

other points of view—one point of view is that Facebook and other social media platforms are not just publishers. They are clearly content providers, and they are having an impact on our behavior.

My bill is very simple. It just says that if you are a social media platform and you use algorithms based on the information you, the social media provider, have collected about us, if you use that information to push our hot buttons by continuously showing us information that just reaffirms our point of view without showing us other points of view, that is fine. That is perfectly legal. That is your business model. But in return, you are no longer going to enjoy section 230 liability.

This would not eliminate section 230 liability in a pervasive manner, but it would say that if you are going to use algorithms to push hot buttons and to keep other points of view away from us and monetize that practice, then you shouldn't enjoy section 230 liability. That is all my bill does.

For that reason, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce be discharged from further consideration of S. 4756, which is my Don't Push My Buttons Act, to which I just referred, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all in the vein of, we have talked now for years about section 230 liability, and I think we ought to actually try to do something about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WYDEN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, this bill is, on its surface, a privacy bill. It appears to have been introduced 2 days ago, and the sponsor has arrived on the floor of the Senate and says that this bill ought to be passed immediately and without debate.

My guess is that a small circle of beltway insiders have seen the text, but I just want the Senator to know that passing this bill this way would just make a mockery of the proposition that we ought to have open, public debate on significant laws. We are dealing with a rush job here.

I will just tell you that based on what we have picked up, the legislation certainly leaves more questions than answers.

First, who does the Senator from Louisiana intend to target with the bill? On a first reading, it could apply to anybody, from Glassdoor, to Spotify, to Cloudflare, to my neighbor's blog, to local media outlets.

At a higher level, if my colleague wants to protect Americans' data from collection and abuse, this bill certainly doesn't do that. On the contrary, his

legislation would push the platforms to simply force users to consent to their data being collected and used as a condition of using their service. That is already being done now, and this bill wouldn't change a thing for Americans' privacy.

Very significantly, our reading is that the Kennedy bill only requires consent if user data is both collected and used by the same company, and it has a massive loophole for data brokers and other shady middlemen who are already compiling dossiers of Americans' sensitive data and selling it to just about anybody with a credit card.

For the last several years, I have been blowing the whistle on these data brokers and these shady middlemen. We have investigated sector after sector where we are seeing these people who really adhere to some of the sleaziest business practices engaging in these tactics where they can get their hands on Americans' sensitive data and basically just sell it to anybody with a credit card.

I guarantee you, there is not a Senator in this body who is going to go home this weekend and tell their constituents: Gee, I want those data brokers and those middlemen to be able to sell my sensitive data to hither and yon, whatever nefarious purposes somebody might want to buy it for.

The Facebooks, the Googles, and the Twitters of the world have all the resources to pay these guys to outsource their data collection and be A-OK. Yet again, as I have said for some time, it is the startups and the little guys who are going to be left behind.

I have been working on these issues since I came to the Senate, and the only person here, really, who knew how to use the computer was the wonderful Senator from Vermont, Senator LEAHY. So as we began to write these formative laws, I said that my interest is the startup and the little guy because the big guys always do great.

That is why, when we were on the floor talking about the change to 230 before, who sold out the little guys? Facebook. And all that happened was the bad guys went off to the dark web.

So this is another bill where the Facebooks and the Googles all have the resources to pay the guys to outsource data collection, as I have been talking about, and the little guy is going to be left behind.

This bill does not require consent to collect your data. It doesn't require consent to use it and follow you around the internet. It wouldn't stop Chinese companies from harvesting American data and selling it to the Chinese Government.

If the Senator from Louisiana wants to protect Americans' sensitive data, I have a bill for doing that. I have comprehensive privacy legislation. It is called the Mind Your Own Business Act. We have been soliciting input on it literally for years. It is the toughest bill in terms of holding the executives actually accountable, for example, if

they lie about their privacy policy, if an executive of one of the major companies, generating billions in revenue, lies about their privacy policy.

The Mind Your Own Business Act is the bill that is the toughest in terms of protecting the consumer. It sets tough privacy and cyber security standards for companies that collect Americans' private data, gives the Federal Trade Commission more authority to issue serious fines, and it is backed up with the strongest enforcement provisions on offer if a CEO lies to the government.

It is not as if you can't write tough privacy proposals. It certainly can be done, and others have ideas on how to do it. But based on everything I have read, and particularly this provision that is going to be a holiday for data brokers and shady middlemen to be able to get people's sensitive data, for all of those reasons and, frankly, others that are too numerous to mention, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 451

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of the first responders in our country. Every day, brave women and men on the frontlines of the COVID-19 pandemic rely on T-Band, a spectrum that makes it possible for them to communicate with each other.

T-Band is the radio frequency that is set aside for these public safety officials so that they can talk to each other to keep all of us safe, all of us healthy. In 11 metropolitan areas, the T-Band system enables our courageous public safety personnel to work quickly and effectively during life-and-death situations.

T-Band allows emergency medical service teams to relay important information about patients' conditions. T-Band permits 9-1-1 dispatchers to send first responders to emergency scenes. Firefighters use T-Band to quickly coordinate strategy.

After the Boston bombing, after the marathon bombing, first responders used T-Band to communicate with each other during the ensuing manhunt.

This resource is nothing short of a lifesaver. T-Band really stands for "trusted band." It is the resource public safety can rely upon.

Unfortunately, the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 required the Federal Communications Commission to begin to auction off the T-Band, the trusted band, by February of 2021, but it would cost between \$5 billion and \$6 billion for first responders—police and fire—to relocate from the T-Band. That is much more money than an auction of that spectrum would ever generate.

Plus, for many first responders, there is simply no alternative to the T-Band; this is their only option. That is why this body must pass the Don't Break

Up the T-Band Act, which repeals the requirement that public safety stop using this spectrum.

The heroes who jump into action when we need them shouldn't have to scramble to figure out how they will communicate with each other. They shouldn't be left in limbo.

My legislation has support from an inspiring coalition of advocates and public safety groups. The International Association of Fire Chiefs, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the National Sheriffs' Association, the National League of Cities, the United States Conference of Mayors, the National Association of Counties, the Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials, the National Public Safety Telecommunications Council, and many others are demanding that we preserve the T-Band.

These groups and the people they represent are not asking for a favor; they are just asking to be allowed to do their jobs effectively.

I thank Leader SCHUMER for his partnership on this issue and his longstanding commitment to the public safety community. I also want to thank Ranking Member CANTWELL and Ranking Member SCHATZ for their work and dedication to this effort.

But don't just take our word for it. Listen to what the current Republican chairman of the Federal Communications Commission recently said about T-Band. Earlier this year, Chairman Ajit Pai stated: "An FCC auction of the T-Band is a bad idea."

This is not a partisan issue. It is a public safety imperative. There is no cost associated with stopping the T-Band auction, and Congress must ensure that the people who step up to keep us safe are taken care of.

If we fail to act, the FCC will have no choice but to move forward and strip this resource from our first responders. To allow that to happen during a public health crisis like the one we face today would be reckless.

First responders already face enormous strain economically and enormous pressure to address the pandemic, as well as deadly natural disasters across the country. The last thing we should be doing is saddling them with millions or billions of dollars in costs to needlessly alter their critical communications system.

Congress can no longer drag its feet. We have run out of time. The FCC has called on this body to stop the T-Band auction, but the Commission has no choice but to start laying the groundwork to auction the T-Band. We can and we must resolve this problem today. Today is the day to do it.

Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 451 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I further ask that the bill be read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be con-

sidered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am here today to object to this unanimous consent request on behalf of the junior Senator from Texas, Senator CRUZ.

As the Senator from Massachusetts knows, Senator CRUZ is also deeply interested in this issue. Both Senators have complementary pieces of legislation. They have had the language of their legislation agreed to unanimously by both the majority and the minority of the Commerce Committee.

So I would ask the Senator from Massachusetts to reach out to the Senator from Texas, and I understand he is fully willing to work with the Senator from Massachusetts on amending the House bill to ensure that it passes the Senate with the Cruz amendment that would not be objectionable to supporters of this bill.

As a result, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I just think that we are missing an enormous opportunity here. It is a shame the Senate is not acting with the urgency it needs in order to help our brave men and women who are first responders in our country.

We can work on issues of spectrum going to the private sector. We can do that in a separate bill, and we can do it together. But, here, we have an opportunity to help our first responders, the brave men and women who every day risk their lives, and we have to make sure they have the spectrum they need to communicate.

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

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

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

REMEMBERING LAURIE SMITH CAMP

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, less than 2 weeks ago, this country lost one of its most brilliant legal minds—Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg. Her passing has left a void that can be felt all across our Nation from Nebraska to Washington.

Sadly, Nebraska recently lost another great jurist—Judge Laurie Smith Camp. Judge Smith Camp was the first woman to serve my State as a Federal judge, a position she had held since 2001. This body voted 100 to 0 to confirm her just 6 weeks after President George W. Bush nominated her. That doesn't happen very often anymore, and her unanimous approval was a testament to her incredible talent.

Judge Smith Camp grew up in Omaha, but she left Nebraska to attend college at Stanford University. She graduated with distinction. And I am glad to say that she came back home to attend the University of Nebraska Law School where she distinguished herself again as editor-in-chief of the Nebraska Law Review.

Before becoming a Federal judge, she served her State through a series of jobs that spanned the legal profession. She began her career in private practice but soon moved on to become general counsel for the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services, the head of the Nebraska attorney general's civil rights section, and then the chief deputy attorney general for criminal matters for the Nebraska attorney general. These wide-ranging experiences were part of what made her an exceptional Federal judge.

Another part was her love for the law and the compassion that flowed from it. She was well known for her dedication to equal treatment for all, regardless of background, and for a sentencing philosophy that preferred rehabilitation to punishment.

She also understood that success isn't just about achieving your professional goals. She was profoundly generous with her time and, when she wasn't leading Nebraska's district court, she could be found promoting women's participation in the legal profession or mentoring young Nebraska attorneys. This was in addition to recently being elected president of the Omaha Bar Association—a job that she had held since June.

Laurie was also my friend. She spoke at an event I held in 2016 called Bridging the Gap, which aims to encourage women to engage in their communities at the local, State, and Federal level. I am lucky to have known her personally and to have seen up close the wise advice and the quick wit that made her famous among her colleagues and those she mentored.

Through her example, she inspired a generation of young women in Nebraska and beyond to pursue careers as attorneys, advocates, and community leaders, just as Justice Ginsburg did. Both of these extraordinary women blazed a trail that today's young women and girls can follow. I join with both their families in mourning their passing and celebrating their lives.

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.

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

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

ANNIVERSARY OF THE ROUTE 91 HARVEST FESTIVAL SHOOTING

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, immediately after a tragedy, we wake up each day and feel the full force of it