

told, to the city of Indianapolis, the State of Indiana, and even to the world.

Though Jim would bark at the title “model,” in my mind he was, in many ways, a model American citizen.

Jim grew up in Terre Haute. He attended Indiana University. It was there that he fell in love twice, once with the school itself and once with his beloved wife Jackie. And that endured.

In 1967, not long after graduation, he became chief of staff to a young mayor of Indianapolis named Richard Lugar. Since that moment, almost nothing great in our capital city happened without Jim’s involvement. He helped launch a university in downtown Indianapolis, until recently known as IUPUI. He was involved with the building of the Indianapolis Zoo, the Indianapolis Colts, and the Indiana Pacers. They all had Jim’s fingerprints on them.

Jim understood that the key to healthy organizations and healthy communities was to connect and empower others and ensure that seriousness of purpose was met with civil discourse.

In 2002, Jim took that approach global when he was appointed to lead the United Nations World Food Programme. He served as executive director of the program for 5 years, caring for and delivering aid to men, women, and children around the world who experienced a level of poverty that is difficult for us to imagine.

These monumental headline-grabbing accomplishments were only a part of who Jim Morris was, though. Indeed, his true legacy was far deeper, more personal, and, I dare say, more beautiful.

He always counseled friends to expand their work to its widest possible sphere of impact, to help more people, or—as he sometimes put it—to find someone who could use a boost.

He practiced what he preached. Indeed, countless Hoosiers have been affected by the small acts of altruism: funding local food banks, building neighborhood basketball courts, and similar generosity that we will never know about.

His servant’s heart, no doubt, stemmed from his deep and abiding faith in God. He was an active member in the Second Presbyterian Church in Indianapolis. He didn’t boast about many of his accomplishments. Instead, he lived a life worthy of the Gospel of Matthew, chapter 20: “Whoever wants to become great among you, must be a servant”—a servant.

I think about our “forgettable” first meeting often. I could be wrong, but Jim probably would have made a poor candidate for public office today. But, you see, that was a choice.

For me, Reverend Henry summed it up at Second Presbyterian, last Friday, in his memorial meditation to Jim. He said that Jim Morris chose—he chose—hope over despair, connection over division, gentleness over meanness, courtesy over discourtesy.

There is power in that choice. Jim Morris chose to be a decent man. He knew, and we must never forget, that no man can truly be great if he is not good. Now, more than ever, we need good men and women like Jim Morris in every corner of our Nation—men and women who become great through selfless service to their communities and endeavor to make life better for the rest of us.

I yield the floor.

## 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 legislative clerk read the nomination of Kashi Way, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

#### VOTE ON WAY NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Way nomination?

Mr. CARPER. 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

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

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VANCE).

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 16, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 218 Ex.]

#### YEAS—79

Baldwin	Fischer	Reed
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Ricketts
Bennet	Graham	Risch
Blumenthal	Grassley	Romney
Booker	Hassan	Rosen
Boozman	Heinrich	Rounds
Braun	Hickenlooper	Sanders
Britt	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Hoeven	Schumer
Budd	Johnson	Shaheen
Butler	Kaine	Sinema
Cantwell	Kelly	Smith
Capito	King	Stabenow
Cardin	Klobuchar	Tester
Carper	Lankford	Thune
Casey	Lujan	Tillis
Cassidy	Lummis	Van Hollen
Collins	Manchin	Warner
Coons	Markey	Warnock
Cornyn	Merkley	Warren
Cortez Masto	Moran	Welch
Cotton	Mullin	Whitehouse
Crapo	Murkowski	Wicker
Daines	Murphy	Wyden
Duckworth	Murray	Young
Durbin	Ossoff	
Fetterman	Peters	

#### NAYS—16

Blackburn	Hawley	McConnell
Cruz	Hyde-Smith	Paul
Ernst	Kennedy	
Hagerty	Marshall	

Rubio	Scott (FL)	Sullivan
Schmitt	Scott (SC)	Tuberville

NOT VOTING—5

Cramer	Menendez	Vance
Lee	Padilla	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). 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.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from Nevada.

## SIGNING AUTHORITY

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Ohio be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions from July 25, 2024, through July 26, 2024.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

## ELIMINATE USELESS REPORTS ACT OF 2024—Continued

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—AMENDMENT  
NO. 3085

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, if good intentions created good laws, there would be no need for congressional debate. I have no doubt that the authors of the bill on the floor genuinely want to protect children, but the bill they have written promises to be Pandora’s box of unintended consequences.

The Kids Online Safety Act, known as KOSA, would impose an unprecedented duty of care on internet platforms to mitigate certain harms associated with mental health, such as anxiety, depression, and eating disorders.

While proponents of the bill claim that the bill is not designed to regulate content, imposing a duty of care on the internet platforms associated with mental health can only lead to one outcome: the stifling of First Amendment-protected speech.

Today’s children live in a world far different from the one I grew up in, and I am the first in line to tell kids: Go outside and touch grass. With the internet, though, today’s children do have some advantages. They have the world at their fingertips, and that can often be a good thing. Just about any question can be answered through the internet by finding a scholarly article or a how-to video with a simple search. Doctors’ and therapists’ offices close at night and on weekends, but support groups are available 24 hours a day online, 7 days a week, for people who share similar concerns or who have had the same health problems. People can connect, share information, and help

each other more easily than ever before. That is the beauty of technological progress.

But the world can also be an ugly place. Like any other tool, the internet can be misused, and parents must be vigilant. Parents must be vigilant in protecting their kids online. It is perhaps understandable that those who sit in this body might seek a government solution to protect children from any harms that may result from spending too much time on the internet, but before we impose a drastic, first-of-its-kind, legal duty on online platforms, we should ensure that the positive aspects of the internet are preserved. That means we have to ensure that the First Amendment rights are protected and that these platforms are provided with clear rules so they can comply with the law. Unfortunately, this bill fails to do that in almost every respect.

As currently written, this bill is far too vague, and many of its provisions are completely undefined. The bill creates a Board that is empowered to regulate content that might affect mental health. Yet KOSA, the bill, does not explicitly define the term “mental health disorder.” Instead, it references the fifth edition of the “Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders” or “the most current successor edition.” So we are going to regulate items on the internet that might cause anxiety or might affect mental health based on a definition that evolves over time in a book, that we are never going to vote on again. It is going to be decided by whoever writes the DSM sixth, seventh, and eighth versions for mental health.

Written this way, not only would someone looking at the law not know what the definition is, but even more concerning, this definition could change without any input from Congress. When the diagnostic manual changes, the law will then be changed according to what the new definition of “mental health” is. The scope of one of the most expansive pieces of Federal tech legislation could drastically change overnight. Congress may not even realize it until after it has already happened. If the diagnostic manual on mental health changes the definition, the law changes, and Congress will have had no input on what the definition of “mental health” is.

None of my colleagues would be comfortable with a definition that effectively delegates—or should be comfortable with a definition that effectively delegates Congress’s legislative authority to an unaccountable third party.

Second, the bill would impose an unprecedented duty of care on internet platforms to mitigate certain harms. It sounds good. They want to mitigate harms such as anxiety, depression, and eating disorders. But the legislation doesn’t define what it considers harmful to minors, and everyone will have a different belief as to what causes harm, much less how online platforms should

go about protecting minors from that harm.

The sponsors of the bill will tell you this is not out of a desire to regulate content, but the requirement that platforms mitigate undefined harms to mental health belies the bill’s effect to regulate online content. How can you mitigate the effects of things that might cause anxiety, because they all involve content? This bill will be setting up a Board to regulate the content of the internet.

Imposing a duty of care on online platforms to mitigate harms associated with mental health can only lead to one outcome: the stifling of constitutionally protected speech.

For example, if online services use endless scrolling to promote Shakespeare’s works or algebra problems or the history of the Roman Empire, would any lawmaker consider that to be harmful? I doubt it, and that is because the website design does not do the harm.

So then you say: We are going to address the design of the website and not the content, but the only way you can mitigate the so-called harm is by mitigating the content. It is content, not design, that this bill will regulate.

Last year, Harvard Medical School’s magazine published a story called “Climate Anxiety; The existential threat posed by climate change is deeply troubling to many young people.” So this bill is going to regulate anxiety. What makes your kid anxious? Well, climate change makes a lot of kids anxious. Are we going to regulate the discussion of climate change for minors?

This article mentioned that among a cohort of more than 10,000 people between the ages of 16 and 25, 60 percent of them are described as being very worried about the climate, and nearly half said they have anxiety affecting their daily functioning because they are worried about the climate. Are we going to protect them by censoring and removing content about climate change?

The world’s most famous climate activist, Greta Thunberg, famously suffers from climate anxiety. Should platforms have stopped her from seeing things about climate warming or cooling or whatever the conjecture is this year? Should they remove that because it makes Greta Thunberg anxious? She has admitted that, as a teenager, Greta wouldn’t eat. She didn’t eat for nearly a year. She lost weight. Some say her growth was stunted. Should we remove climate change discussion from teenagers because it creates anxiety? This bill has the potential to do that.

Under this bill, Greta Thunberg would have been considered a minor, and she could have been deprived from engaging in the online debates that made her famous but also made her anxious.

Anxiety and eating disorders are two of the undefined harms that this bill expects internet platforms to prevent and mitigate. Are those sites going to

allow discussion and debate about the climate? Are they even going to allow the discussion of a person’s story about overcoming an eating disorder? That certainly could make people anxious.

What if you hear the story of someone with anorexia, and it makes you think that you are an anorexic? Instead of getting the moral that it was a bad idea to engage in this sort of psychological problem, it may cause you to be anxious because you now have to address the situation. Could that be regulated? Under this bill, it could.

What will happen is the fear of liability, the fear of lawsuits, the fear of what will happen under the penalties of this bill are going to cause people to censor themselves. Online platforms will be forced or feel themselves forced or coerced to censor themselves.

There is a question: Will pictures of thin models be tolerated lest it result in an eating disorder for the people who see them? There is a discussion of this all over. Now everybody sees, you know, the obese models who are now hired for Sports Illustrated in order to not cause anxiety. Well, if that is done voluntarily by a magazine, by all means, but if we are going to coerce these online platforms and say “you can’t show people who are too thin,” what is too thin? That is one of the results that could happen from this bill.

What about violent images of war? I think even adults are made anxious by that, but what of kids? Should we restrict images of war? There is a war going on in Gaza, and there are a lot of young people with opinions on that. Should we say, “Well, young people shouldn’t be allowed to see images of Gaza because it might make them anxious”?

Should we silence discussions about gun rights from either side—from the right or the left—because it might cause people anxiety? I would think that if you had been in a school where there was a school shooting, every time you would read about it, it would probably cause you anxiety. Should this be something that parents should try to address? or colleges? psychiatrists? By all means, parents should be involved in what their kids do online, but once the government sets it up, it depends on who is on the Board.

If the Democrats are in power—and they aren’t really fond of the Second Amendment—if they are in power, my guess is the people they appoint to the Board will believe that gun ownership or gun use is wrong and causes anxiety and shouldn’t be on children’s sites. Conversely, when the Republicans are in charge—and we are more for allowing the Constitution to be applied through the Second Amendment to gun ownership—we probably would want to police people telling kids they are not allowed to. It works both ways. There is enough to hate this bill from the right and the left because the government shouldn’t be making these blanket decisions.

What of online discussions of sexuality? Would pro-gay or anti-gay discussion cause anxiety in teenagers? I would think it might. This bill would allow the children's online safety to regulate things that cause anxiety. If a discussion of sexuality causes anxiety, it would be eligible under this bill for mitigation.

They didn't want to use "censorship" because it sounds bad, but that is what they want to do. They are appointing a committee called the children's online safety council, which will be able to censor things that cause anxiety: climate change, sexuality.

What about pro-life messaging? Should pro-life discussions cause anxiety in teenage mothers considering abortion? I am guessing that whole scenario from either the pro-life or the pro-abortion, you know, perspective is full of anxiety. But are we going to protect the teenage mom who might be offended that a pregnancy center is offering her a way out or is offering her a lifeline to have her child, because maybe somebody else thinks that she should have an abortion? Maybe she decides one way or another, but it is anxiety. That is probably full of more anxiety than most of us can imagine, but are we going to ban teenagers from seeing that?

This is insane. This bill is not well thought out. This bill is Pandora's box for censorship. In truth, this bill opens the door to nearly limitless content regulation as people can and will argue that most any piece of content could contribute to some form of mental health disorder.

In addition, financial concerns may cause online forums to eliminate all anxiety-inducing content for all users, regardless of age, if the expense for policing teenagers is prohibitive. So think about it. If we make this onerous process that adds a great deal of cost to the people developing the websites and they have to be liable and the State attorneys general can sue them, which this bill allows, maybe they say, "Gosh, is it worth my while having any discussion of anxiety-producing content?" which basically means things that are controversial. "Maybe we should stay away from that." Maybe there will be a self-policing effect to this bill where people are going to say, "I am not going to do it for my adult users because I don't want to be sued."

The bill gives the unlimited right and cause of action for every State attorney general. Some of them are on the far left, some of them are on the far right, and you can imagine each of them has their own pet cause to want to sue to say: You should take this content down.

This bill does not merely regulate the internet; it threatens to stifle important and diverse discussions that are essential to a free society. And who is empowered to help make these decisions? The task is entrusted to a newly established speech police. This bill would create a kids' online safety

council—aka speech police—to decide what constitutes harm to minors and what platforms would have to do to address the harm.

So the harms are broadly defined—mental health, anxiety, gambling, alcohol—but then the specifics of how it is going to be regulated are left to this new regulatory body. This is what many on the right have referred to as giving the power to bureaucrats.

There was a famous case called the Chevron case where they said the government should give deference to anything created by government. That is under review now, but this is the same problem. You are giving power to this new group that can censor that is virtually unlimited and ill-defined. These are the types of decisions that should be made by parents and families, not unelected bureaucrats serving as a censorship committee.

Those are not the only deficiencies of this bill. The bill seeks to protect minors from beer and gambling ads on certain online platforms—not everywhere, just in some places. So we are going to put this duty on some platforms that your kid can't watch gambling ads and can't watch beer ads, but on other platforms, we won't. So there will be a differential to financial cost. Some places won't have to pay anything, and other places will have to pay an amount to figure out how to set up a website that doesn't let kids watch golf with gambling commercials.

The bill seeks to protect kids from beer and gambling ads on certain online platforms, such as Facebook or Hulu. But if those same minors turn their phone off and turn their TV on, they can jolly well watch as much PGA with the announcer saying: FanDuel says gamble on Bryson DeChambeau this week or Rory McIlroy.

This is a bizarre bill. We are going to make it illegal to talk about certain things online or to advertise online for gambling or beer, but your kid can simply turn the TV on and watch PGA, which is full of ads.

You can have a variety of opinions on whether we should have gambling ads on TV, but they are perfectly legal. So we are going to punish certain groups on the internet and still say your kid can just turn the TV on—that is bizarre. It is just completely meaningless and bizarre.

Your kid can watch the Super Bowl with about a thousand beer commercials on it. And I haven't really heard of a lot of people jumping up and down and saying we should ban the Super Bowl or we should say the Super Bowl can't have beer ads. But that is what this says.

So with all the stuff your kid can watch on TV, he is now going to be limited—not on the whole internet, because you can go to PGA.com, and it has got an exemption because it is primarily news on sports. So they carved out all of these exemptions, and then there are going to be certain areas you can't go to on the internet. So this is a

punishment bill for certain aspects of the internet, not all of the internet, because there are a lot of exceptions, and not for TV.

This is a crazy notion. Yet you are going to see it pass overwhelmingly today because of the title: Kids Online Safety Act. Who could oppose that?

There are some tragic stories of people who have committed suicide or died because of things that happened on the internet. No one is here to discount that. But it has to be thoughtful, how we fix it.

Is removing all discussion of climate change, abortion, gambling ads, and beer ads going to do anything that would have addressed the life of any of the children who tragically lost their lives? I think not.

This is a hand-fisted bill that will not fix the problem but will be the first big bill to regulate speech online. It doesn't make any sense.

Should we prevent online platforms from showing kids the same content they can and do see on TV? Should sports viewership be effectively relegated to the preinternet age? You can watch golf on TV; you can't watch golf on a streaming service.

Even if it were possible to shield minors from every piece of content that might cause anxiety, depression, or eating disorders, it still is not enough to comply with KOSA—KOSA is the bill—because KOSA requires websites to treat differently individuals that the platform knows or should have known are minors. As you can realize, it is not easy to tell what someone's age is online.

The standard had been that if there were rules for minors, you had to know they were a minor, and you had to know you were broadcasting adult content to a minor. But it is kind of hard to enforce. So they are going to change the standard from "you knew it was a minor" to "you should have known it was a minor."

This means that the media platforms that earnestly try to comply with the law could be punished because the government thinks it "should have known" a user was a minor. This dumbing down of the standard will broaden the fear of this bill, broaden the impact of this bill, and lead to countless lawsuits.

This bill, then, does not just apply to minors. A "should have known" standard means that this bill is an internetwide regulation. Every website will have to figure out who and how old they are so they don't get in the way of the speech police or they don't get in the way of being sued by the attorney general from that State.

This is opening pandora's box. It is not going to be just sites that might have kids. It is every website, every streaming service that is now going to have to police themselves at a cost and live in fear of these people coming after them.

Adults and minors alike better get comfortable with providing a form of

ID every time they wish to visit a website. This knowledge standard destroys the notion of internet privacy and interactivity.

I raised several questions about this bill today, but no one—not even the sponsors of this bill—can answer these questions honestly because they don't know the answers. They are creating something that is going to create the regulation of the internet.

This is the problem of most of the legislation in Washington. They are not creating the censorship standards. They are creating an autonomous body that will regulate things that cause anxiety. They haven't told us what causes anxiety.

So I have given you examples. They are not in the bill because the bill doesn't tell what this new body is going to regulate. It says things that cause anxiety, things that might involve gambling or beer or eating disorders. It could be any of those things. But they are just going to tell you that we are going to let this body decide.

So the Senate is not going to decide what they are going to censor today. They are going to create a committee today that then will be the censorship committee, and, at a later date, we will decide what they want to censor. This is an insane encroachment on the First Amendment.

The inability to answer these questions is a result of several vague provisions in this bill, and once enacted into law, these questions will not be answered by elected representatives. They will be answered by unelected bureaucrats who are on this council, who will make the decision as to what will be censored.

There are good reasons to think that the courts will strike this bill down. They would have a host of reasons to do so. Vagueness pervades the bill. The most meaningful terms are undefined, making compliance with the bill nearly impossible. Even if we discount the many and obvious First Amendment violations inherent in this bill, the courts will likely find this bill void for vagueness. We can only hope so.

But we should not rely on the courts to save America from this poorly drafted bill. The Senate can reject this bill today and force the sponsors to at least provide greater clarity of the bill.

This bill, KOSA, is a Trojan horse. It purports to protect our children by claiming limitless ability to regulate speech and depriving them of the benefits of the internet, which include engaging with like-minded individuals, expressing themselves freely, as well as participating in debates among others with different opinions.

Government mandates and censorship will not protect children online. The internet may pose new problems, but there is an age-old solution to this issue. Free minds and parental guidance are the best means to protect our children online.

Opposition to this bill is bipartisan, from advocates on the right to the left.

A pro-life organization, Students for Life Action, commented on this bill stating:

Once again, a piece of federal legislation with broad powers and vague definitions threatens pro-life speech. . . . those targeted by a weaponized federal government will always include pro-life Americans, defending mothers and their children—born and [unborn].

Students for Life Action concluded their statement by saying:

Already the pro-life generation faces discrimination, deplatforming, and short and long term bans on social media on the whims of others. Students for Life calls for a No vote on [this bill] to prevent viewpoint discrimination from becoming federal policy at the FTC.

So you could say: I don't really care. I am on the other side of that issue. I am a liberal, and I am pro-abortion. I don't care what pro-life students say.

Well, maybe you should care what the ACLU has to say about this. The ACLU brought more than 300 high school students to Capitol Hill to urge Congress to vote no on this bill because, to quote the ACLU, "it would give the government the power to decide what content is dangerous to young people, enabling censorship and endangering access to important resources, like gender identity support, mental health materials, and reproductive healthcare."

So here you have it. You have people on one side who are pro-life, like myself, who are worried that pro-life language will be stifled because it might cause anxiety on teenagers. But you have people on the other side, such as the ACLU, who would have—I believe when they refer to "reproductive healthcare" they are talking about abortion. They are worried that people in favor of abortion would be stifled as well.

This bill is opposed from the right and the left by anybody who is thoughtful about freedom of speech, about freedom of association, about freedom of discussion of ideas online.

In the next few minutes, I will ask unanimous consent to have an amendment to this bill. What you will notice is, while the supporters of this bill will come forward and say, "It doesn't do that; it doesn't do that," one thing that is for certain is they won't allow amendments to this. So there will be no amendments to this bill.

The reason I am asking for an amendment from the floor is because they have already said privately they will not allow amendments.

One reason they won't allow amendments is, when I read the content of my amendment, people would be aghast that anybody could vote against it. And a vote against it would be deeply damaging for people running for office, Republican or Democrat.

The bill contains too many flaws as is. Even my one amendment wouldn't fix this bill, but at least put people on the record who don't believe that there should be restrictions for limiting religious or social speech.

The Senate should tackle the most glaring problem with this bill: that it will silence political, social, and religious speech.

My amendment seeks to address this concern, shared by many in the pro-life movement, as well as anyone who values the principles of free speech. My amendment merely states that no regulations that will be put forward by this magical and mysterious new censorship police that will be in the future—who we don't know who they are, and we don't know what they will be regulating—but if my amendment were to pass, they will not be allowed to regulate, and it will not apply to political, social, and religious speech. Another name for that would be constitutionally protected speech.

My amendment is intended to address the legitimate concern that the bill threatens free speech online. If the supporters of this legislation really want to leave content alone, they will allow the amendment. So the fact that they will deny me this amendment effectively tells Americans they don't want any dissent, and they acknowledge that this is a bill of censorship.

They don't want anything to mitigate or lessen the ability for the committee to censor you. So they will not allow this amendment. They won't even allow a vote on it because they are afraid to be on record. Really, the sponsors of the bill are here today, and they will rebut my words. I would like them to state publicly for all of us how they would vote on the amendment and why they are blocking the amendment.

If the supporters of this legislation really do want to leave content alone, they will welcome and vote for my amendment to protect political, social, and religious speech.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that if cloture is invoked on the motion to concur with further amendment in the House amendment to S. 2073, amendment No. 3022 be set aside, and it be in order for me to call up my amendment No. 3085. I further ask that, at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Republican leader, there be 30 minutes of debate, equally divided between the proponents and opponents of my amendment; finally, that following the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote on my amendment No. 3085 with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETERS). Is there objection?

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have listened to my colleague from Kentucky, and in the interest of time, I think the very simple answer and the reason for my objection is: Read the bill. Read the bill.

If you read the bill, you will see, for example, there is no empowering of attorneys general to enforce this measure; there is no vagueness in these provisions. They were crafted narrowly to target specific evils—real evils—that destroy lives.

And if he thinks that this bill, as he has termed it, is “crazy” and “bizarre,” he should tell the parents and the young people who have come to us over these past years—to Senator BLACKBURN and myself—with harrowing stories of the destructive harm to their children’s lives, and young people telling us about those harms to their own lives.

The principle of this bill is very simple: It does not empower those unelected bureaucrats—which, again, unfortunately, our colleague from Kentucky has misread. It empowers young people and parents. It gives them choices. It enables them to take back control over their own lives. It enables the strongest settings of safety by default. It requires companies to disable product features that are destructive. It gives young people and parents tools to opt out, to choose not to be a part of algorithm recommendations that fuel destructive mental health harms. It gives them safeguards to shield themselves against online predators and options to protect their own information.

Young people and parents deserve these kinds of choices to make on their own. That is the principle of the bill.

And so this mischaracterization is regrettable, but I know that my colleagues are going to see through it—they are going to see that this bill is very specific, not vague; narrowly targeted, not broad—to protect children and give parents and kids choices that enable them to take back control over their own lives.

And let me just say, there is no censorship in this bill—none, zero. It is about product design, much as it would be about a car that is unsafe and is required to have seatbelts and airbags.

We wouldn’t credit an argument by a car manufacturer that somehow it is a First Amendment right of expression to eliminate those car seats and airbags that protect lives. It would be ludicrous. It would be laughable, and so are these objections that have been made by my colleague from Kentucky.

I am proud of the work that we have done on a bipartisan basis over these years. This bill is the result of bipartisan, careful, methodical, time-consuming work by Senator BLACKBURN and myself listening to those parents and young people but also—and let me be very blunt here—listening to the Big Tech companies. They have come to us, and they have said, in effect: Trust us. Trust us. We will take care of it.

We have seen this movie before. We know how it ends: No action. “Trust us” is no longer tolerable, and one reason it is no longer tolerable is we have looked under the hood. We have seen how the car works. We have seen it from their own documents, their own files, their own written product designs. And we have seen their business model, which is repetitive, toxic stuff driven at kids and more eyeballs meaning more advertisers, meaning more dollars if those kids are online for longer periods of time without the

choices that we are giving them to disconnect.

We are no longer going to trust Big Tech to do the job. We are determined that we will make this product safer by empowering young people and their parents and creating a duty of care—not vague, not overbroad, but carefully crafted—to make sure that these companies have to prevent the kind of harms that they know are happening.

We know they are happening because the documents show it, and their own evidence, in effect, proves it. And we are not going to trust them anymore to comply with the law; we are going to require audits and transparency, access to the black box algorithms so that they are held accountable.

This bill is a major step toward online safety for children, and I am hopeful that my colleagues will, in fact, see through the inaccuracies in the arguments that have just been made here and that they will join Senator BLACKBURN and me, as 70 have done in co-sponsoring this measure, to say it is time for online safety.

I yield to my colleague from Tennessee, Senator BLACKBURN, who has been a steadfast and invaluable partner in this effort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, who has worked so diligently on this.

This legislation has been years in the making, as he has said. Basically, the amending process has gone on for 3 years. And as I mentioned, 70 Members of this body have joined to sponsor this legislation.

To the concerns that my colleague expressed, I want him to know this is not a speech bill. This is not a content bill. No agency can make rules on speech. Nonprofits are not covered in this bill. There is no rulemaking. News outlets are not covered in this. The government is given no new authority. And when he mentioned websites and blogs, the Kids Online Safety Act only covers social media, social networks, multiplayer online video games, social messaging apps, video streaming services. It does not include blogs and personal websites.

Now, the question he was saying that the Kids Online Safety Act covers platforms that are run by nonprofits: Websites run by nonprofit organizations, which often host important and valuable education and support services, are not covered in the scope of this legislation. And these are important points to make.

And as Senator BLUMENTHAL said, reading the bill, you see this is a product design. The duty of care that is there, it requires social media companies to prevent and mitigate certain harms that they know their platforms and products are causing to young users as a result of their design choices, such as their recommendation algorithms, their addictive product features.

The specific covered harms include suicide, eating disorders, substance use disorders, and sexual exploitation. And these are the reasons for having this duty of care and having this included in the Kids Online Safety Act.

But, no, it is not a speech bill. It is not a content bill. It does not include rulemaking authority. It has no rulemaking authority in the legislation, and it does not give additional authority to the government, and it does not give more authority to State attorneys general or to the FTC.

So I think the fears are unfounded. This is a good product, good legislation. We have worked with our colleagues. We have heard from thousands—thousands—of kids and parents, pediatricians, teachers, principals, mental health professionals, and everyone has come to the table to say: It is time to hold Big Tech accountable for what is happening to our kids.

And I yield back to my colleague from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I just want to add—and I thank Senator BLACKBURN for her excellent summary and argument—about this reference to social speech: We are dealing here with social media companies. This proposed rule of construction, in effect, would destroy the bill. That is the intent here, and we are not going to let it happen.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, a few comments on the support the authors of the bill have come forward with.

The discussion is that State attorneys are not empowered when, in actuality, if you read the bill, the State attorneys are empowered. They are specifically referred to in the bill, and they are specifically empowered to sue if and when the Child Online Safety Committee promulgates rules to the FTC. This is specifically given to all these State attorneys, but also the rulemaking authority is given in the bill.

State attorneys general will also be allowed to sue even if no rule is made. This does empower State attorneys general across the Nation to sue over whether or not people are adequately suppressing or censoring speech based on anxiety. So that is a factual dispute we have with the authors.

One of the authors says: We can’t trust the online people. We can’t trust the people hosting these platforms.

Well, of course you can’t. That is why you are supposed to be parents. That is why you are supposed to be involved with your church and community and you are supposed to try to police. Everything is imperfect, but you are supposed to try. It isn’t the government.

So he says: We can’t trust them.

But, you know what, I have also heard another comment: Trust us; we are from the government. Trust us; we are going to give this Child Online Safety Committee unlimited, unchecked power to regulate anything that causes your teenager to feel anxiety—from climate change to sexuality to who knows what to eating disorders to thin models to gambling on the PGA or any website, or beer commercials. This is Pandora's box, and we need to be aware of what it actually does allow to occur.

The rule of construction, the amendment that is being blocked, is typical. This is a bill to block free speech. So in order to pass a bill to block free speech, you block the free speech on the floor of the Senate and disallow amendments.

Who in America would think it would be wrong to limit this bill and to protect political, social, and religious speech? That is what they are actually saying. They won't allow amendment on it, but they are not for exempting political, social, or religious speech. What does that mean? It means they conclude that the bill will allow regulation of political, social, and religious speech.

Mark my words: We will revisit this issue. The court is either going to strike this thing down or we are going to come back here in a year or two, and people are going to go: Oh, my God. Did anybody read the bill before they passed it?

They have 70 cosponsors because nobody reads the bills. Nobody thinks of the implications of the bill. The bill gives virtually unlimited purview to the Children's Online Safety Committee to determine what causes anxiety.

Everything causes anxiety in teenagers. Every controversial subject could potentially cause anxiety. This is a huge mistake to give this authority to unelected bureaucrats—who we don't know who they are yet or who will appoint them—who will make the decisions over what causes anxiety.

So while these people—I grant them good motives. I grant them wanting to do the best for people. I grant that there are terrible and tragic cases where children have committed suicide or otherwise, but this isn't the answer. The answer isn't to abbreviate or take away the precious rights guaranteed under the First Amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Members be permitted to speak prior to the scheduled vote: Senator MARKEY for up to 5 minutes, Senator CASSIDY for up to 5 minutes, Senator KLOBUCHAR for up to 5 minutes, Senator SCHATZ for up to 10 minutes, Senator CRUZ for up to 5 minutes, Senator BLUMENTHAL for up to 5 minutes, Senator BLACKBURN for up to 10 minutes, and Senator SCHUMER for up to 5 minutes.

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

S. 2073

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I rise today in defense of the mental health of children and teenagers in the United States of America.

Our young people today are facing a devastating mental health crisis. I have said these statistics on the floor before, but they bear repeating because they come from the Centers for Disease Control in our country: One in three high school girls in the United States seriously considered suicide in 2021 and at least one in ten high school girls attempted suicide that year; among LGBTQ youth, the number is more like one in five attempted suicide. That is staggering, and it is unacceptable that Big Tech has knowingly contributed to these disturbing numbers.

And let's just move on. Take it from the U.S. Surgeon General who, just a few weeks ago, referred to the young mental health crisis as an "emergency" and identified social media as an "important contributor" to that crisis.

Over the next week, the U.S. Senate has a chance, finally, to do something about it, to stand up to Big Tech's lobbying machine and put an end to the invasive targeting and tracking of young people online.

Today we have a procedural vote to move ahead on the Kids Online Safety Act, which includes my legislation partnering with Senator CASSIDY, the Children and Teens' Online Privacy Protection Act, or COPPA 2.0. Our legislation cuts to the heart of this emergency by addressing Big Tech's financial incentives to keep kids and teens addicted to social media and allows kids, parents, and teens to say no to the endless tracking and targeting of young people online in our country, because as long as Big Tech can profit off of young people's addiction, they will find ways to do so.

And our job is to change those incentives, to change Big Tech's business model so that addicting kids and teens does not lead to fatter wallets and larger bonuses for Big Tech executives. The core problem facing children and teens is Big Tech's relentless and unyielding drive to accumulate more and more data on its users.

This data may seem vague and uncertain, but it is anything but vague and uncertain. It is a child's name, a child's email address, a child's location, their height, their weight, their health conditions, their fingerprints and facial scan, their likes, their dislikes, even their sexual orientation and gender identity. Why? Targeted advertising by Big Tech companies.

With more data, the platforms can develop more effective targeted ads; ads that are chosen to match the user's specific age, location, and interests; ads that are displayed at a certain time of day when the algorithm knows a user is most likely to click them; and soon, with the advent of artificial in-

telligence, perhaps ads that are even generated just for the individual user. That is the promise of AI.

All of this hyperpersonalized advertising requires huge amounts of data on an individual user. Data is the fuel for Big Tech's profit machine, the raw material that sustains Big Tech's business model. The formula is simple: More time on social media means more data to fuel the targeted advertising machine, which means more profits for Big Tech. More addiction equals more data equals more money for Big Tech. Very simple. And they target teenagers and children in our country in the same way that the tobacco industry targeted teenagers and children.

And it is a lot of money.

In 2022, the major Big Tech platforms earned nearly \$11 billion from U.S. users under the age of 18—\$11 billion. That is 11 billion reasons to build ever more sophisticated data profiles on younger users; 11 billion reasons to develop new addictive features; 11 billion reasons to keep your young people clicking, swiping, and liking all day long.

With the growth of artificial intelligence, Big Tech's appetite for data has never been greater. And that means the privacy of our young people has never been more at risk. The question, then, is how to change Big Tech's incentives to develop platforms that benefit children and teens rather than addict them. And if Big Tech no longer has an incentive to maximize the data collected on a young person, it will lose the incentive to develop ever-changing methods to addict that child or teen in the first place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time expired.

Mr. MARKEY. May I ask for one additional minute?

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

Mr. MARKEY. Here is what the bill does. One, it will ban targeted advertising to children and teens. Two, it will create an eraser button to delete children and teens' data. And, three, stop the unnecessary data collection practices of online platforms.

With these updates, the Senate has an opportunity to pass the most comprehensive privacy law for young people in over 25 years and send a message to Big Tech that these days of invading and exploiting young people must come to an end.

We have to stop business as usual. That is what we are going to vote on today, to begin this process procedurally to get it out on the floor of the Senate substantively for an historic vote next week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, think about how much has happened over the last several weeks. We have had one Presidential candidate survive an assassination attempt. Our current President is dropping out of the race. We



have had protesters burning an American flag and raising a Palestinian flag as the United States' closest ally gave a speech to Congress yesterday. That is how much has happened in several weeks.

Guess what hasn't happened in 25 years? An update of how to protect children on their online experience. That has not changed in 25 years, even when so much happens in just a few weeks. So rules from 25 years ago cannot effectively govern social media sites that did not exist 25 years ago, were not conceived of 25 years ago.

We have waited too long to update these rules, but today we have a chance to fix. The current armor protecting children's internet activity passed into law in 1998. Babies born that year are well into their professional careers. People were concerned about Y2K, and Nick Saban had not become LSU's football coach.

Of course, the 1998 rules do not prohibit Instagram, Facebook, and TikTok from collecting personal information on young teenagers without consent because that was not envisioned 25 years ago.

Today, the internet is an integral part of a child's life. The information a child has access to has drastically expanded, exposing children to risks that they may not have the maturity to navigate independently.

The internet has so many good things and can be a great learning tool for our children. But we can't ignore the dangers—the adult content, the pornography, the cyber bullying, the violence, the predatory behavior, the overall impact upon our children's mental health. Our children should not be left to face these challenges alone. Under current law, the law passed in 1998—good for the time, but not for now—only children less than age 13 were covered, leaving a whole population of teenagers unprotected.

With 95 percent of teenagers between 13 and 17 using social media, their protections should be expanded. By expanding these protections, by banning targeted advertising, by limiting data collection, and strengthening parental control, COPPA 2.0 enables safer online experiences and guards against exposure to manipulation and exploitation. This, in lockstep with the Kids Online Safety Act, or KOSA, will give the parents the peace of mind to know their child is safer than they were before.

These bills empower parents. They empower children. They are bipartisan no-brainers, which is why they have overwhelming bipartisan support in both Chambers of Congress.

Look, I am a doctor, a father, a grandfather. But I am not the only grandfather and father voting on these pieces of legislation. Anyone with children knows that they would do anything to protect those children. Congress has a chance to reflect that paternal and maternal instinct and take a serious step to protect our children. These bills will make a difference. I urge my colleagues to support.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today because the time to protect our kids from these online platforms is now, after decades of delay, thanks to our colleagues, Senators BLUMENTHAL, BLACKBURN, MARKEY, and CASSIDY, as well as Chair CANTWELL and Ranking Member CRUZ, Judiciary Committee Chair DURBIN and Leader SCHUMER, as well as Ranking Member GRAHAM. I serve on both committees. I have been a strong proponent of these bills as well as others.

For too long, social media companies have turned a blind eye when children join their platforms and build algorithms that push harmful content out to kids.

What have we seen? A recent study from the Mayo Clinic showed us—the study found kids have difficulty sleeping, unrealistic expectations about their bodies or their lives, exposure to online predators, subject to cyber bullying. The result of this is tragic results for teens.

I am thinking of Devin Norring from Hastings, MN. I have gotten to know his mom Bridgette. Struggling with migraines, he bought what he thought was Percocet online on Snapchat, but it wasn't really Percocet. It was laced with fentanyl. Right off Snapchat, he got that pill. He died.

Alexander Neville, like Devin, purchased a pill online that turned out to be counterfeit made with fentanyl. It killed him. He was only 14.

Carson Bride ended his life 4 years ago after he was viciously cyber bullied by his high school classmates who were using Snapchat's anonymous app. Not so anonymous for Carson Bride.

I met with their moms. They have come to the Capitol. They are here today. It is time to get this done with no delay. Why do they even need to be here? Because there weren't safeguards and rules already in place.

Why didn't these companies act when they learned of the danger? Let's be clear. They knew of the danger. This is about profits over safety.

When that Boeing plane door fell out, what happened? We grounded the fleet. We made sure it was safe. Why haven't we been doing this here?

It is time to act. It has been 26 years since Congress passed any meaningful kids' online privacy legislation. I am so honored that the chair of the Judiciary Committee is here, Senator DURBIN, who helped me and Senator CORNYN to get the SHIELD Act through this Chamber, which would prohibit the online distribution of explicit and intimate images, also known as revenge porn.

We just passed Senator DURBIN's DEFIANCE Act, with Senator HAWLEY and Senator GRAHAM and myself, to allow victims of explicit deepfakes to seek the justice that they deserve.

The Kids Online Safety and Privacy Act before us will expand existing laws

to protect children online. It also goes further to ensure a safe online environment for children by creating a legal duty for social media companies to take all necessary steps to protect kids from harmful features and algorithms on their platforms.

I will never forget the parent who once told me that she was relying on her older kids because she couldn't figure out how to stop her younger kid from putting up more and more apps, and she couldn't get around it. She said it was like water overflowing a sink, and she was out there by herself with a mop trying to mop it up. I thought that kind of said it all for how parents feel. We need to stand by their side.

In addition to the bills that are so important before us today, we need to pass the Cooper Davis and Devin Norring Act, which requires social media companies to report illegal drug sales on their platforms. To law enforcement, that bill is heading this way to the floor.

We need to finally take this on; not put our heads in the sand, not expect those parents to be out there with a mop while these big companies are profiting off of their kids. This is a moment, but this is only a beginning. There is so much more work to do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, while there is no doubt our country has greatly benefited from the internet, for some families, it has come at a painful and even tragic cost.

Every parent I know is concerned about the online threats directed at our kids. Whether it is predators targeting children or online videos promoting self-harm, risky life choices, or undermining their lack of self-esteem, we all know someone who has had to grapple with the failure of Big Tech to take responsibility for the harms caused by its products.

Today, the Senate is beginning to put Big Tech on notice. The Kids Online Safety Act, or KOSA, and the Children and Teens' Online Privacy Protection Act, or COPPA 2.0, will both help keep children safer online and protect their privacy.

I want to thank Senators BLACKBURN, BLUMENTHAL, MARKEY, and CANTWELL for collaborating with me and my team over the past year to significantly improve both measures.

In KOSA, we added an express preemption provision that will help limit the litigation magnet from a patchwork of State laws.

We eliminated all FTC rulemaking authority, putting in place guardrails against government overreach.

Importantly, we also struck an important balanced approach on the obligation tech companies have with respect to determining whether a user online is a minor in both KOSA and COPPA 2.0. Instead of the current law's age-verification approach—an actual knowledge standard that has permitted

tech companies to rely on children absurdly claiming to have been born in 1882—tech companies will now have to bear more responsibility to enforce underage online accounts. This update is not a constructive knowledge standard, but it reflects, rather, a balance that puts greater responsibility on tech companies without imposing unfeasible requirements.

Nearly 30 years after the original COPPA's passage, the internet has changed, and I believe COPPA 2.0 meets the moment to update the current privacy issues effectively.

Congress should continue to build off the specific bipartisan provisions in COPPA 2.0 for children's privacy and enact a comprehensive data privacy bill. In the Commerce Committee, I intend to continue that work.

KOSA and COPPA 2.0 are important first steps in protecting children online, but we are not finished. More work remains to be done.

Senator KLOBUCHAR and I have together introduced the Take It Down Act, which targets bad actors who use AI to create and publish on social media sites fake, explicit imagery of real people—often teenage girls. The Take It Down Act gives them the justice they deserve by criminalizing the spread of so-called revenge porn and requiring Big Tech to remove the images immediately upon notice by the victim. It also applies to fake images made using AI, deepfake images that we are seeing more and more becoming a plague targeting young people and in particular young women.

Senator SCHATZ and I have also introduced the Kids Off Social Media Act, KOSMA, which builds upon KOSA by addressing specific harms to children from social media—especially in schools. Big Tech claims users under 13 aren't permitted, so KOSMA makes that explicit. It prohibits children under 13 from having social media accounts. It stops companies from targeting minors, and it requires schools to block social media in school.

I hope this body will meet parents where they are and say enough is enough. Let's also soon pass KOSMA because there is no good reason for an 8-year-old to be on Instagram or a teenager to be doom-scrolling Twitter in a classroom at taxpayers' expense.

Parents across the country agree: It is time Congress answered the call and held Big Tech accountable. I am proud to work alongside Republicans and Democrats. I am proud of the work the Commerce Committee has done to bring KOSA and COPPA 2.0 forward. I look forward to continuing this critically important work of protecting our kids online.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BUTLER). The clerk will call the roll.

The 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.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 708.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Stacey D. Neumann, of Maine, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maine.

### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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 Executive Calendar No. 708, Stacey D. Neumann, of Maine, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maine.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Peter Welch, John W. Hickenlooper, Margaret Wood Hassan, Jack Reed, Laphonza R. Butler, Richard Blumenthal, Benjamin L. Cardin, Tammy Baldwin, Christopher Murphy, Chris Van Hollen, Catherine Cortez Masto, Tammy Duckworth, Christopher A. Coons, Brian Schatz, Sheldon Whitehouse.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent the mandatory quorum call for the cloture motion filed today, July 25, be waived.

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

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

### ELIMINATE USELESS REPORTS ACT OF 2024—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

S. 2073

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, I know we are waiting for our colleague from Indiana to come to the floor, so as we do, today, we are moving to a cloture vote on the Kids Online Safety Act. This is something Senator BLUMENTHAL and I have worked on over the last 3 years, and we are grateful

that we are now to this day. We introduced this bill about 3 years ago, after a series of hearings where it became evident that platforms like Instagram knew they were causing rising rates of eating disorders, mental health issues among teenage girls, and yet they were downplaying these harms.

Since then, we have seen more and more evidence that Big Tech is focused on putting profit over children's safety. Children are the product when they are online. We have seen internal documents from these companies that show they know what they are doing to our kids.

We have worked tirelessly over the last 3 years to get this bill in shape. It will create new tools for parents to identify harmful behavior and to report abuse directly to those social media sites.

It will provide new controls for families to support their children, including to opt out of algorithmic recommendations.

It will require mandatory audits of the social media platforms to ensure that the platforms are mitigating harms to children.

Perhaps most importantly, it will create a duty of care for online platforms to prevent and mitigate specific dangers to minors, including the promotion of suicide, eating disorders, substance abuse, and sexual exploitation.

Without real and enforceable reforms, social media companies will only continue to pay lipservice to the issue of protecting children while putting profits over their safety.

I am grateful to my colleague Senator BLUMENTHAL and to Senator SCHUMER for his leadership in allowing the vote today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, while we are waiting, I understand, for one of our colleagues to come and do a live UC, I just want to echo my colleague Senator BLACKBURN's thanks to all of our friends and colleagues in this body for their support.

We have reached 70 cosponsors, and I anticipate with gratitude an overwhelming bipartisan majority in favor of this bill. I want to thank in particular Senator SCHUMER, who has provided leadership on this bill that I think is going to be long remembered. Certainly, it will be remembered by the parents and children who have driven advocacy for this measure. They may be in the gallery now. I don't know for sure. But I think on behalf of all of us, we owe them a great debt of thanks.

And, again, this bill addresses a longstanding problem for this Nation. We can no longer rely on the promises of Big Tech. We can no longer take at face value the promises of "trust me." "We will take care of it." We are giving choices, and we are empowering young people and their parents, providing