

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.