

the Green New Deal that would have made the Obama-era War on Coal look like child's play. Among all of its other craziness, it sought to end all production of American oil, coal, and natural gas within a decade. How ridiculous. How absurd.

We had a vote on it in the Senate, and lest we think this was just some extreme view that only the fringe subscribes to, only 4 of 47 Democrats could bring themselves to oppose the Green New Deal in the Senate—only 4 of 47 Democrats could bring themselves to oppose the Green New Deal in the Senate. There were 43 of 47 Democrats who couldn't vote against this thing. Fortunately, Republicans voted it down.

But last week, not to be deterred, a number of Democrats rolled out yet another far-left environmentalist manifesto. This new resolution calls for—here we go again—a managed phaseout of the use of oil, gas, and coal to keep fossil fuels in the ground—a managed phaseout of the use of oil, gas, and coal to keep fossil fuels in the ground. Of course, this means a whole lot more intrusive Big Government.

The bill calls for a “massive-scale federal mobilization of resources”—a “massive-scale federal mobilization of resources.” Just imagine what that would entail. And get this: The new manifesto dictates that our Nation model ourselves after Europe, Canada, and liberal enclaves like New York and Los Angeles. You just can't make this stuff up.

The contrast is clear. Republicans are working overtime to rebuild the conditions for middle-class prosperity, and we are working overtime to help those who were hit hard in the Obama years. But Democrats are working to resurrect the same bad ideas that caused much of that damage and implement them yet again, this time on steroids. The good news is, as long as this Republican Senate has anything to say about it, none of these radical job-killing manifestos have a chance of becoming law.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Clifton L. Corker, of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

CONSUMER PRIVACY

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, these days, there is an online component to

almost everything that Americans do. Were you at the beach last weekend? You undoubtedly posted pictures on Facebook and Instagram. You probably used Google Maps or Waze or another map app to find your way there. You undoubtedly booked a hotel stay on one of the myriad hotel booking sites, and you transmitted your credit card information online to pay for it. During your stay, you probably took advantage of the hotel's free Wi-Fi, whether you were uploading pictures or watching a show on Netflix. If you had dinner at a restaurant while you were there, there is a good chance you used the internet to make a reservation. If you booked an excursion while you were there—maybe a fishing trip or a boat tour—chances are good you made that reservation online as well.

I could go on, but you get the idea. The internet and mobile internet-enabled devices like our phones and watches have resulted in an explosion of opportunity and innovation. Information is more accessible than ever before. We can communicate more swiftly and easily than ever before. We can shop without leaving our house, strike out confidently into the unknown without a map and still find our way back, turn on the air conditioner or heater with a simple voice command, and see who is knocking on our door while we are 600 miles away on vacation.

With the convenience and opportunity of the internet revolution comes serious privacy concerns. Every time we book a hotel, navigate a new town, buy movie tickets, or buy groceries online, we are putting a lot of personal information into the hands of a lot of different companies: banking information, health information, information about our location, our preferences, our habits. All of this information is likely used in some form or fashion by some of the world's most successful internet businesses to personalize our search results on Google or to deliver the content that we see on Facebook or Instagram.

As a member and former chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, I have gotten an up-close look at the issue of consumer privacy. I believe that developing bipartisan consumer privacy legislation needs to be a priority in Congress.

Last year, as chairman of the Commerce Committee, I convened hearings into consumer data privacy and the accessing of millions of Facebook users' personal data by the political intelligence firm Cambridge Analytica. I also led a hearing to discuss the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation and California's new privacy-related law. I have continued to focus on consumer privacy this year as chairman of the Commerce Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, Innovation, and the Internet.

A few weeks ago, I convened a hearing to look at the use of persuasive technology on internet platforms like

Facebook and YouTube. Sites like YouTube and Facebook use algorithms and artificial intelligence driven by user-specific data to tailor just about everything you see on their platforms, from ads to the video that plays after the YouTube video you searched for. These algorithms can be useful. If you searched for Paul Simon's “Diamonds on the Soles of Her Shoes” on YouTube, you probably will not mind hearing “Graceland” next. If you are shopping for a new computer, you might find it useful to see an ad for the latest HP or Apple laptop.

These algorithms can also be deployed in far more troubling ways. For example, in June, the New York Times reported that YouTube's automated recommendation system was found to be automatically playing a video of children playing in their backyard pool to users who had watched sexually themed content. Algorithms can also be used to limit what news stories and other content people are exposed to.

As we learned from a witness at the hearing on persuasive technology, a former Google employee named Tristan Harris, these algorithms have the potential to be used to influence the thoughts and behaviors of literally billions of people.

For all of these reasons, I believe that transparency needs to be an essential part of the conversation. Americans should be clearly informed about how their personal data is being used and how companies influence and control what Americans see online.

Obviously, users have an obligation to exercise personal responsibility, but companies also need to provide greater transparency about how content is being filtered.

Given the ever-increasing size of our digital footprint and the increased privacy dangers that come along with that, the question isn't whether we will have Federal privacy legislation; it is what that legislation will look like.

I believe that any final bill should be bipartisan and should set a single national data privacy standard so that companies and consumers don't have to navigate 50 different sets of rules. We need to make consumer data privacy a priority while also preserving the ability of companies to innovate and deliver the cutting-edge services we rely on.

I also believe, as I mentioned, that any bill should include transparency provisions that give consumers a clear understanding of what is being done with their data. I believe consumers have the option to engage on internet platforms without being manipulated by algorithms powered by their own personal data.

This isn't the first time Congress has tackled new and emerging privacy concerns. Over the last few decades, Congress has acted to protect children online, protect sensitive healthcare information, and to modernize how institutions use consumer data.

I believe we can follow in that tradition by developing a new consumer privacy law, and that is why I am committed to working with colleagues from both parties to develop legislation to meet the privacy challenges we are facing today. I am confident that we can arrive at a strong consumer privacy bill for the digital age, and I will continue to make Americans' privacy a priority of mine here in Congress.

I yield the floor.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

SENATE LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, last night, we saw the President of the United States, who has spent years maligning America, continue to malign Americans. The President once again whipped up a toxic brew of racism, xenophobia, and nativism, with his crowd chanting “send her back” about a duly elected Member of Congress and a U.S. citizen—one of the oldest and ugliest racist attacks against Americans of color.

The way the President appeals to the worst instincts of people and what was shouted and chanted at the rally last night without the President’s upbraiding them was despicable and eerily familiar to what happens in dictatorships.

We all know that the only way President Trump will stop this is for Republicans—his own party—to demand it. The only way President Trump will stop is when Republicans on the other side have the honor, the decency, and the courage to tell him to stop. All we hear is silence and diversions from Leader McCONNELL.

So, America, if you don’t like what the President says, if it gets you upset and makes your hairs stand on end, say: This is not the America I know and love. Whatever your political views, call your Senators and tell them to tell President Trump to stop this.

Argue the merits, argue the issues, but stop this appeal to the worst instincts—the worst instincts. And our Republican friends are silent.

History will show this. This is a moment. There is no John McCain anymore. When this kind of bitter racism emerged in his townhall meeting, he rejected it publicly when somebody used it against then-Candidate Obama. It went down in history as one of his finest moments. Where are the fine moments of my colleagues? There are 53 of them on the Republican side, and not one has spoken out strongly enough—not one.

They are quiet on everything else, too—things that matter to average

Americans to help make their lives better. Where are our Republican friends on the substantive issues that can help Americans of all colors and creeds—all colors and creeds—help Americans whether their families have been in this country for 11 generations, as some of my friends have been, or are new immigrants, as some of my friends are? In New York, we have everybody.

Here are some of the things our Republican friends can do. The House has passed legislation to improve our healthcare system and intervene in the lawsuit against eliminating protections for Americans with preexisting conditions, but Leader McCONNELL—once again silent—sent the bill to his legislative graveyard. The House has passed legislation to close loopholes in our gun background check system. This is no longer controversial. Ninety percent of Americans are for it—90 percent. Leader McCONNELL has sent that bill, too, to the legislative graveyard. Climate change, voting rights, paycheck fairness for women—all are in the legislative graveyard.

Where are my Republican friends on those issues? Why aren’t they standing up and saying that we should at least debate them here in the Senate? Democrats have had to petition for weeks to even be allowed amendment votes on issues of importance to the American people.

It is a sorry state of affairs here in the Senate. I believe it has frustrated many of my Republican friends—I hear it from them privately—as well as us Democrats, because while we may not always agree on legislative solutions to a problem—we are not all supposed to agree; this is not a dictatorship—we want to debate the issues. We want to make forward progress.

My Republican colleagues know that they didn’t come here just to rubberstamp an assembly line of the President’s nominees, judicial and executive, and neither did we, but under Leader McCONNELL, legislative progress is the lowest and often last priority.

H.R. 1327

Madam President, for example, yesterday, my colleague Senator GILLIBRAND asked unanimous consent to reauthorize the Victim Compensation Fund for the brave first responders who got sick after working on the pile after 9/11. It is as unobjectionable a piece of legislation as you can imagine. These are the people who rushed to the towers after 9/11. They got all kinds of gunk in their lungs and in their gastrointestinal systems and later developed cancer. Many of them are now gone, some of them are people I became friends with, like Ray Pfeifer and Detective Alvarez. And all we want to do is what we do with our soldiers when they are on the battlefield and get illnesses and wounds. We want to help them. That is all. Nothing more. Yet, over the course of the last several years, again, our Republican friends, aided and abetted by Leader McCon-

NELL, have either blocked this legislation or diluted it. But now it seems there is a breakthrough.

In the House, this bill passed with I think only 12 Republicans objecting. Conservative Members like MARK MEADOWS, who is head of the Freedom Caucus, Leader McCARTHY, and Whip SCALISE all voted for it. Why can’t we just bring it to the floor and vote on it here? We should.

My colleague from Kentucky, RAND PAUL, objected. Bring it to the floor. Bring it to the floor. Give him an amendment, but let’s not just have this one lay in the legislative graveyard as well. I am hopeful it will not because as soon as it passes the Senate—and we don’t want to amend it because that will send it back to the House, and who knows what will happen in the back-and-forth—if we just pass the bill as is and defeat an amendment that is not intended to help or improve it, it will go to the President’s desk, and he will sign it. Even if he doesn’t, there are veto-proof majorities in both Chambers to overcome it.

Senator GILLIBRAND, my friend and colleague who has done so much on this issue, will try again today to get this Chamber’s consent to pass the bill. If the junior Senator from Kentucky again blocks the bill, I strongly urge the senior Senator from Kentucky, Leader McCONNELL, to put the bill on the floor. It is unacceptable that once again we are dealing with delays on legislation to help our brave 9/11 first responders, some of whom are gone, many of whom are ill, and many more of whom will get ill in the future from the diseases they acquired because of their bravery and selflessness on 9/11.

FACEAPP

Madam President, on another matter, over the past couple of days, millions of Americans have been downloading FaceApp—a viral tool that applies a little AI technology to a selfie to make your face look younger or older or add a beard. That seems like a benign new social media fad, but it actually may not be benign at all.

Who is the parent company of this app? Wireless Labs. It is based in, of all places, St. Petersburg, Russia. It also came to light that the app not only takes your picture but retains the right to access all your photos, your search history, and gives “perpetual, irrevocable, and worldwide” license to use your photo, your name, and your likeness. This is a breathtaking level of access—all too common in murky apps like these—that raises very substantial privacy concerns.

After everything we learned about Russia’s unrepentant cyber aggression in 2016, the nexus of facial recognition, digital privacy, and a shadowy Russian company based in St. Petersburg, where so much of the Russian interference in our elections and interference with the internet emerged from, what happened with this app from Wireless Labs called FaceApp should set off alarm bells for all Americans.