

want to give them pause. They need to think before they do that.

Our update removes the “otherwise objectionable” standard that I mentioned previously, and it replaces it with some specific terms that would protect platforms when they remove content that promotes terrorism, promotes self-harm, or is unlawful.

You know, it is a good thing when Congress can be specific in what they mean and when they can be specific in the intent of the law. Changing this language would provide that specificity that is needed.

Last but not least, the bill clarifies the definition of “information content provider” to include a person or entity that creates, develops, or editorializes information provided through the internet or any other online platform.

Now, this will help online publishers, periodicals, and websites that are news websites. But then you have Big Tech block them because somebody puts up something in the comment section that Big Tech doesn't like. Of course, we all are familiar with Mark Zuckerberg saying that his company, Facebook, works more like a government than a corporation. So, this pulls back on what they have used as their control.

There has been a lot of discussion in this Chamber regarding the best way to handle section 230. Many argue that we would all be better off if Congress wiped the statute off the books and just got rid of it completely. But I will tell you, I fully believe that is a misguided approach. That strategy will not temper the effects of Big Tech's bias because their bias stretches far beyond interactions that raise section 230 concerns.

This isn't a simple issue. Those of us who have been working on section 230 for years are still studying the ripple effects these changes will bring. What we know for sure is that simply closing the book on section 230 via congressional decree would be like casting a protest vote against Big Tech's bad behavior. It would be absolutely pointless.

Until we recognize the importance of clarifying and preserving liability protections for the internet we have now and not—not—the internet we had in 1996, Big Tech will keep pushing the boundaries until private corporations will become judge and jury over not only how Americans discover new information but what information is actually there to discover.

It is time for the U.S. Senate to step up, to do the work, and to write those changes into law.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The 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 Mark C. Scarsi, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

Mitch McConnell, Martha McSally, Tom Cotton, Rob Portman, Kevin Cramer, John Barrasso, Roy Blunt, John Boozman, Marco Rubio, Richard Burr, Mike Crapo, Roger F. Wicker, John Cornyn, Lamar Alexander, John Thune, Steve Daines, James Lankford.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Mark C. Scarsi, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or change their vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 77, nays 12, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 169 Ex.]

YEAS—77

Alexander	Ernst	Menendez
Baldwin	Feinstein	Murkowski
Barrasso	Fischer	Murphy
Bennet	Gardner	Paul
Blackburn	Graham	Perdue
Blunt	Grassley	Peters
Boozman	Hassan	Portman
Braun	Hawley	Reed
Brown	Heinrich	Risch
Burr	Hoeven	Roberts
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Romney
Cardin	Inhofe	Rosen
Carper	Johnson	Rounds
Casey	Jones	Rubio
Collins	Kaine	Sasse
Cornyn	King	Schatz
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Leahy	Scott (SC)
Crapo	Lee	Shaheen
Cruz	Loeffler	Shelby
Duckworth	Manchin	Sinema
Durbin	McConnell	Smith
Enzi	McSally	Stabenow

Sullivan
Tester
Thune

Udall
Warner
Whitehouse

Wicker
Young

NAYS—12

Blumenthal
Booker
Cantwell
Gillibrand

Hirono
Klobuchar
Markley
Merkley

Schumer
Van Hollen
Warren
Wyden

NOT VOTING—11

Cassidy
Coons
Cramer
Daines

Harris
Kennedy
Moran
Murray

Sanders
Tillis
Toomey

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 77, the nays are 12.

The motion is agreed to.

The majority leader.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the confirmation vote with respect to the Scarsi nomination occur at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow; further, if cloture is invoked on the Blumenfeld nomination, the postcloture time with respect to the Blumenfeld nomination expire at 2:15 p.m. tomorrow, the Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination, and following disposition of the Blumenfeld nomination, the Senate vote on the motions to invoke cloture on the Holcomb and Robinson nominations in the order listed; further, if cloture is invoked on the Holcomb nomination, the postcloture time with respect to the nomination expire at 5:15 p.m. tomorrow and the Senate vote on the confirmation of the nomination. I further ask that if cloture is invoked on the Robinson nomination, the postcloture time expire at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Democratic leader on Wednesday, September 16; finally, that if any of the nominations are confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message