21.7 million comments it has received about this proposed rule, it should not proceed with this vote.

A recent New York Times article by Farhad Manjoo, entitled, "The Internet Is Dying. Repealing Net Neutrality Hastens That Death," lays out clearly why the FCC's proposed repeal of net neutrality will bring the open internet one giant leap closer to becoming a corporate playground. If, as expected, Chairman Pai jams through his proposed rule change next week, it will be clear that he has done so to the benefit of a few deep-pocketed corporations and to the detriment of everyone else who relies on the internet to support commerce, communication, and community. I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Manjoo be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 29, 2017]

THE INTERNET IS DYING, REPEALING NET NEUTRALITY HASTENS THAT DEATH

(By Farhad Manjoo)

Sure, technically, the internet still works. Pull up Facebook on your phone and you will still see your second cousin's baby pictures. But that isn't really the internet. It's not the open, anyone-can-build-it network of the 1990s and early 2000s, the product of technologies created over decades through government funding and academic research, the network that helped undo Microsoft's stranglehold on the tech business and gave us upstarts like Amazon, Google, Facebook and Netflix.

Nope, that freewheeling internet has been dying a slow death—and a vote next month by the Federal Communications Commission to undo net neutrality would be the final pillow in its face.

Net neutrality is intended to prevent companies that provide internet service from offering preferential treatment to certain content over their lines. The rules prevent, for instance, AT&T from charging a fee to companies that want to stream high-definition videos to people.

Because net neutrality shelters start-ups—which can't easily pay for fast-line access—from internet giants that can pay, the rules are just about the last bulwark against the complete corporate takeover of much of online life. When the rules go, the internet will still work, but it will look like and feel like something else altogether—a network in which business development deals, rather than innovation, determine what you experience, a network that feels much more like cable TV than the technological Wild West that gave you Napster and Netflix.

If this sounds alarmist, consider that the state of digital competition is already pretty sorry. As I've argued regularly, much of the tech industry is at risk of getting swallowed by giants. Today's internet is lousy with gatekeepers, tollbooths and monopolists.

The five most valuable American companies—Amazon, Apple, Facebook, Google and Microsoft—control much of the online infrastructure, from app stores to operating systems to cloud storage to nearly all of the online ad business. A handful of broadband companies—AT&T, Charter, Comcast and Verizon, many of which are also aiming to become content companies, because why

not—provide virtually all the internet connections to American homes and smartphones.

Together these giants have carved the internet into a historically profitable system of fiefs. They have turned a network whose very promise was endless innovation into one stuck in mud, where every start-up is at the tender mercy of some of the largest corporations on the planet.

Many companies feel this shift. In a letter to Ajit Pai, the F.C.C. chairman, who drafted the net neutrality repeal order, more than 200 start-ups argued this week that the order "would put small and medium-sized businesses at a disadvantage and prevent innovative new ones from even getting off the ground." This, they said, was "the opposite of the open market, with a few powerful cable and phone companies picking winners and losers instead of consumers."

This was not the way the internet was supposed to go. At its deepest technical level, the Internet was designed to avoid the central points of control that now command it. The technical scheme arose from an even deeper philosophy. The designers of the internet understood that communications networks gain new powers through their end nodes—that is, through the new devices and services that plug into the network, rather than the computers that manage traffic on the network. This is known as the "end-to-end" principle of network design, and it basically explains why the internet led to so many more innovations than the centralized networks that came before it, such as the old telephone network.

The internet's singular power, in its early gold-rush days, was its flexibility. People could imagine a dazzling array of new uses for the network, and as quick as that, they could build and deploy them—a site that sold you books, a site that cataloged the world's information, an application that let you "borrow" other people's music, a social network that could connect you to anyone.

You didn't need permission for any of this stuff; some of these innovations ruined traditional industries, some fundamentally altered society, and many were legally dubious. But the internet meant you could just put it up, and if it worked, the rest of the world would quickly adopt it.

But if flexibility was the early internet's promise, it was soon imperiled. In 2003, Tim Wu, a law professor now at Columbia Law School (he's also a contributor to *The New York Times*), saw signs of impending corporate control over the growing internet. Broadband companies that were investing great sums to roll out faster and faster internet service to Americans were becoming wary of running an anything-goes network.

Some of the new uses of the internet threatened their bottom line. People were using online services as an alternative to paying for cable TV or long-distance phone service. They were connecting devices like Wi-Fi routers, which allowed them to share their connections with multiple devices. At the time, there were persistent reports of broadband companies seeking to block or otherwise frustrate these new services; in a few years, some broadband providers would begin blocking new services outright.

To Mr. Wu, the broadband monopolies looked like a threat to the end-to-end idea that had powered the internet. In a legal journal, he outlined an idea for regulation to preserve the internet's equal-opportunity design—and hence was born "net neutrality."

Though it has been through a barrage of legal challenges and resurrections, some form of net neutrality has been the governing regime on the internet since 2005. The new F.C.C. order would undo the idea completely; companies would be allowed to block