House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Thursday, June 11, 2020, at 9 a.m.

Senate

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2020

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Our Father in heaven, may Your name be praised. Lord, use our Senators today to permit justice to rule in our land. Remind them that righteousness exalts a nation, but sin is an equal opportunity destroyer. As our lawmakers strive to do Your will, reward their faithfulness. Illuminate their hearts with Your wisdom and love. Help them to remember that the entire ethical requirement is fulfilled by loving your neighbor as you love yourself. May this love for those in need hasten the day when justice will roll down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream. Continue to be our strength and fortress, sustaining us with Your amazing grace.

We pray in Your merciful name.

Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. Loeffler).

The Senator from Iowa, Mr. GRASSLEY, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute in morning business, please.

The Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act

Mr. GRASSLEY, Madam President, the virus pandemic underscores the very vital contribution pharmaceutical sciences make for our Nation's public health, our Nation's economic prosperity, and our way of life. It also confirms that we need a policy solution to treat soaring healthcare prices.

The American people want the best medical cures at prices they can afford. The Prescription Drug Pricing Act is a winning solution. Let's get it to the President's desk without delay. It will help secure our American way of life in a post-pandemic world for generations to come.

I yield the floor.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Recognition of the Majority Leader

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, yesterday, I explained that pushing the envelope and airing disagreements are necessary in a free market of ideas.
But 1 week ago, the Gray Lady finally met her match. Vladimir Putin? No problem. Iranian propaganda? Sure.

But nothing could have prepared them for 800 words from the junior Senator from Arkansas.

Senator Cotton wrote an op-ed explaining a position which one survey found 58 percent of Americans agreed with. He argued that leadership in several cities had proven they either couldn’t or wouldn’t stop the riots, so President Joe Biden should use National Guard troops to secure the peace, as several Presidents have in our history. His view was controversial, no question, but there is also no question it was a legitimate view for a Senator to express.

Looting and arson were crippling cities nightly. Some local authorities seemed to be functionally sacrificing their cities’ small businesses to appease pacified radicals. No problem. Iranian propaganda? Sure.

But nothing could have prepared them for airing the argument. The paper for airing the argument. The Senator’s employees flooded social media to claim physical safety with the Senator’s employees. They had called for a crackdown on peaceful protesters, and instead of telling them to go take a hike, the paper pleaded guilty and begged for mercy. Their readers’ comfortable bubble was re-infated. Their safe space was safe again.

Now, our colleague from Arkansas has a unique job. The far left cannot write angry emails to a university president or a publisher to get him fired. He cannot be silenced by professionals of outrage or the use of magic words like “problematic.” His only boss is his constituents.

This broader, leftwing obsession with banning heretics from the public square will be poison for this country if it persists. Our Republic can survive a pandemic, it can survive civil unrest, but ideas and deliberation are our very foundation. America cannot be American if civil disagreement becomes a contradiction in terms.

The liberal tradition in this country used to pride itself on being broad-minded, but we have spent years making our public universities more like private businesses. They didn’t pop up overnight. It has taken more than a century of dedicated work to designate, acquire, and maintain the public lands Americans enjoy today. The Land and Water Conservation Fund, which this legislation will give permanent support, that makes them accessible for generations to come.

To that, in more than 5 million Americans rely directly on outdoor recreation for their livelihood. They contribute to $778 billion in economic activity. In recent years, their industry’s growth has outpaced an economy that was red-hot in its own right. A bright future for our public lands is a bright future for our Nation, and a predictable, consistent support provided by the LWCF will play a critical role in these efforts.

Take my home State of Kentucky, for example. For years, I have been proud to advocate for LWCF funding to conserve some of the Bluegrass’s precious wilderness and historic sites. Back in 1996, Kentucky was the only State without a national wildlife refuge, and it was my legislation that helped secure the creation of one at Clarks River.

Last year, additional legislation I authored helped create another sanctuary for wildlife and recreation at the confluence of the Green and Ohio Rivers. Already, the Fish and Wildlife Service has marked the Green River Wildlife Refuge as the LWCF’s top funding priority for the coming year. The dedicated resources in this legislation would be instrumental in the growth of Kentucky’s newest national treasure, along with other areas like Clarks River.

As the LWCF drives the preservation of more national wetlands, forests, and battlefield space in Kentucky, I suspect every dollar spent through the Land and Water Conservation Fund turns out $4 in economic benefit. Every $1 million directed toward the LWCF in this country.

THE GREAT AMERICAN OUTDOORS ACT

Mr. McCONNELL, Madam President, now on to an entirely different matter. Thanks to the bipartisan leadership of colleagues like Senators Daines, Gardner, Portman, Alexander, Manchin, and Warner, we are attending to legislation that will shape the future of the great American outdoors for the better.

It is fitting that the legislation before us comes with support of such a broad bipartisan coalition because our national parks, forests, and other public lands are the lungs of the United States. They’re the places where we can breathe. They’re the places that allow us to escape the hustle and bustle of our daily lives.

And it is fitting that the legislation before us comes with support from such a broad bipartisan coalition because our national parks, forests, and other public lands are the lungs of the United States. They’re the places where we can breathe. They’re the places that allow us to escape the hustle and bustle of our daily lives.
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turn supports as many as 30 American jobs.

So I am extremely proud to be a co-sponsor of the Great American Outdoors Act. I am proud of the work our colleagues have put in to get it this far, and I look forward to seeing it passed.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

TAXPAYER FIRST ACT OF 2019—MOTION TO PROCEED—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 1957, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 75, H.R. 1957, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

JUSTICE IN POLICING ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, yesterday at the Fountain of Praise Church in Houston, TX, a funeral service was held in honor of the life of George Floyd, whose death has moved hundreds of thousands of people across America and around the world to peacefully march against police violence. Today, his brother Philonise Floyd will testify in front of the House Judiciary Committee.

It is hard to imagine the courage it takes, so soon after the tragic, awful, and brutal loss of a family member, to not only grieve in the national spotlight but to turn that pain into action. There have been many reasons for Americans to be shocked and outraged, angry and frustrated with the injustice they have seen in their country, but the death of George Floyd has given the Nation reason to hope.

Now, Democrats in the House and Senate have proposed legislation that would directly respond to the issues of racial bias and excessive force in our police departments. The Justice in Policing Act would ban the use of choke holds, limit the transfer of military equipment to local departments, make it easier to hold police departments accountable, and institute a whole lot of reforms to help prevent that misconduct in the first place. It is a comprehensive proposal, and many of the experts on racism, discrimination, and inequality in America have had large input into the bill.

We need action on the Justice in Policing Act as soon as possible, and we need the Senate Republicans to work like hell to make it happen. The moment calls for bold and broad-scale change. We need wholesale reform, not piecemeal reform. We cannot approach this debate by cherry-picking one or two reforms and calling the job complete. It is my hope that by the time the Republican colleagues intend to do. We need a strong bill. The Justice in Policing Act is where we should begin.

Senators, the Senate is a collaborative institution, at least by design, but there is no way to express what legislation reaches the floor, and that is Leader McConnell. For 2 weeks I have asked him to commit to a debate and a vote on a police reform bill by July 4—an open debate and certainly an ability to vote on the Justice in Policing Act. I still have not received an answer.

Is it too much to ask that, as hundreds of thousands, if not millions, are in the streets, when the vast majority of Americans think we need reform, that the leader spend some floor time here so we can debate this issue and maybe move forward for the first time in a long time? I don’t think so. But our leader is silent, missing in action, as he is on so many different major issues that face America.

After House and Senate Democrats released the draft legislation on Monday, yesterday, Senate Republicans announced they would put together a working group to prepare their own set of proposals. Working groups are all fine and well, but it is critical that we pursue comprehensive reform, not seek the lowest common denominator, and it is critical that we get a real commitment to consider strong legislation on the floor.

Unfortunately, in the aftermath of other recent moments of national strife, particularly the mass shootings, President Trump, Leader McConnell, and Senator Sanders make the right noises—let’s study it; let’s consider it—but never follow through.

Leader McConnell once promised that a debate on expanding background checks would be “front and center” on the Senate floor after shootings in Dayton and El Paso. “What we can’t do is fail to pass something,” he said. Yet there was no debate on expanding background checks, and the Republican majority in the Senate did exactly what Leader McConnell said that it could not—it failed to pass anything on gun safety.

So while I welcome ideas from our Republican colleagues, we need a hard and fast commitment from the Republican leader to put real, broad-scale police reform on the Senate floor before July 4.

Americans, please, be watching the Senate. Watch the leader. Watch the Republicans.

Is this going to be another situation just like with gun control, just like with background checks, where they talked a good game, tried to let the issue fade away, and did nothing? The Nation—the Nation—will not let this issue fade away, I assure my Republican friends.

CORONAVIRUS

There is another major crisis in the country, and the moment, as well. COVID–19 continues to kill and infect Americans. Case numbers are rising in Western States—Arizona, New Mexico, California, and Oregon. The massive disruption to economic activity initially left more than 40 million—40 million—Americans without work.

This week it became official: The United States has been in recession—the first one in many years—since February.

In truth, the issues of racial justice and COVID–19 are not unrelated. The COVID–19 pandemic disproportionately kills Americans. People of color have less access to quality healthcare, greater food insecurity, greater percentages of poverty, and a disproportionate number of our frontline essential workers—41.2 percent—are African American and Latino. Yet you are starting to hear my friends on the other side stand and say ‘cause one jobs report wasn’t quite as awful as it might have been, awful as it was.

The President made a revolting comment that the recent jobs report was a great day for George Floyd and equality, even though it showed African-American unemployment continuing to rise. What a horrific comment.

Everyone is rooting for our country to return to normal as quickly and as safely as possible and for our economy to rebound with similar speed, but unemployment sits at 13 percent—higher than any point since the great recession—and the President and my Republican colleagues are ready to declare victory.

After saying that another COVID relief bill was likely in June, Leader McConnell has told his Republican caucus not to expect another relief bill until late July at the earliest—late July at the earliest—late. As millions are out of work, millions risk being removed from their homes, millions can’t feed their families.

Racial justice, civil rights, a global pandemic, an economic disaster—this is truly a time of historic challenge, and Leader McConnell and the Senate Republicans are missing in action. No
commitment to consider comprehensive police reform. No urgency to provide our country the desperately needed relief from COVID-19. Instead, Leader McConnell is likely to schedule votes next week on two circuit court nominees. Mark Walker and Cory Wilson—both of whom have expressed deep-seated antipathy toward our healthcare law. And I am not aware of either of them embracing civil rights, voting rights so desperately needed in this country.

That is right—in the middle of a public health crisis, the Republican majority is planning to confirm rightwing judges who have spoken out against our healthcare law. Watch what they do, not what they say. And what they are doing is regressive— it is not even a lack of moving us forward; they attempt to move us backward with rightwing judges who want to turn the clock back.

FBI MISCONDUCT INVESTIGATION

Even more shocking— do you think it can get worse? It does with this Republican majority. The Judiciary Committee tomorrow will hold a hearing. The Republican chairman will continue his pursuit of President Trump’s wild conspiracy theories about the 2020 election, asking for scores of subpoenas to chase down alleged misconduct by the FBI.

Let me get this straight: The Republican Party will eagerly focus on law enforcement that affects President Trump, but they aren’t ready to commit a focus on law enforcement, on racial equality when Americans demand it? I don’t hear anyone other than the President and his acolytes demanding a reinvestigation as it affects President Trump on a largely discredited conspiracy theory. But that is what our Republican Senate friends are doing, showing how removed they are from the national needs and the national sentiment.

Senate Republicans are ready to issue nearly 100 subpoenas to trash the FBI to protect President Trump, but they can’t commit to debate on one bill to reform police departments to protect African Americans. Instead of addressing the real challenges African Americans face, the Republican conspiracy caucus is obsessed with viciously attacking the FBI for protecting our national security while putting our democracy at risk. What a bizarre and outrageous inversion of our Nation’s priorities.

Now I am glad my friend from Illinois is here because it was his leadership that will cause, in the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senate Democrats to request subpoenas for Trump administration officials like Rick Gates, George Papadopoulos, and Michael Flynn, among others. These officials at one time or another have pled guilty to offenses related to Putin’s interference in the election. The Republican conspiracy caucus wants to waste the Senate’s time dredging up old conspiracy theories, we are at least going to try to show and get the story straight and not just call a list of witnesses that they want. It is just crazy. Kangaroo court, kangaroo hearing.

Let’s see if the Republicans have any— any— strength of conviction when it comes to doing. If they did, they would allow the witnesses that Senator Durbin and the other members of the Judiciary Committee have proposed to come forward and tell their side of the story— quite contrary to the witnesses that the Republican majority and the Republican chairman are calling.

PROTESTS

That is one crazy conspiracy theory, but yesterday the country was treated to another 75-year-old World War II veteran who was seriously injured in Buffalo, NY. The President said he might have belonged to a radical group and that the event might have been a setup because the man “fell harder than was pushed.”

It was disgusting, even for a President known for disgusting attacks. How small a man do you have to be to get palmed off as some Russian state financed Witney Morning? The President tweeted a vicious attack on a 75-year-old constituent of mine who was seriously injured in Buffalo, NY. The President said he might have belonged to a radial group and that the event might have been a setup because the man “fell harder than was pushed.”

I am not in the habit of responding to every Presidential tweet—something I am sure my Republican colleagues are familiar with. I have a problem with this President that I tweet it and talks about it.

I am not in the habit of responding to every Presidential tweet—something I am sure my Republican colleagues are familiar with. The President tweeted a vicious attack on a 75-year-old constituent of mine who was seriously injured in Buffalo, NY. The President said he might have belonged to a radical group and that the event might have been a setup because the man “fell harder than was pushed.”

I am not in the habit of responding to every Presidential tweet—something I am sure my Republican colleagues are familiar with. The President tweeted a vicious attack on a 75-year-old constituent of mine who was seriously injured in Buffalo, NY. The President said he might have belonged to a radical group and that the event might have been a setup because the man “fell harder than was pushed.”

I am not in the habit of responding to every Presidential tweet—something I am sure my Republican colleagues are familiar with. The President tweeted a vicious attack on a 75-year-old constituent of mine who was seriously injured in Buffalo, NY. The President said he might have belonged to a radical group and that the event might have been a setup because the man “fell harder than was pushed.”

I am not in the habit of responding to every Presidential tweet—something I am sure my Republican colleagues are familiar with. The President tweeted a vicious attack on a 75-year-old constituent of mine who was seriously injured in Buffalo, NY. The President said he might have belonged to a radical group and that the event might have been a setup because the man “fell harder than was pushed.”

I am not in the habit of responding to every Presidential tweet—something I am sure my Republican colleagues are familiar with. The President tweeted a vicious attack on a 75-year-old constituent of mine who was seriously injured in Buffalo, NY. The President said he might have belonged to a radical group and that the event might have been a setup because the man “fell harder than was pushed.”
during the COVID-19 pandemic is the value of telehealth. As a resident of a rural State, I have long been a proponent of telehealth for the access it gives to rural communities.

If you live in a major city, you usually think a lot about where you will find a doctor if you need one. If you need a cardiologist, for example, you don’t spend a lot of time worrying whether you will be able to find one within driving distance. But if you have a heart attack, you know you are in reach of at least one hospital and maybe even several.

That is not always the case for Americans in rural areas. In the smallest towns in America, access to specialty care can be a challenge. The only providers may be a primary care provider, a nurse, or a pharmacist. These providers serve rural families, but sometimes specialty care is needed. When there isn’t a specialist close by, telehealth can help get these rural providers and their patients the medical care they need at a remote location through the use of technology.

The coronavirus has highlighted the fact that telehealth is a valuable resource for every American. During the pandemic, we have seen healthcare providers turn to telehealth to continue serving their patients without running the risk of spreading the virus. Telehealth has always allowed patients to access a variety of services that might have been risky to obtain at an office or hospital during the height of the pandemic.

Telehealth’s usefulness will extend long beyond the coronavirus crisis. While telehealth has particular value for rural areas, rural, urban, and suburban areas alike experience provider shortages and a lack of access to care. The Association of American Medical Colleges estimates that there will be a shortage of up to 122,000 doctors in the United States by the year 2022. Even in areas without shortages, telehealth can make life easier for patients by reducing the number of times that they have to visit a doctor’s office for care.

While there will always be a need to see a doctor in person, for many patients, some office visits can be replaced with telehealth appointments. That can make a big difference for individuals whose health requires them to see a doctor frequently. It is also a convenient option for patients in the workforce or caring for children or other family members who may need to be able to access services quickly and easily.

It was very pleased when Congress expanded access to telehealth in the coronavirus relief bills that we passed. We advanced the principles of value-based insurance design by allowing high-deductible health plans to cover telehealth services prior to a beneficiary’s reaching his or her deductible.

We also permitted the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services to waive certain Medicare restrictions on telehealth during a public health emergency, which has been hugely helpful to both seniors and the providers who care for them. With this waiver authority, providers can be paid for seeing patients in their homes, regardless of whether the patient lives in a rural area.

We also expanded the types of services that are reimbursable via telehealth under Medicare. In addition to video, providers are able to offer telehealth appointments using audio-only technology, which is helpful for patients who don’t have access to internet or to a smart device.

Congress’s coronavirus legislation also increased telehealth access for community health centers, rural health clinics, home health hospice, and home dialysis for the duration of the pandemic.

I would like to see us make many of these measures permanent. I will be pushing for that in the Senate over the coming months, along with the CONNECT for Health Act, which I have cosponsored with Senators SCHATZ, WICKER, CARDIN, WARNER, and HYDE-SMITH for the last several Congresses.

This legislation, which influenced many of the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act telehealth provisions, addresses restrictions that limit the use of telehealth in Medicare, including by providing waiver authority for the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. In addition, the legislation would remove restrictions that affect Medicare reimbursement for Indian Health Service and facilitate the use of telehealth for emergency medical services and mental health care.

I will also continue to urge passage of the bill I introduced in March to increase telehealth services in nursing facilities. My Reducing Unnecessary Senior Hospitalizations Act, or what I call the RUSH Act, would allow Medicare to establish agreements with a medical group to provide care to nursing home patients remotely, with the goal of reducing instances of avoidable trips to the emergency department.

There is one way to reach that goal, I believe, and that is to incentivize medical students and dental students in America to make a commitment to serve in areas of greatest need. We are in desperate need of additional doctors and nurses and dentists and medical professionals. We are in need of more technology—telehealth, of course, is one of those technologies—to make sure we expand the reach of Medicare in the United States. In the midst of this coronavirus pandemic, we understand that now more than ever. That is why I have introduced legislation called the Health Heroes 2020 Act with specific design to dramatically expand the number of healthcare professionals.

There is one way to reach that goal, I believe, and that is to incentivize medical students and dental students in America to make a commitment to serve in areas of greatest need in this time of great urgency. In March, Congress’s coronavirus legislation called the Health Heroes 2020 Act provided for the expanded use of telehealth, which translates into greater access to care for rural Americans.

I will continue to push for anything I can to make telehealth more available to underserved patients in rural communities and to the country as a whole. The coronavirus pandemic has highlighted just how valuable a resource telehealth can be for literally every American, and we should ensure that all Americans can access its benefits.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I would like to follow up on the speech just made on the floor by my colleague from South Dakota because his observations about shortages when it comes to healthcare across the country do not just his State, South Dakota, but certainly affect Illinois and many other States as well.

We are in desperate need of additional doctors and nurses and dentists and medical professionals. We are in need of more technology—telehealth, of course, is one of those technologies—to make sure we expand the reach of Medicare in the United States. In the midst of this coronavirus pandemic, we understand that now more than ever. That is why I have introduced legislation called the Health Heroes 2020 Act with specific design to dramatically expand the number of healthcare professionals.

There is one way to reach that goal, I believe, and that is to incentivize medical students and dental students in America to make a commitment to serve in areas of greatest need in this time of great urgency. In March, Congress’s coronavirus legislation called the Health Heroes 2020 Act provided for the expanded use of telehealth, which translates into greater access to care for rural Americans.

I will continue to push for anything I can to make telehealth more available to underserved patients in rural communities and to the country as a whole. The coronavirus pandemic has highlighted just how valuable a resource telehealth can be for literally every American, and we should ensure that all Americans can access its benefits.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority whip.

Do you know that most doctors and dentists who graduate have a minimum of $240,000 in additional student debt over and above the undergraduate experience—$240,000 in debt when they become licensed doctors and dentists? So we even encourage young men and women with all this talent and all this determination want to serve in the areas of greatest need but throw up their hands and say: I have to pay off this loan. I have no choice but to go to a different place.

If we had the National Health Service Corps expanded to provide loans for the cost of medical education, with the incentive that those new medical professionals would serve in areas of great need, it would certainly help to solve a major problem in America. We feel it in the inner cities, but we feel it as intensely, if not more so, in the rural and
smalltown areas of the Senator from South Dakota’s State and my State of Illinois. Could we work together to do this? Could we work to come up with the money to make sure these medical professionals are there?

What we talk about doctors and nurses, don’t overlook the need for dentists. There are millions of people in my great State of Illinois who do not have ready access to dental care. The Illinois Dental Society once or twice each year has a free dental service weekend, and they—usually on a Saturday—will allow any patient to come in and have dental care given to them for nothing. People wait in a queue, in a line overnight for this opportunity.

Can you imagine having a problem with your teeth, some pain or discomfort or perhaps a disfigurement, and being unable to afford the care you need? For many of these people, this is their last chance, to wait in line all night to get in for free dental services from the Dental Society, and then to see if a dentist will provide these services. What an eye-opener to see all of these people who are in desperate need of dental care.

We need more dentists. We need to make certain that they are accessible and affordable for Americans wherever they may live. I support the suggestion of the Senator from South Dakota when it comes to telehealth, but let’s make sure we have the men and women on the front end of the process who are still an important and critical and essential part of the kind of professional medical service and dental service we all need.

There is another way to help make sure we have enough dentists and doctors. It is to make sure that those who are currently in the United States in dental school or medical school, who are graduating and who go to another country, have a chance to remain in this country.

By way of background, 20 years ago, I introduced a bill called the DREAM Act. The DREAM Act was designed for those brought to the United States as children, infants, and toddlers, who were brought into this country perhaps on a visitor’s visa and overstayed their visa and didn’t file the necessary documents and soon became undocumented in America. They didn’t leave. They grew up here. They were little kids who grew up in America, went to school, being part of America, and believing America was their future.

Usually, sometime in their adolescence, their parents would sit down and tell them the grim reality that they had to be legal to be in this country. Despite the fact that they knew no other country, spoke no other language, pledged allegiance to the same flag we do, they were technically not legally in America.

We sought to change the DREAM Act to give them a chance. If they completed school and had no serious criminal issues, they would be given a chance to become American citizens. The bill went back and forth. It would pass the House one year and pass the Senate the next year. It would come up the majority of the Senate but not 60 votes.

It languished until I appealed to the President, then-President Barack Obama—and asked him if he would consider creating by Executive order some protection for these young people, and he did. This was the DACA Program, and under DACA, these same Dreamers I mentioned earlier would go through a criminal background check, and be given, for 2 years, the ability to stay and work in this country.

How many young people showed up for this Obama DACA Program and went through it successfully? There were 800,000. There were 800,000 from all around the country just to get a chance to go to school, to complete their dream, and to even serve in America’s military. They just want to be part of this country—800,000.

What was going to happen to this program when a new President named Donald Trump came to office? The very first time I met President Trump was just after he had been sworn in as President. There was a lunch for him—an inaugural lunch—in Statuary Hall, and I went up to him and introduced himself.

I said: Mr. President, I am begging you, do what you can to extend the protection of DACA to these 800,000 young people. They are counting on it. He leaned over, and he looked at me, and he said: Oh, Senator Durbin, don’t worry. We are going to take care of these young people.

Well, that was the President’s assurance, but unfortunately he didn’t keep his word. He decided, unfortunately, to abolish the DACA Program, saying that President Obama had no authority to make DACA law by executive order to give this kind of protection.

Then a number of people filed a case in court saying that the Executive order of the President should or should not be sustained. It had to be contested in court. Luckily, for the DACA recipients—800,000 of them—while the court case has been pending, they have been protected by court order from being deported. But the decision is going to be made by the Supreme Court, and it could be made in the next week or in the 2, 3 weeks that follow. So in the month of June, the fate of 800,000 of these young people will be decided across the street in the Supreme Court.

These are the young people who have become an important part of America. When the Republican Senator from South Dakota talks about shortages in medical personnel, I hope he knows that 41,000 of those DACA recipients are currently providing vital medical services in this pandemic that we are facing across the States and if they are judged to be deported and illegal to work in this country and leave, it will leave a gap in the medical services that this country desperately, desperately needs.

Some of these young people are incredible. Their stories are nothing short of amazing. I would like to tell you of one here at this moment—Maria Galati.

Today, I want to tell you that she is the 122nd Dreamer whose story I have told on the Senate floor.

Mariana came to the United States from Mexico when she was 5 years old. She grew up in Camden, NJ. It wasn’t an easy life. She grew up in a single-parent household, and her mother did not speak English. Here is what she told me about it:

I had to fend for myself at a young age. I feel like I never got to have a childhood. I tried to never let that backdrop define me or stop me from my dreams.

What was her dream? To become a nurse. While working at a bakery, she went to a technical school to become a medical assistant, and then in 2012 President Obama created DACA. Mariana was able to work as a medical assistant. Here is what she said about DACA:

Before DACA, I had no future, purpose, or chance of a better life. DACA is that it can go away—an expiration date approaching that means that I have to go back to the way things were. Now I understand why we are called Dreamers—it is because before DACA all we could do was dream of the life we wanted to have—a dream about being “someone.”

While working as a medical assistant, Mariana is studying to become a nurse. She is now a junior at Rutgers University Nursing School. Here is what she said about that experience:

To be a nurse is a way of living. I do not look at it as a job, it is beyond that for me—it’s a calling. Advocating for and giving people a voice is a reward within itself. Helping people in their time of need where they are most vulnerable is a privilege.

Mariana is currently on the frontlines of fighting the COVID–19 pandemic. She is a registered medical assistant at the Jefferson Cherry Hill Hospital COVID–19 testing center. She faces exposure to that virus every day that she goes to work. She takes every shift that she is offered. She said:

I have to be there. I want to be there. I am not scared, but I am scared at the same time. I know what the risks are.

I want to thank Mariana Galati for her service. She is an immigrant hero. She is putting herself and her service. She is an immigrant health assistant at the Jefferson Cherry Hill Hospital COVID–19 testing center. She faces exposure to that virus every day that she goes to work. She takes every shift that she is offered. She said:

I have to be there. I want to be there. I am not scared, but I am scared at the same time. I know what the risks are.

I want to thank Mariana Galati for her service. She is an immigrant health assistant at the Jefferson Cherry Hill Hospital COVID–19 testing center. She faces exposure to that virus every day that she goes to work. She takes every shift that she is offered. She said:

I have to be there. I want to be there. I am not scared, but I am scared at the same time. I know what the risks are.
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failed and refused to consider any solution or any effort to rescue people like Mariana and to give them a chance to be part of America’s future.

When we look at those in essential services, medical and social services, it turns out that one in six of them are immigrants to this country. I know it is not a popular thing to say to this administration, but I have to remind him that we are a nation of immigrants. My mother was an immigrant to this country, and her son has been fortunate enough to elect Senator and represent the great State of Illinois. That is my story. That is my family’s story, but it is also America’s story.

We are in this together. People from across the world have come to this country to be part of its future. Mariana is an example—a young woman who could have thrown up her hands and said: I am undocumented. I am not going to have any way of legally being part of America. My dreams are just going to be put on hold.

But she didn’t. She was determined to make the best of her life. Then when President Obama created DACA, a door opened for her that she couldn’t have imagined. She had the opportunity to move forward, to become a nurse. She is studying at Rutgers for that purpose.

Really, Mr. President, do you think New Jersey or America would be better if Mariana is deported out of this country?

As soon as next week, maybe even next Monday, the U.S. Supreme Court is about to rule on the future of DACA. The President of the United States can solve this problem if they decide that DACA is to be abolished. He can fix this himself.

There is another person who has a critical role, too, and that is Senator McConnell, the Republican leader in the Senate. He has the power to bring this to a vote. If he does not bring this to a vote in the Senate, the Senate will not have a chance to act. We need the help of the McConnell in the Senate. He has the power to bring this to the floor of the Senate for a debate and a vote.

The House of Representatives has already passed the Dream and Promise Act, which would solve the challenge that would be created if the Supreme Court abolishes the DACA Program. Are we overwhelmed with business in the U.S. Senate, as I peer at an empty Chamber with my wonderful speech being the only thing as an item of business at this moment? We have time. We have more than enough time to deal with this issue. For 800,000 protected by DACA, it is literally a life-and-death issue.

I would appeal to Senator McConnell to use his power as the Republican leader to solve this problem, to address this issue, to say that, if you qualify for the DACA Program, you are going to be protected until the end of the year or, beyond that, given an opportunity to become citizens of the United States, a goal which I have been seeking for the 20 years that I have worked on the Dream Act.

We know that we need the help of wonderful young people like Mariana Galati to make this a better nation. The question is whether the President will ever realize that or whether Senator McConnell would make room in our schedule for us to debate this issue. Let’s get this right. Let’s make sure that we have sensible immigration policies in America. The notion of abolishing DACA and saying to Mariana, “you will now be deported back to a country you cannot even remember,” is not the answer.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Sasse). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The supplemental, yes, so ordered.

Mr. Wyden. Mr. President, the Senate has taken up and will be voting soon—I hope successfully—on watershed environmental legislation that will provide for municipal, county, State, and national parks and public spaces in America for generations to come.

This is legislation I have been working on for years—legislation that I pushed hard to advance as chairman of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee and legislation for which I am now a cosponsor.

The bill is going to repair public spaces, making them usable by all, while creating new public spaces that reflect the continuing story that is our great country.

In my view, when the Senate debates this kind of legislation, the debate also has to include a discussion about a particularly important topic, and that is jobs.

A major component of this bill is, of course, the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which puts funding into natural wonders all over the country, in cities and in rural areas. Today, I want to speak for a moment specifically about those rural areas and rural economies.

The economic impact of the COVID-19 pandemic has hit so many of our rural communities like a wrecking ball. These are communities that have been struggling going back a long time, and many of them are facing COVID-19 going to be enormously challenging. So the Senate ought to be looking at this and voting on it.

In my view, when the Senate debates this kind of legislation, the debate also has to include a discussion about a particularly important topic, and that is jobs.

A major component of this bill is, of course, the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which puts funding into natural wonders all over the country, in cities and in rural areas. Today, I want to speak for a moment specifically about those rural areas and rural economies.

The economic impact of the COVID-19 pandemic has hit so many of our rural communities like a wrecking ball. These are communities that have been struggling going back a long time, and many of them are facing COVID-19 going to be enormously challenging. So the Senate ought to be looking at this and voting on it.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund isn’t just about opening up the country’s treasured areas for everyone to enjoy and to help people get outdoors. It has a proven track record of boosting the economy in communities near those lands. The Land and Water Conservation Fund is the ultimate win-win approach. This program focuses on recreation that involves protecting our natural wonders and jobs. That is a big step forward. So what I wanted to do was just spend a few minutes talking about how we could do even more.

For some time now, I have been working with my colleagues from the Pacific Northwest—Senator Crapo, Senator Heinrich, and Senator Merkley—trying to help secure two economic lifelines for the rural communities of the Northwest. I have been talking about Secure Rural Schools and Payments in Lieu of Taxes Programs. They are known as SRSs and PILT.

In the West, there are a lot of areas that have long depended on resource extraction and a lot of areas made up of Federal lands. So we went through a lot of boom-and-bust cycles that defined those economies for generations, and nearly always those boom-and-bust cycles proved to be harmful and unsustainable. So some time ago—one of these—is former Senator Larry Craig and I wrote the bill that created the Secure Rural Schools Program. It provided years and years of reliable revenue for rural counties so they could plan budgets and provide services for people who live in their borders.

For a little while, Secure Rural Schools got caught up in the knockdown, back-and-forth fiscal battles that happen in Congress too often. So once in a while, the program would lapse. It then meant that from all over the country, county leaders from rural communities came to Washington and had to plead for extensions of the Secure Rural Schools Program that has always been successful and a model.

It involves local input. Extending this program should have been a no-brainer all along. It expired just last year before Congress stepped up at the last minute to reauthorize the program, but these start-and-stop authorizations do nothing for certainty.

Moreover, one year out of the Secure Rural Schools Program up, the distinguished Senator from Alaska, Ms. Murkowski, and I were involved in selling off the federal lands. That gave us some money—some key money—for the Secure Rural Schools Program in the West. I remember when we sold off the federal reserves to get money for Secure Rural Schools, a number of editorial writers out West had a lot of fun with it and basically said: Well, we always knew Ron Wyden was full of hot air.

The point is, we have got to end that cycle, that boom-and-bust cycle, in place of going through these routines at the end of the period, when Secure Rural Schools was helping the roads and schools.

I worked with Senator Crapo to propose reforms that would upgrade the Secure Rural Schools Program into a stable, predictable source of funding for rural counties. Our bill would establish a permanent endowment fund, like funding for county economic development and roads and schools. That is where the money goes. It goes into
economic development. It goes into roads and schools.

By the way, when you are helping those rural communities with their budget, when they have those funds secure, it frees up money for them for important things like mental health. We have certainly seen a demand for mental health increase dramatically in the last few months.

After Congress makes an initial investment into the fund under our proposal, the permanent endowment to provide funding for county economic development into roads and schools—Congress makes that initial investment into the fund—the principle will be invested, and the interest will be used to make SRS payments to counties. So you have Senator CRAPO, Senator MERKLEY, Senator RISCH, and I proposing a way to move away from this roller coaster in the West to upgrade Secure Rural Schools into a stable, predictable source of funding with a permanent endowment fund that provides money for the roads and the schools and the counties, and the principles are invested, and the interest will be used to make SRS payments to counties.

This proposal is backed by 100 percent of Oregon’s U.S. Senators and 100 percent of Idaho’s U.S. Senators—four U.S. Senators, two Democrats and two Republicans, having worked closely with rural groups, the National Associations of Counties, and others to advance this idea.

Our proposal also directs revenue-sharing payments from forest management to be deposited into the endowment each year. That way, the payments to the counties will grow, and the safety net they provide for their constituents can expand.

In my view, these are the basics of an economic toolkit for rural areas. If you focus on roads, if you focus on schools, if you focus on those counties where the money for services so they can, for example, take care of mental health needs, that is the key to building up rural economies and helping to create good-paying jobs for residents.

Now, payments in lieu of taxes is a program that exists for similar reasons. People who live in these rural counties dominated by public lands also deserve support. They, too, rely on local governmental services and deserve a safety net like everyone else. They ought to be able to budget and plan and create jobs like bigger cities can. Our amendment to really promote Secure Rural Schools and PILT would extend PILT for 10 years to give these counties the certainty and predictability they need.

I am going to wrap up here in a moment, but I just hope that the majority leader is going to set up a process for real debate on these ideas and these amendments.

This is a bipartisan proposal. When we have offered in the past—Senator CRAPO, Senator MERKLEY, Senator RISCH, and I and others—to extend this program, we nearly always get at least 70 votes here in the U.S. Senate because there is an awareness of how important it is that these rural communities have certainty for schools and roads and basic kinds of services that our efforts to extend.

The COVID-19 pandemic is causing enormous pain everywhere, but we have seen big corporations—we talked about this yesterday in the Finance Committee. Some colleagues think: Well, we can make available trillions of dollars to the biggest corporations in America.

So the COVID pandemic is causing pain everywhere, but it seems to me, with so many resources going to big corporations and powerful interests in intensely populated areas, the U.S. Senate has an obligation to make sure rural economies and rural workers and rural businesses aren’t just left behind. Upgrading Secure Rural Schools and extending PILT is a targeted way to advocate for rural communities.

We are going to be home for several weeks in July, and my hope is to be able to talk to folks in those areas in person in those areas. I haven’t been able to do as much of that. I have had 970 townhall meetings in person, just there to be able to respond and answer questions. So I really hope that we are going to be able to do that again soon.

When we have those discussions, you can be very sure that, in those rural communities, front and center will be Secure Rural Schools, and front and center will be Payments in Lieu of Taxes. Folks will zero in on those areas because they will say, as they have to me since Larry Craig, our former colleague from Idaho, and I wrote this program: Ron, what Secure Rural Schools is doing is giving us a chance to make sure we have a real education program.

Before we get that program going, people thought they would have school 3 days a week. So people will say: Ron, we need Secure Rural Schools. We need it for education. It is a key to our roads program.

The roads program for these smaller counties is an absolute key to being able to have rural life. Without those roads, without rural schools, the heart of Secure Rural Schools, you can’t have rural life. So these two programs are a solution based on providing certainty and predictability to help build thriving economies and good jobs in rural areas.

I am going to keep pushing for support here in the Senate. I know my colleagues Senator CRAPO, Senator MERKLEY, and Senator RISCH are going to continue to do so as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 20 minutes as in morning business.

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

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, this week we consider a measure for permanent funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund and for our national parks.

I would support this measure joyously if there were a similar program for America’s coasts and bays and oceans. As it is, I support this measure but with a heavy and frustrated heart, as once again, the urgent needs of coastal communities go unaddressed.

Put bluntly, the Land and Water Conservation Fund massively favors inland and upland States and projects, as indicated by the prevalence of advocates for it here on the floor from landlocked States. It fails to meet the needs of coastal communities.

Over the past decade, for every dollar the fund sent to inland States, it captured $85 cents. The imbalance against coasts gets worse if you factor in that there is greater coastal than inland economic activity, and the imbalance against coasts worsens further when you factor in that much of the Land and Water Conservation Fund’s spending in coastal States is for upland, inland projects. Coasts and saltwater are not treated fairly.

The upland freshwater imbalance is not justified, and we ought to make it right.

Look at Rhode Island. People from around the Nation and around the globe visit our wonderful beaches and beautiful Narragansett Bay, and they drive a huge amount of our economic activity. In 2018, Rhode Island’s Coastal Resources Corporation reckons 25 million people visited our State, supporting $100 million in State and local tax revenue and over 86,000 jobs. In total, travelers to Rhode Island generated $6.8 billion in our economy. Our coast attracts that economic activity. It is a big deal for us.

Rhode Island isn’t alone. Over half of Americans live in a coastal county. Nearly 60 percent of the Nation’s gross domestic product derives from coastal counties. According to the American Shore and Beach Preservation Association, “more than twice as many people visited America’s coasts as visit State and national parks combined; consequently 85 percent of all tourism-related revenue in the U.S. is generated in coastal States while the leading attraction. Beach tourism supports 2.5 million jobs, $285 billion in direct revenue and $45 billion in taxes annually.”

For all that, the Land and Water Conservation Fund gives 40 cents to coastal States for every dollar that it sends to inland States. That 40 cents is per capita, not adjusted for the great coastal economic activity and greater
coastal tax revenue, and it doesn’t adjust for upland uses in coastal States. Coasts are overlooked.

I wish it were just the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Look at the inland-to-coastal disparity in the Army Corps of Engineers’ Coastal Storms Reduction Fund. Over the past 10 years, the Corps has spent out of that fund, in various years, between 19 and 120 times more on inland work than it has spent on coastal work. Let me repeat that. In 2017, the Corps spent $200 million on coastal dollars, while our coast’s best year and 120 inland dollars to 1 coastal dollar was our worst.

Coastal communities are exposed to storms, to sea level rise, to shifting fisheries, to all manner of other conservation and infrastructure challenges, but across the decade, they received less than 3 pennies out of each dollar spent from an Army Corps program that has “coastal” in its name.

This persistent and unfair imbalance against coasts ignores the massive and unique risks that coastal communities, coastal features, coastal infrastructure, and coastal economies now face. Look at the warnings of coastal property value crash. Freddie Mac, which is not an environmental group, has estimated that somewhere between $238 billion and $507 billion worth of coastal real estate will be gone, below sea level by 2035, and that coastal dollars will not support that. “The economic losses and social disruption of that . . . are likely to be greater in coastal than those experienced in the housing crisis and Great Recession.”

Are we listening?

Along the east coast, the First Street Foundation estimates property values already took a $13 billion hit due to sea level rise. The Providence Journal, using University of Rhode Island data, reported that Rhode Island lost over $44 million in relative coastal property value from 2005 to 2017. First Street data show that Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Massachusetts lost a combined $403 million during that stretch. Hundreds of millions of dollars are gone already, and the worst is yet to come.

Look elsewhere along the coast. Do you want to know why Senator Cassidy is so motivated? His entire Louisiana coast is in a declared state of emergency. A recent headline from the Times-Picayune said: “We’re screwed”: “The only question is how quickly Louisiana’s wetlands will vanish, study says.”

That Tulane University study says sea level rise will flood 5,800 square miles of Louisiana coastal wetlands. The report concludes: “This is a major threat to one of the ecologically richest environments of the United States but also for the 1.2 million inhabitants and associated economic assets that are surrounded by Mississippi Delta marshland.”

That is obvious, but are we listening to Senator Cassidy?

In Florida, coastal communities already see flooded streets on sunny days. Researchers project over 2½ feet of sea level rise in the next 40 years affecting 120,000 Florida coastal properties in or near rising seas. Some studies say Miami Beach’s iconic South Beach has 2 decades left. Communities in southern Florida are considering abandoning public infrastructure to the sea because of the sticker shock of protecting it.

Fish, manatees, dolphins, sea turtles, and other sea creatures have washed up dead on Florida based due to toxic algae like the West Coast. The iconic Everglades are imperiled.

Who is listening?

In North Carolina, the Outer Banks face erosion and sea level rise such that the National Parks Service warns that swaths of the area will be inundated. As the Outer Banks wash into the sea, there go millions of annual visitors, thousands of local jobs, and a local economy worth over $250 million. Over 5,500 homes in coastal Texas are projected to be lost by next decade. These homes are worth $1.2 billion.

Coastal South Carolina, just since 2017, has been hit by four different billion-dollar hurricanes.

The list of what our coasts are facing goes on and on, and the projected losses are enormous. Here is Moody’s Investor Service’s warning for coastal communities issuing bonds:

The growing effects of climate change, including climbing global temperatures, and rising seas, are forecast to have an increasing economic impact on U.S. State and local issuers. This will be a growing negative credit factor for issuers without sufficient adaptation and mitigation strategies.

I would like to ask my colleagues, if you are a small community on the coast, where are you going to go to get sufficient adaptation and mitigation strategies for Moody’s? Where are we in helping those communities?

Here is the mainstream: “By the end of the 21st century, nearly 2.5 million residential and commercial properties, collectively valued today at $1.07 trillion today, will be at risk of chronic flooding.”

Chronic flooding makes those properties uninsurable and unmortgageable, which is one of the reasons for Freddie Mac’s warning about a coastal property value crash. The Land and Water Conservation Fund is not listening.

Our coastal lands, waters, and resources, like coastal private property, face enormous peril, and the Land and Water Conservation Fund virtually ignores that peril. That is why I am offering a commonsense, bipartisan amendment—not a spoiler amendment, not a “gotcha” amendment, not a poison pill. It is a commonsense, bipartisan amendment. My amendment takes nothing away from the Land and Water Conservation Fund. It leaves the Land and Water Conservation Fund intact, but with an upland bias intact. It separately provides coastal revenues dedicated from offshore wind and renewable energy development to support coastal States, coastal resiliency, coastal infrastructure, and coastal adaptation.

Unless we do this, millions of dollars in offshore wind energy revenues will bypass coasts and go straight to the Federal Treasury. There should be a balance of both offshore oil and gas energy revenues, which go in significant part both to Gulf Coast and, ironically, to the predominantly upland and inland projects of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Don’t get me wrong. I don’t begrudge our landlocked colleagues their funding. I do begrudge them refusing me the opportunity to add something for coastal communities. There should be a balance of coastal and saltwater program to balance the upland and freshwater bias of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Our landlocked colleagues are wrong to stop this amendment. It does them no harm. The situation along our coasts is dangerous and worsening. Let me repeat that. The situation along our coasts is dangerous and worsening. I am going to vote for this bill, but I will do so, as I said, with a heavy and frustrated heart.

I will continue pushing as hard as I can for the day when we get parity for coastal communities because what we are doing here by refusing this amendment is both shortsighted and unfair.

This is not my first rodeo on this subject. I have to tell you that I am sick to death of people telling me: You are right; we need to do something for coasts. And then, as soon as the Land and Water Conservation Fund passes, they are gone—“zippo,” vanished.

My environmental friends say: You are right, SHELDON. Just help us on this, and we will help you with coasts.

And then you don’t.

My colleagues say: You are right, SHELDON. Just help us on this, and we will help you with coasts.

And then you don’t.

And now, by making the Land and Water Conservation Fund permanent, we are permanently baking in its inland and its upland bias, and there is no added for coastal communities. Everyone is saying: Yes, you are right, SHELDON, but just help us on this, and we will help you with coasts.

Well, my friends, bitter experience tells me otherwise. But you will have my vote, and you will have my help to protect your inland and fresh water resources, as we should, and we from coasts and saltwater States will, again, have to await our day. Today is not our day in coastal States. Today is not our day, but maybe one day—and one day soon, I pray—all this talk will finally turn into action for our coasts. A sense of decency and a sense of urgency would both seem to demand that.

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.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, the Senate is considering landmark legislation, I call it that because it is indeed landmark legislation, but also it is about the great landmarks of our Nation.

We have a chance to lead this country this week with a historic package of bills. The Great American Outdoors Act combines the Land and Water Conservation Fund—our crown jewel of conservation programs—with the Restore Our Parks Act, legislation which would recreate—help to catch up on our deferred maintenance backlog throughout our National Park System. It is more than just our national parks, though; it addresses the needs of our National Forest System, our Bureau of Land Management lands, Fish and Wildlife Service, as well as the Bureau of Indian Education.

This legislation affects all four corners of Colorado, but it also affects every part of this country. In fact, this chart shows a map of the States that get support from the Great American Outdoors Act, shown in green. The States that don’t get support from the Great American Outdoors Act are highlighted in orange. It may be hard to see because there are no orange-highlighted States. Every State in the Union receives support through the Great American Outdoors Act, from sea to shining sea.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund, the Restore Our Parks Act, and the Great American Outdoors Act will provide billions of dollars in opportunities for recreation, hiking, fishing, camping, conservation, and access to lands that the public already held but didn’t have access to until the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Ninety-nine percent of the land and water conservation funds go to lands the American people already hold, inholdings within a national park. In fact, one of the consequences that the Land and Water Conservation Fund performed in Colorado was in Rocky Mountain National Park, acquiring one of the land holdings within the national park, helping to complete the Great Rocky Mountain National Park, the third most visited national park in the country.

This legislation gives this Congress a chance to pass a bill that affects everyone, from Maine to California, from Texas to Alaska, from Maine to Hawaii, Hawaii to Utah, Utah to Alaska, and beyond.

I know there are some who believe this is a Federal land grab. That simply is not true. As I mentioned, 99 percent of the dollars in the Land and Water Conservation Fund go to purchasing inholdings.

The way we use this money is mandatory spending. Remember how this bill was passed. In 1965, the Land and Water Conservation Fund was authorized at $900 million a year. It was authorized for a certain dollars over time, and it became $900 million, but it only reached that level twice in the history of the program.

Throughout the past 55 years, though, dollars had been diverted away from the Land and Water Conservation Fund. What this legislation does through its permanent funding is make sure the dollars we authorized beginning in 1965 by this Congress in the permanent authorization in the John Dingell Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act by a vote of 92 to 0—to make sure those funds would not get diverted and to stop funds from being syphoned off and instead go to what we were intended to go to in the Land and Water Conservation Fund beginning in 1965. We have an opportunity to stop that diversion. This is not paid for—not by the taxpayers but by oil and gas revenues. These dollars are generated from the revenues that come from offshore. Those energy revenues—the boat excise tax, the boat fuel excise tax, and a couple of other allocations—it is not coming from the taxpayers.

It is an opportunity to protect our land, our most precious spaces, to catch up on our deferred maintenance of national parks, and to make sure we are doing that across the country without costing the taxpayers money.

This land is purchased. There is no Federal land grab. There is no eminent domain. They don’t use eminent domain for this. There is no premium that the Federal Government gets to buy land to crowd out other people. There is a formula that is used that doesn’t allow for premiums. So this, in essence, is another stick in the bundle of property rights for landowners.

We also know the positive impact this bill has right now on our economy. You know, when we started working on this legislation, we were talking about its economic impact and what it would mean, but we were talking about it in terms of the overall outdoor recreation economy, which in Colorado is $32 billion and growing. There are 5.2 million Americans employed in the recreation economy.

When COVID hit, we saw what happened in western Colorado as ski slopes shut down 2 months early and as hotels and restaurants closed. This bill will help address priority repairs for 10,000 jobs, restoring our national parks, repairing trails and forest systems. It does so at a time when we have high unemployment rates in those communities, those communities surrounded by public lands because of the shutdown as a result of the coronavirus.

This is an economic and jobs package as much as it is a conservation package. For every $1 million we spend in the Land and Water Conservation Fund, it supports between 16 and 30 jobs. It is our chance to not only provide us a future for nature to thrive, kids to play, and hunters and anglers to enjoy. National parks and public lands provide access to outdoor recreation opportunities for all Americans no matter where they live, and reestablishing those areas it will ensure a future for nature to thrive, kids to play, and hunters and anglers to enjoy. National parks and public lands provide access to outdoor recreation opportunities for all Americans no matter where they live, and reestablishing those areas it will ensure a future for nature to thrive, kids to play, and hunters and anglers to enjoy. National parks and public lands provide access to outdoor recreation opportunities for all Americans no matter where they live, and reestablishing those areas.

In 2018, over 318 million national park visits led to $32.2 billion in direct spending at hotels, restaurants, outfitters, and other amenities in gateway communities, supporting over 290,000 jobs and generating over $60.1 billion in total economic output. Nationally, outdoor recreation contributes $778 billion in consumer spending and supports 5.2 million jobs.

The Great American Outdoors Act will ensure that our parks and other public lands continue to preserve our nation’s heritage and recreation opportunities that local communities and economies in these areas will continue to flourish.

The Great American Outdoors Act will ensure that our parks and other public lands continue to preserve our nation’s heritage and recreation opportunities that local communities and economies in these areas will continue to flourish.
We urge you to support our parks and public lands by voting for the Great American Outdoors Act (S. 3422) as a clean bill with no amendments. Thank you for considering this request.

Sincerely,

[If necessary, include a list of organizations or individuals supporting the measure.]

[Include any additional context or commentary relevant to the amendment or the legislation being considered.]
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The Great American Outdoors Act will help ensure a better, brighter future for nature and for all of us. As Secretaries, we have all experienced how public lands managed by the Department provide vital functions like wildlife habitat while preserving water quantity and quality, sustaining working landscapes and rural economies, increasing access for recreation opportunities, and stimulating the outdoor economy. Nationally, outdoor recreation supports roughly $78 billion in consumer spending and supports 5.2 million jobs. The Great American Outdoors Act will ensure that our parks and other public lands are maintained and enhanced so that they can continue to provide these critical benefits for generations to come.

We are pleased to see strong bipartisan support from the House and Senate—and from the President—for the Great American Outdoors Act. Americans need these public lands, and we continue to lead to deliver this historic legislation into law.

Sincerely,

RYAN ZINKE
Secretary of the Interior 2017–2019

KEN SALAZAR
Secretary of the Interior 2009–2013

GALE NORTON
Secretary of the Interior 2001–2006

SALLY JEWELL
Secretary of the Interior 2013–2017

DROUOT TOULMIN
Secretary of the Interior 2006–2009

BRUCE BABBITT
Secretary of the Interior 1993–2001

Mr. GARDNER. We have a chance to lead. We have a chance to show the American people that Congress can work together. We have a chance to show the American people that indeed Republicans and Democrats can come together for the good of their country to provide great things for future generations. Despite the bickering seen on nightly talk shows, this Congress can come together and to inspire each other with what people hope we will do, and that is to pass the Great American Outdoors Act, which can restore faith in our government to do what people hope we will do, and that is to come together and to work together and to inspire each other with those dreams of previous generations. The Great American Outdoors Act, which can restore faith in our government to do what people hope we will do, and that is to come together and to work together and to inspire each other with those dreams of previous generations.

June 10, 2020

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI, MINORITY LEADER MCCARTHY, MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL AND MINORITY LEADER SCHUMER: During our time as Secretaries of the Interior, we had the privilege and responsibility of stewarding some of America’s most incredible landscapes and natural and cultural treasures. Now, more than ever, we are all cognizant of the critical role of public lands in our lives, as places to recreate, to recharge and to seek solace in the midst of great stress and to create jobs. Together, we write to strongly urge swift passage and enactment of the Great American Outdoors Act (S. 3422) without any amendments. This bill (and its expected House companion) is critically needed to support the public lands upon which all Americans rely. The Great American Outdoors Act will advance the protection of America’s special places and invest in the repair and restoration of deteriorating infrastructure. The bill also prioritizes necessary repairs in our National Parks and on other public lands by directing up to $9.5 billion over five years to address maintenance needs within the National Park System, other public land agencies, and Bureau of Indian Education schools. It will also fully and permanently fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund, our nation’s most important conservation program, as authorized at $900 million every year to ensure protection of and access to our public lands.

The Great American Outdoors Act will help ensure a better, brighter future for nature and for all of us. As Secretaries, we have all experienced how public lands managed by the Department provide vital functions like wildlife habitat while preserving water quantity and quality, sustaining working landscapes and rural economies, increasing access for recreation opportunities, and stimulating the outdoor economy. Nationally, outdoor recreation supports roughly $78 billion in consumer spending and supports 5.2 million jobs. The Great American Outdoors Act will ensure that our parks and other public lands are maintained and enhanced so that they can continue to provide these critical benefits for generations to come.

We are pleased to see strong bipartisan support from the House and Senate—and from the President—for the Great American Outdoors Act. Americans need these public lands, and we continue to lead to deliver this historic legislation into law.

Sincerely,

RYAN ZINKE
Secretary of the Interior 2017–2019

KEN SALAZAR
Secretary of the Interior 2009–2013

GALE NORTON
Secretary of the Interior 2001–2006

SALLY JEWELL
Secretary of the Interior 2013–2017

DROUOT TOULMIN
Secretary of the Interior 2006–2009

BRUCE BABBITT
Secretary of the Interior 1993–2001

Mr. GARDNER. We have a chance to lead. We have a chance to show the American people that Congress can work together. We have a chance to show the American people that indeed Republicans and Democrats can come together for the good of their country to provide great things for future generations. Despite the bickering seen on nightly talk shows, this Congress can come together and to inspire each other with what people hope we will do, and that is to come together and to work together and to inspire each other with those dreams of previous generations. The Great American Outdoors Act, which can restore faith in our government to do what people hope we will do, and that is to come together and to work together and to inspire each other with those dreams of previous generations.
The motion was agreed to.

**TAXPAYER FIRST ACT OF 2019**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1957) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

**AMENDMENT NO. 1617**

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute.)

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1617.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL], for Mr. GARDNER, proposes an amendment numbered 1617.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following:

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

**AMENDMENT NO. 1626 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1617**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL], for Mr. GARDNER, proposes an amendment numbered 1626 to amendment No. 1617.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask that the reading be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

The amendment is printed in today's Record under "Text of Amendments."

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

**AMENDMENT NO. 1627 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1626**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 1627 to amendment No. 1626.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask that the reading be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

The amendment is printed in today's Record under "Text of Amendments."

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The amendment is printed in today's Record under "Text of Amendments."

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The amendment is printed in today's Record under "Text of Amendments."

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The amendment is printed in today's Record under "Text of Amendments."

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.
The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1629 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1630

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 1629 to amendment No. 1630.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask that the reading be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike “3 days” and insert “4 days”.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send cloture motion to the desk for the underlying bill.

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 send a cloture motion to the desk for consideration.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Strike “3 days” and insert “4 days”.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send cloture motion to the desk for the underlying bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to commit the bill to the Energy and Natural Resources Committee with instructions to report back forthwith with amendment No. 1630.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to commit H.R. 1957 to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources with instructions to report back forthwith with Amendment No. 1630.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask that the reading be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following: “This Act shall take effect 5 days after the date of enactment.”

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to commit with instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1630 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1631

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 1631 to the instructions of the motion to commit. Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading be waived.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike “3 days” and insert “4 days”.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions be waived.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 710.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The clerk will report the nomination. The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Justin Reed Walker, of Kentucky, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. 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, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Justin Reed Walker, of Kentucky, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia.


Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls be waived.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to move to legislative session.

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

The Senator from Maryland.

JUSTICE IN POLICING ACT

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the Justice in Policing Act, introduced yesterday by my colleagues Senator HARRIS from California and Senator BOOKER from New Jersey.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation. This legislation is urgently needed after the death of George Floyd in police custody in Minnesota, which has sent shock waves through the Nation and the world. I am pleased that the protests have been largely peaceful, and that the Senate sits in Washington, our local leaders have moved to deescalate tensions.

I was pleased on Monday to hold a Facebook Live session with Hillary Shelton, the director of the NAACP’s Washington bureau and senior vice president for advocacy and policy, as well as Marc Morial, the president and chief executive officer of the National Urban League and the former mayor of New Orleans. We talked about this legislation in some detail.

I received feedback from several of my constituents at my Facebook Live event on how to improve relations between police and the communities they serve and how to rebuild trust between them.

Before they first put on a badge, a police officer takes an oath to uphold the law. Most do so with the best intentions and carry out their duties with willing hearts and noble communities. But in far too many communities around the country, the system in which they work has been failing. People are dying at the hands of police, predominantly people of color. Accountability has been tied to public videos rather than doing the right thing. Incremental reform is no longer an option when it comes to police reform. We have been patient, but we must do better to protect the civil rights, human rights, and lives of men, women, and children of this country.

Congress must finally pass a comprehensive plan to improve training and community relations, hold police
accountable, and rebuild trust between law enforcement and the communities they serve. To that end, I have been proud to work with my colleagues Senator Booker and Senator Harris in creating a package of reforms and accountability measures that show where we need to be as a nation with a fair and just system of laws.

The package focuses on three major pillars: accountability, data collection, and training policies. I was proud that two of these pieces included in the Justice in Policing Act are from bills that I have introduced for many Congresses: the End Racial and Religious Profiling Act and the Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act.

The End Racial and Religious Profiling Act is designed to enforce the constitutional right to equal protection under the law by eliminating racial- and religious-based discriminatory profiling at all levels of law enforcement, including the policies and procedures. It allows police to focus their work more accurately rather than wasting resources on blanket stereotypes. It requires enhanced data collection for DOJ to track and monitor discriminatory profiling. It holds State and local enforcement agencies accountable by conditioning Federal funds on their adoption of policies and best practices to combat profiling by officers.

The Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act takes a comprehensive approach on how local police organizations can adopt performance-based standards to ensure that instances of misconduct will be minimized through training and oversight. The bill provides that, if such instances do occur, they be properly investigated. It requires the creation of law enforcement accreditation standards and recommendations based on President Obama’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing.

This bill also enhances funding for so-called pattern and practice discrimination cases. In Baltimore City, for example, the department voluntarily entered into a consent decree in 2017 with the U.S. Department of Justice to overhaul the police department after the tragic death of Freddie Gray in police custody in 2015, which led to civil unrest in Baltimore. I might add, I am very pleased that we have seen progress in Baltimore, as evidenced by the types of protests after the Floyd tragedy. They have been almost all peaceful.

In Baltimore, the Department of Justice report had found a widespread pattern and practice of illegal and unconstitutional conduct by the Baltimore Police Department through targeting African American residents with disproportionate and disparate treatment. The U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland is now overseeing a complete overhaul of the Baltimore Police Department.

We have made progress.

Other important provisions of the Justice in Policing Act will save lives. The bill bans choke holds at the Federal level and conditions law enforcement funding on State and local governments banning choke holds. It bans no-knock warrants in drug cases at the Federal level and conditions law enforcement funding on State and local governments banning no-knock warrants. It requires that deadly force be used only as a last resort and requires officers to employ deescalation techniques first. It requires better data collection on how and under what circumstances officers use force.

We need these standards. We have seen too many tragedies on the misuse of power and force by law enforcement.

The bill takes important steps to de-militarize our police forces—we are a civilian society; we are not run as a military state—and encourage more professionalism, consistent with changing our police officers’ mentality from a warrior mindset to a guardian mindset.

The legislation limits the transfer of military-grade equipment to State and local law enforcement. It requires Federal uniformed police officers to wear body cameras and requires State and local law enforcement to use existing Federal funds to ensure the use of police body cameras.

This comprehensive legislation takes several important steps to hold police accountable in courts. It makes it consistent with standard practice to prosecute police who violate their constitutional rights by changing qualified immunity for law enforcement.

Finally, the legislation gives better tools to the Department of Justice and State attorneys general to investigate and prosecute police misconduct. It re-invests in our communities by supporting critical community-based programs to change the culture of law enforcement among our communities to reimagine public safety in an equitable and just way.

As I mentioned earlier, in Baltimore, after the Freddie Gray tragedy, we recognized that we needed to do a better job in working with communities and police, and we reached out. Part of our consent decree is to improve that relationship, that direct relationship between police and community.

The legislation that I have mentioned on the floor here establishes public safety innovation grants for community-based organizations to create local commissions and task forces to help communities to reimagine and develop concrete, just, and equitable public safety approaches.

Let me share with you two stories. I do this because there are so many people who have come forward and shared their experiences growing up and living in a society of discrimination.

I remember, after the Freddie Gray episode in Baltimore, I met with a group of community leaders in Sandtown, where the tragedy occurred, and listened to their accounts of how they grew up with the fear of police and the stories of how they were singled out or discriminated against by traffic stops and by other harassment just because of the color of their skin.

I want to share some stories that were reported recently in the paper. One is the story of Michael Turner, his encounter years ago with the Montgomery County police. Turner was only 18 years of age when this encounter occurred.

The police had come to break up a party in the suburban county and quickly focused on Turner and his fellow African American friends. They checked IDs. No one was drunk. The cops asked them to move along. “One officer looks at us,” Turner recounted, “and says, ‘Now go back to your projects.’”

The broader context of the email, written eight days ago, was Turner’s effort to explain why he wanted a protest in downtown Silver Spring. “We come in peace, commander,” wrote Turner. “March with us. It’s time for a change. I’m ready to help, are you?”

The email set off six days of written and phone dialogue between Turner and Captain Darren Francke, who leads the Silver Spring police district for the Montgomery County department. It culminated Sunday afternoon when Turner, Francke and three other Montgomery County officers took a knee in front of more than 200 protesters facing them and stretching half a block down Georgia Avenue.

. . . Turner’s protest in the sprawling suburb just miles north of the District had a different twist: It was a demonstration put together with the active help of the police.

To Captain Francke, it all made sense. He had served in the Pennsylvania Army National Guard and joined the Montgomery police in 1996. A father of three, including a daughter who also came to the protest, he previously commanded the department’s major crimes division—supervising murder investigations throughout the region.

“Thank you for sharing your story,” Francke wrote. “I don’t blame you for having a chip on your shoulder. I am not proud of the things that happened before and now . . . I am saddened and angered by what happened to George Floyd, and a number of other events over many years that were clearly violations of the values that the vast majority of officers have. My officers and I will march with you. With your assistance, we will also help to keep the crowds safe from those that would turn your message into something else. We want your message to be heard.”

P.m. Sunday, more than 200 people had gathered at Veterans Plaza in downtown Silver Spring. They marched 3 blocks to the corner of Coleville Road and Georgia Avenue, haired, and waited for Turner to lead everyone to one knee. He swayed back and forth, his head buried in a towel weeping as he thought of Floyd’s family. Francke stood next to him, clapping. Next a quick prayer. Then the knee. The crowd erupted with applause at the 2 minute 53 seconds mark as the group marched back to Veterans Plaza.

A wave of speakers came to the crowd. . . . About 3:30 p.m., Turner handed the microphone back to Francke. The commander told the crowd about Turner’s encounter with the police. And then the captain turned toward him. “I’m sorry,” he said.
That sorry, I think, underscores the importance that what happened in Minneapolis affects everybody in our country, not just the African-American community.

Let me close with one additional story that we also reported and brings out a very familiar challenge for African-American families.

As the day drew to a close, DeShawn Rasberry, age 6, and his younger brother, Dain, age 4, were already tired. They had been at Pennsylvania Avenue and 13th Street since noon with their mother, Janessa Smith, age 28, handing out water, Gatorade, and granola bars as people were passing. The brothers had never seen so many people before, and neither had Ms. Smith. It was the family’s first protest.

“My mom always told me, ‘If you want a change, you have to be a part of it,’” Dain, age 4, said. “It’s just not something that you can learn on the internet.”

Davián was dressed in a Superman cap and a matching T-shirt and smiled and nodded. Ms. Smith had explained to her sons that they were here to “protest,” which means standing up for something, she said, and to help others.

She hadn’t told them that the protest was against police brutality, spurred by the killing of a man with their same skin color in police custody.

“They’re so young now, still so young,” Ms. Smith said. “And right now they’re in love with law enforcement. . . . I don’t want to spoil that. Not yet.”

She pointed out that neither of her children were afraid of police. Ms. Smith looked at her sons, both just barely coming up to her waist, gripping cold water bottles. One day she will have to give them “the talk” about police officers, she thought to herself, but not today.

Let’s rise to the occasion so that Janessa Smith never has to give that heartbreaking talk to her boys in Prince George’s County, MD. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to focus on common humanity and respect for the rule of law.

There are examples of best practices in community policing that should be a guide nationwide. Let us work together to get criminal justice under the law and fulfill the promise of our Constitution in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, and ensure domestic tranquility.

Let this Nation finally guarantee “Equal Justice,” which is carved in the marble of the entrance to the Supreme Court, which is just across the street from our Senate Chamber.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, since the death of George Floyd, the American people have once again been engaged in a passionate discussion about the tragic loss of life that has existed throughout our Nation’s history.

In many ways, the killing of George Floyd was the match in the powder barrel. It ignited long-overdue conversations and activism against inequity and discrimination that still exists in homes, workplaces, and in particular, institutions charged with keeping us safe.

There is no question that what happened to George Floyd was a failure of the Minneapolis Police Department. He was killed by police officers as one applied pressure to his neck and three others stood by and did nothing. We are going to leave that to the criminal justice system to make sure that the appropriately accountable, but we are not off the hook. We have a responsibility, and we have experienced enough of these tragedies to know that it is not an isolated event.

Black men and women and other minorities were died in custody for doing things that do not warrant the use of deadly force. In the case of Breonna Taylor, who was killed in March, she was asleep in her home when plainclothes officers with a no-knock warrant the use of deadly force. In the case of Breonna Taylor, who was killed in March, she was asleep in her home when plainclothes officers with a no-knock warrant the use of deadly force. In the case of Breonna Taylor, who was killed in March, she was asleep in her home when plainclothes officers with a no-knock warrant the use of deadly force. In the case of Breonna Taylor, who was killed in March, she was asleep in her home when plainclothes officers with a no-knock warrant the use of deadly force. In the case of Breonna Taylor, who was killed in March, she was asleep in her home when plainclothes officers with a no-knock warrant the use of deadly force.

Unfortunately, as in too many of these cases, the officers who were responsible were never held responsible, and that needs to change.

We are engaged in a discussion about how we can root out the injustices that exist in our criminal justice system. One terrible idea that has been floated is to defund or even disband the police. I can’t even believe we have to talk about it, but we do because it has been proposed by some and embraced by the Minneapolis City Council members. Over the weekend, nine of them said they will begin the process of ending the Minneapolis Police Department. Well, I am amazed that we have to say it, but apparently we must. This is an extraordinary and radical reaction that I will go down. I was glad to see a number of our Democratic colleagues here in the Senate and over in the House reject such a crazy idea. I don’t know how you can call it anything else.

While it is clear that bold action is required, disbanning institutions charged with keeping us safe would do more harm than good. You would think that would be self-evident. If you have a leak in your roof that suddenly causes your ceiling in your kitchen to crash down, the solution isn’t to eliminate your roof. Sure, it would guarantee you are never going to have a leak again, but it is going to open you up to wholly new problems that would do far more damage. Our job here is to fix the leak and figure out how to move forward. The process in this case isn’t going to be quite so straightforward.

Nationwide, we have some 18,000 Federal, State, county, and local law enforcement agencies. Some have 1 officer, while some have more than 30,000, so they are not all the same. The policies and procedures governing how the officers in each of these agencies interact with their community vary widely from one department to the next. By and large, that makes sense.

If you are in Mayberry with Andy Taylor, it may be a two-police-officer town. Conversely, you have things a little differently than you can in a major metropolitan city like New York, Dallas, or Houston. That is why I believe that a one-size-fits-all approach does not make sense. We simply don’t have the expertise, nor do we have the skill to try to write legislation that will treat 330 million people the same way.

Yet there are policies and practices that we can promote as best practices, and that is actually where I think the Federal Government’s role is irreplaceable. It is very important. We can do that and provide good guidance to the States and local authorities.

One example is the chokehold. Chokeholds are already banned from a number of law enforcement agencies across the country but not all. In the past few weeks, State legislatures and city councils have taken action to ban this dangerous and controversial practice, and have no doubt, will follow suit. This is a great example of the type of action we can and should take in Washington to ensure America’s law enforcement officers are helping, not hurting, the very people they are sworn to protect.

In the Republican caucus, Senator TIM SCOTT is leading the charge to develop a package of bills that will make much needed and long-overdue reforms to our criminal justice system. We have done this before with the FIRST STEP Act, bringing State-proven remedies to prison reform and rehabilitation and safe reentry into society to the national scale. So we have done this before.

I have been in close discussions with Senator SCOTT and Leader MCCONNELL and a handful of other Senators who are interested in trying to come up with the most effective ways to create tangible change. This is not going to be a matter of political grandstanding; this is about practical problem-solving. It is certainly not going to be an effort just to serve as a political marker. I think there is actually enough common
ground where we can do something constructive on a bipartisan, bicameral basis and get a Presidential signature on it.

One provision in the list of provisions that Senator Scott is putting together involves a bill that has already received broad bipartisan support. This provision, which I recommended, included a bill that Senator Gary Peters, a Democrat from Michigan, and Senator Graham of South Carolina, chairman of the Judiciary Committee and I introduced last year to create a National Criminal Justice Commission.

I know sometimes people will say—Well, creating another committee or another commission doesn't solve the problem.' But this is not mutually exclusive. I think this is to supplement the other things we do here in the near term to come up with a comprehensive view of what we need to do in our criminal justice system to make it more fair and to make sure our law enforcement officers receive the best training and understand the best practices when it comes to community policing.

This is based largely on the same model as the 9/11 Commission. You recall that after the 9/11 Commission—there were roughly 14 people appointed by the White House in both political parties here. They studied the vulnerabilities we had that led to the 9/11 terrorist attacks and made concrete recommendations to Congress that we took up and passed. I think that is a sensible way for us to approach the problems with our criminal justice system writ large. It could include things like policing reform. That is an obvious one given the concerns of the day, but it doesn’t have to be limited to just that.

We haven’t done this sort of top-to-bottom review of our criminal justice system since since 1965. This is the legislative version of finding the leak in your roof. This is the critical first step to figuring out the full range of problems that exist so we can begin the repair process.

A similar version of this bill passed the Senate unanimously late in 2018. I hope it can be a part of the conversation we have in the coming days and weeks about how to respond.

I know minorities across America are hurting. There is a deficit of trust between many of their communities and the police departments. That is because too many families had to bury their sons or daughters who were killed without justification. While we can’t turn time back, we can take action to prevent history from repeating itself.

A couple of days ago, I had the honor of talking to George Floyd’s family as they were preparing for his funeral yesterday in Houston. I told them that at times I know how inadequate words can be, but if there was some comfort that I could offer, it is that his death is not in vain, that something good will come out of this. I think that is true.

This repair process isn’t going to be quick or easy. It is not something we can turn to next week and take off our plate and forget about it. This has been a long marching line that has been committed the original sin of treating part of our population—our African-American population—as something less than fully human. We fought a civil war over slavery, and in the 1960s, we had pretty controversial and certainly controversial legislation that protected the vote of minorities and protected civil rights writ large.

This is going to require a long-term, bipartisan commitment, not just from us in Washington but folks in the State capitals, city halls, and police departments across the country.

Because ultimately it is the local officials who have the responsibility to hire and fire the police chief, to make sure those are the people that are immediately moved from the force, and that is where the near-term responsibility needs to lie because we don’t have that capability here.

But when I think—Do I believe there are concrete steps we can take right now to address the racial injustices that were exposed once again with the death of Mr. Floyd. I appreciate Senator Scott and Leader McConnell for responding to this crisis with the urgency that it deserves, and I am proud to be part of this effort in the Senate. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Trump). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

H.R. 1957

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, this week we are considering the bipartisan Great American Outdoors Act. I think it is fair to say that this is one of the most important pieces of conservation legislation that we have seen in a long time. It might be fair to say that it is the most important piece of legislation since President Theodore Roosevelt dramatically made additions to the National Park System just a little more than 100 years ago.

The bill essentially combines two important provisions—the Restore Our Parks Act and the Land and Water Conservation Full funding act. I am a cosponsor of both of those. We have been told by the police officers are those two bills both do for a long time, and here we are.

During World War II—we are just within a few days of D-Day—President Eisenhower—at that time, General Eisenhower—drew a line that when things are sometimes if a problem is too big to solve or seems to be too hard to solve, you solve it by making it bigger.

Interestingly, what we have done here with two things that we have been trying to do for a long time—to have full access to the reason the Land and Water Conservation Act was created and to do a better job maintaining our parks—has that all been combined into this Great American Outdoors Act.

The first thing this act does is, frankly, make a significant investment for the deferred maintenance we have on all kinds of Federal land. It is one of our challenges as a government generally. It has been a result of all of our challenges as it relates to the National Park System, to the Forest Service, to the Fish and Wildlife Service, to the Bureau of Land Management—every one of those has deferred maintenance issues that have been there for a long time. In fact, some of them have been there for decades.

I mentioned earlier that the Park System as we now know it is a little more than 100 years old. Some of these monuments are hundreds of years old, maybe 50 years old. Maybe half of the life of the entire Park Service we have had these issues on a list of something that needs to be done.

In Yellowstone, that high bridge that thousands of cars go over every summer—that bridge needs to be repaired. The water maintenance systems in our parks where particularly they have overnight accommodations and other things—many of those systems are more than 100 years old. Maybe half of the life of the entire Park Service we have had those issues on a list of something that needs to be done.

In Yellowstone, that high bridge that thousands of cars go over every summer—that bridge needs to be repaired. The water maintenance systems in our parks where particularly they have overnight accommodations and other things—many of those systems are more than 100 years old. Maybe half of the life of the entire Park Service we have had those issues on a list of something that needs to be done. We need more private-public partnerships. We saw a great example of that at the renewal of the arch and the museum and the area in St. Louis that just had a significant effort made, almost all by either local or private funds—very few Federal dollars there. There are buildings we have in all those locations where the access is no longer appropriate and haven’t been for a long time. Sometimes that meant you just closed the visitor center. You closed that part of the park that people previously had a way to get into and see a display, look at an exhibit, but because of disability issues that should have been fixed long ago, they haven’t been able to.

I have been saying—I have been saying certainly for several years now that the second century of the Park System needs to be different from the first century of the Park System.

We need more private-public relationships. We saw a great example of that at the renewal of the arch and the museum and the area in St. Louis that just had a significant effort made, almost all by either local or private funds—very few Federal dollars there. There are buildings we have in all those locations where the access is no longer appropriate and haven’t been for a long time. Sometimes that meant you just closed the visitor center. You closed that part of the park that people previously had a way to get into and see a display, look at an exhibit, but because of disability issues that should have been fixed long ago, they haven’t been able to.

But a lot of this deferred maintenance will not be all that obvious. It is just something that has to be done. And because it is not all that obvious—the bridge hasn’t collapsed yet, and the water system still appears to be producing water that people can use, so let’s worry about that at some future time. Well, the future time is here.
This act will work to help improve the visitor experience at the park—certainty at the units in my State and, Mr. President, your State. I have been to a number of the facilities in Georgia that will be impacted by this.

In Missouri, there is the westward expansion that is celebrated at the arch, and we just made a significant investment in that facility. The Truman home in Independence will be a National Park Service facility. The first park in America dedicated to an American Indian national park, the George Washington Carver park at Diamond, would be a place that would potentially benefit from this. The new park that we have established in Ste. Genevieve, MO, that has more of the original French architecture left—vertical log architecture and big porches that would have looked like a farmhouse in Normandy with a Caribbean porch put on it—numbers of those are going to create one of the best walking historic parks in America. That park would benefit.

So the Federal Park System benefits, but this legislation also includes permanent annual funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

What is of the title of the fund, why would you have to do permanent funding to be sure that the Land and Water Conservation Fund got spent on land and water? It doesn’t seem to be a genius move to do what we are doing here. What we are doing here with this fund is taking about $900 million a year that has been going in many cases for other purposes and saying: No. We collect the fund for this purpose. Let’s use it for this purpose. It is not like we ran out of things to do with the money, and so we decided to put it somewhere else. But this does what the fund is supposed to do with the fund.

In our State, again, in Missouri, over the past 50 years we spent about $150 million out of that fund. The fund is being used to protect historically significant sites like the Mark Twain National Forest, the Ozark National Scenic River, and the Big Muddy National Fish and Wildlife Refuge. They have all been beneficiaries of that fund to some extent. The Wilson’s Creek National Battlefield has been a beneficiary of that fund. The fund was created for the purpose that this legislation will ensure it largely serves.

We now have to build important relationships between local communities, between the Park Service, and between the American public to ensure that these sites are managed in the right way, that they are preserved for the future, and that they are safe to use for the millions of Americans who are going to use them this summer and next summer and the summer after that, and this winter and next winter and the winter after that.

In addition to the preservation and conservation efforts, the bill will help, frankly, bolster Missouri’s outdoor recreation industry, and it is significant. The Outdoor Recreation Industry Association says that we generate about $14 billion—almost $15 billion—in our State in consumer spending, and about 133,000 jobs are created in Missouri because of outdoor recreation. About 6 million American jobs are created and sustained by outdoor economic activity are created because of the ability to use these and other outdoor resources.

This is obviously not a normal year. So anything we can do to encourage people to use these facilities in a better way is important, as is anything we can do, as we look to the future, to maintain them and hand them over. And we have a chance here on all of these areas, whether it is the bureau of public lands or the national forests or the national parks, we have a chance to hand them to the next generation in better shape than we got them. We have a chance to look at projects that have been on the “we need to do this” list for 40 or 50 years and do what is needed to be done for 40 or 50 years.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill. I am proud of the leadership, particularly of Senator GARDNERSenator GARDNER and Senator DAINES, on our side on this effort, and the best bipartisan support that this bill will have. I look forward to voting for it. I urge my colleagues to vote for it, and, even more importantly, I look forward to seeing this bill have the impact that it absolutely will have and to have on these important resources that we need to make the right kind of investment in. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, as everybody knows, our country today faces an extraordinary set of crises—unprecedented, in fact—in the modern history of this country. Over the last several months countless numbers of Americans from one end of this country to the other, from big cities and small towns, have rightly taken to the streets to demand an end to police murder and brutality and, in fact, to rethink the nature of policing in America.

In the midst of that—that rising up for police department rethinking and police department murder and brutality—our country continues to suffer from the COVID-19 pandemic, which, in a number of locations in this country, is actually getting worse and which has, up to this point, killed over 110,000 people and infected over 2 million Americans.

Then, on top of all of that—the struggle for racial justice and dealing with a pandemic in the midst of all of that—we have the worse economic downturn since the Great Depression of the 1930s. In the last number of months, as you know, over 32 million Americans have lost their jobs.

In the midst of the struggle for racial justice, in the midst of this horrific healthcare crisis, and in the midst of this economic meltdown, the American people are demanding to know what their government is doing in response to these crises. We were elected as Senators and Members of the House to respond to the needs of the American people. All over this country the American people are demanding to know what is the leadership here in the Senate doing? Tragically, the answer is nothing—nothing.

Historians have suggested that in the year 64 AD, while Rome was burning, the Emperor Nero played his fiddle. At least he did something. He provided entertainment to his court. But here, in the U.S. Senate, Republican Leader MCCONNELL and his leadership team are doing nothing. Sadly, tragically, this is the worst do-nothing Senate in modern American history. And every Member of this body should be deeply ashamed at the degree to which we are failing our constituents.

Enough is enough. The U.S. Senate must respond to the pain and the suffering of the American people. Let us wrap up debate on the Land and Water Conservation Fund act, which is on the floor right now. Let us wrap up debate, and let us vote on this bill. It is a good bill. Let’s pass it. Then, let us begin to work on the unprecedented crises that are facing our country.

If there is anything that the torture and murder of George Floyd by Minneapolis police has taught us is that we have to rethink the nature of policing in America and reform our broken and racist criminal justice system.

Let us be clear. The murder of George Floyd is not just an isolated incident. It is the latest in an endless series of police killings of African Americans—including Eric Garner, Sandra Bland, Laquan McDonald, Tamir Rice, Ahmaud Arbery, Breonna Taylor, Freddie Gray, Rekia Boyd, Walter Scott, and many, many, many others.

If anyone thinks that these police murders have just begun to take place in recent years when people had cell phone cameras, you would obviously have been mistaken. This has gone on forever.

The American people are rightly demanding justice and an end to police brutality and murder. The U.S. Senate has got to act now. We have to hear the cries for justice that are coming from the streets of this country, that are coming from the African-American community, from the White community, from the Latino community, and from all of our people. We must act and we must act now.

Let me just suggest some of the items that must be in the legislation that we pass. This is a limited number. We can do more.
In my view, every police officer involved in a killing must be held accountable, and those found guilty must be punished with the fullest force of law. That includes officers who stand by while these brutal acts take place. Every single killing of a person by police or civilians that is a crime must be investigated by the Department of Justice. We must create a process by which police departments look like the communities that they serve and not look like invading armies.

We need to abolish qualified immunity so police officers are held civilly liable for abuses. We need to prohibit the transfer of offensive military equipment to police departments. We need to strip Federal funds from departments that violate civil rights. We need to provide funding to States and municipalities to create a civilian corps of unarmed first responders to supplement law enforcement.

For too long we have asked police departments to do things for which they are not trained or prepared to do and have criminalized societal problems like addiction, homelessness, and mental illness. These are not problems solved by incarceration. We need to make records of police misconduct publicly available so that an officer with a record of misconduct cannot simply move two towns over and start again.

We need to require all jurisdictions that receive Federal funds to establish independent police conduct review boards that are broadly representative of the community and that have the authority to refer deaths that occur at the hands of police or in police custody to Federal authorities for investigation.

We need to ban the use of rubber bullets, tear gas, and pepper spray on protesters. We need to make certain that when people go to the street to protest, they will be treated like criminals and not their basic constitutional rights are not denied. The struggle for racial justice is just one of the crises that we have to address.

Today, we are looking at a pandemic unprecedented in the last 100 years, and I would tell you that New Zealand, a very small country of about 5 million people, did something rather interesting—not surprising but interesting. They listened to their scientists. They acted boldly. The start of the pandemic, they said, the political leadership trusted by their citizens. The result is that just the other day, New Zealand was able to announce that the COVID–19 virus was virtually eliminated in their country and they could reopen their economy safely.

On the other hand, in the United States, under President Trump, we have a President who downplayed the crisis from the very beginning, who ignored or attacked scientists, and who most people recognize is a pathological liar, not to be trusted.

In New Zealand and in many other countries, bold and intelligent action saved lives, and in our country, incompetent leadership cost us lives.

Well, we cannot bring back those who unnecessarily died or who have become ill, but what we can do is take action now to do everything possible to minimize unintended and ill health in the future. First and foremost, we need a national protocol based on science to address this pandemic and not have 50 States and hundreds of communities going forward in different directions. There is no one to deal with this crisis, and that leadership should be coming from the Federal Government. What we are talking about is the need, among other things, for increased testing and how to best utilize that testing as we talk about opening businesses and schools. We need, through the Defense Production Act and any other approach, to make certain that all medical personnel have the necessary personal protective equipment that they need.

Even a year ago, months after the pandemic erupted, doctors and nurses still lack the equipment they need to protect themselves. I was on the phone just a couple of weeks ago with people in Vermont who work in clinics. They still do not have the protective equipment they need.

We need to produce hundreds of millions of the most effective masks that we can so as to protect all Americans, above and beyond medical personnel. Masks are an important part of fighting this pandemic, and every American should be able to have the best quality masks possible.

Working with the international community, we need to make certain that a safe vaccine is produced as quickly as possible and that it is distributed to every American for free. I have asked the Trump administration on several occasions. God willing, that vaccine will be produced soon—as soon as possible. We plan to act.

As you know, the Federal Government is spending billions of dollars to help develop that vaccine, giving money to the drug companies. That is fine, but after that vaccine is developed, it must be distributed to every man, woman, and child in this country at no cost. I don’t want to see people dying because they can’t afford to pay for a vaccine. I don’t want to see the drug companies profiteering from this Federal investment.

When we are talking about responding to the pandemic, we are talking about workers who are on the frontlines, whether they are medical professionals, workers in transportation, grocery stores, drug stores, meatpacking plants, or whatever. They must receive hazard pay for the dangerous work that they do. I get a little bit tired of seeing these TV ads from big corporations thanking the heroes who are out on the frontlines. Well, I have read those ads, but pay them. Pay them hazardous pay for the dangerous work that they are doing. We can no longer allow multi-billion dollar corporations like Amazon, Walmart, and Tyson Foods to treat essential workers like expendable workers—like sacrificial workers. We can no longer allow multi-billion dollar corporations to run advertising campaigns thanking the heroes while paying them starvation wages and treating them disrespectfully.

It is not just the racial justice crisis we face, not just the pandemic we face, but we are in the midst of an unprecedented economic crisis, and we must act boldly and aggressively to protect the American people in the midst of this crisis. As we speak, tens of millions of people have lost their jobs. They are worried about being evicted from their apartments. They are worried about losing their homes. They are worried about putting food on the table. In Vermont—and, I suspect, in every State in this country—there are people lining up at emergency food banks to get the food they need to feed their families. Anybody that says that this is not a moment of urgency does not understand what the word urgency means. When people in America go hungry, we have to act. When people are being evicted from their apartments or losing their jobs, we have to act, and we have to act now, not a month from now, not 2 months from now.

No, President Trump, this is not a time to take a victory lap. The real unemployment rate remains over 20 percent, the highest it has been since the Great Depression. Unless we get our act together boldly, over half of small business owners in America will be forced to close their doors for good within the next 6 months. We need to respond vigorously to the economic crisis that we face and the pain and suffering of the American people.

Now, what does that mean? Again, these are just a few of the provisions that have to be passed. We need to pass a paycheck security act which does what many European countries do, and that is to provide workers with 100 percent of the paychecks and benefits they previously received. According to a recent study from the University of California Berkeley, if we had adopted a paycheck guarantee program similar to the one in Germany, 24 million Americans would have a job today. Instead, we are seeing President Trump's Labor Secretary McCarthy take a victory lap because we created some 2 million jobs last month. That is good, but when we have 32 million people who have lost their jobs in recent months, we have to act, and we have to act bold and quickly.

In my view, during this crisis, we must make sure that every American gets the healthcare they need by expanding Medicare to cover the underinsured, the uninsured, and the needs of people who have private insurance but inadequate private insurance. In my view, in the midst of this crisis with so much economic suffering, we need to provide for every working-class person to have health and safety protections. And I don’t just mean measures like making face masks available. I mean, every worker has to have the right to be protected from COVID-19 and this pandemic. In my view, we need to have a health and safety act that guarantees every American the right to be protected from this pandemic.

In Vermont, and I suspect in every State in this country, we need to do things which the President and the leadership in the White House clearly are not going to do. We need to use the Defense Production Act and any other approach to make sure that we can have the economic recovery that we need.

We have an opportunity to create a new economy that reflects the values of the American people, an economy which is not just about Wall Street, the rich, and the powerful, but about everyone working together in this country. With the Debt Production Act, we can do that.
person in this country with a $2,000 emergency payment each and every month until the crisis is over, so that they can pay the rent, feed their families, and deal with their basic needs.

Furthermore, as a top priority, we have to take the end of police killings and brutality and demanding racial justice in this country. All over this country, people are being infected with a virus and continue to die, and all over this country, people are wondering how they are going to pay their bills because they have lost their jobs and have, in some cases, no food in the cupboard. If there was ever a time in the modern history of this country that the Senate and the House are called upon for families for the working families of this country, who are struggling, who are living in emotional anxiety, who are scared to death about what is going to happen in the future, and if we are to reaffirm faith in government in this country to know that we are seeing an end of this engineering that pain, now is the time. So today, I just call upon my colleagues. I know we have disagreements, but let us understand the urgency of the moment. Let’s deal with the pandemic. Let’s save lives. It’s deal with the economic crisis. Let’s put people back to work. Let’s deal with the issue of racial justice. Let’s fight to end racism in this country. There is an enormous amount of work to be done. Let’s do it.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today having just heard the Senator from Vermont talking about the Nation in its effort to recover from the coronavirus crisis and the economic crisis as a result, and other important issues affecting our country. I heard him say that we have not done enough and need to do more, specifically with an economic recovery, with a coronavirus recovery, and it sounded like almost a liberal wish list of government providing for food, clothing, shelter, and income for every American.

I come to the floor today to tell you what we have done, in a historic way, because we passed the largest economic rescue package in the history of this country—trillions and trillions of dollars. This Senate, the House, and the White House worked together to help us as a nation to recover from the coronavirus crisis.

Last week, the Senate passed and the President signed another bipartisan bill to help small businesses across our country. It is the Paycheck Protection Program Flexibility Act. That is what the people of Wyoming were asking for—this very successful Paycheck Protection Program, with flexibility, so it would be easier for our small businesses to use the relief funds. And 1,000 businesses in Wyoming took over $1 billion in loans, and it is keeping our economy alive, breathing life into the economy and allowing paychecks to continue to be paid as our businesses reopen.

Across the country, this jobs-saving effort is working, because last month in the U.S., we added 2.5 million jobs. It smashed all expectations. It was the largest single month of job growth in this Nation in the history of our great country. Americans literally ran out the front door and back to work. Unfortunately, May it defied all of the forecasts and defied what we just heard the Senator from Vermont talking about and what his expectations have been.

We are headed for a faster economic rebound than anyone has imagined. Across the country, the State lockdowns have been ended. States have started to safely reopen. Small businesses are reopening. People are going back to work. I thought I heard the Senator from Vermont say that he was thinking that half of all the small businesses in America wouldn’t be able to reopen again ever.

Young people are going back to school. K-12 schools and colleges are planning to reopen this fall. Of course, I don’t think any of us were surprised to see the University of California system say that they are going to stay closed until 2021—until next year, all 10 campuses—because in California, one size fits all. But for the rest of our Nation, the schools and the colleges are reopening and students will be heading back to campus.

There is a return-to-normal routine that is going to boost our communities. As the American recovery begins, we are going all in to keep people safe. That is a big part of it. That means more virus testing, more treatment, and better treatment and vaccines.

Innovations are rapidly expanding testing. The country has now performed more than 22 million coronavirus tests. Nearly a half million tests are done every day, including today. Our researchers, our scientists, and our doctors are making record progress on a vaccine. We are calling this effort Operation Warp Speed. It is a public-private partnership with companies—and a vaccine for the American people that will then be used around the world. The private sector finalists will soon be announced. The government will support their vaccine work, will assist with clinical trials, and will review the most promising vaccines.

One of the companies, called Moderna, is in phase 2 trials and plans to start phase 3 in July. The Food and Drug Administration approval is then the final step. Another company, AstraZeneca, plans to end phase 2 and phase 3 trials over the next few months.

AstraZeneca just announced a new partnership with the Biomedical Research Authority and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency. So our military is joining in this public/private partnership. This project may deliver emergency vaccines as early as October, which we hope to make a truly record-breaking. The pharmaceutical company Merck will conduct trials in July. Johnson & Johnson plans phase 1 and phase 2 trials for July as well. Pfizer hopes to have a vaccine ready by October. The goal is to make a safe, effective vaccine and make it available to all Americans by January of 2021.

Operation Warp Speed partners want to beat this, and they want to make that their most ambitious goal—beating timelines that have never been beaten before, breaking the records. At the same time a number of other companies are pursuing a vaccine independently. America’s researchers, scientists, and doctors have dropped everything and are working in overdrive. They have gone all in.

One major drug company CEO said yesterday that there will be no big price for the coronavirus vaccine. Every company should make that same pledge. Every company should make that same pledge. This is a tremendous opportunity for companies to do the right thing, to make the vaccine as accessible as any vaccine in the history of our Nation.

As we begin to recover from this crisis, the goal is clear, and it has been clear: We want to keep Americans safe and get them back to work. Together, that is what we must all endeavor to do.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, let me apologize in advance. My accent has not changed, but my speech has. I had a little oral surgery, so I am going to try to be as clear as I can be.

I want to talk for a few minutes today about the Communist Party of China and Confucius Institutes.

As you know, Confucius Institutes are the Communist Party of China’s so-called learning centers that are located on 72 university campuses across the continental United States and, of course, Alaska and Hawaii. Each one of these symbols is one of these Confucius Institutes located at one of our universities.

Here is how a Confucius Institute works. The Communist Party of China gives our universities—these 72 universities—money to open these Confucius Institutes, and supposedly the purpose of these Confucius Institutes is to, A, teach the Chinese language, and B,
to teach culture about the country of China to American students.

At this juncture, it is important to distinguish between the people of China and the Chinese Communist Party. I had the pleasure of visiting China. I spent three times, and I was the Presiding Officer has. The Chinese people are wonderful people. They are smart. They are hard-working. They have a wonderful sense of humor. They are just extraordinary people. Their government, the Communist Party of China. Not many know much. So when I talk today about China, I am talking about their government, the Communist Party of China.

These Confucius Institutes, which are, once again, funded by the Communist Party of China, you will not be surprised to learn come with a lot of strings attached to that Chinese Communist Party money. For example, most of the teachers who teach at these Confucius Institutes on American university campuses are trained in China. In fact, the Communist Party of China has to approve all the teachers even though they are teaching in our universities. The Communist Party of China also has to approve all of the events and all the speakers at these Confucius Institutes.

In addition, in order to get the money from the Communist Party of China, our universities have to agree that the Confucius Institutes will be governed by both Chinese law and American law. I have never seen anything like that. It is unprecedented.

In order to get the money from the Communist Party of China, our universities also have to agree through these Confucius Institutes that certain topics will be off limits. For example, at these institutes, you can’t talk about Taiwan; you can’t talk about civil liberties in Hong Kong; you can’t talk about Tiananmen Square and the murders of Protesters in Tiananmen Square; you can’t talk about Tibet; you can’t talk about the Dalai Lama; and you can’t talk about the discrimination and indeed the imprisonment of the Uighur Muslims in northwest China. Once again, these are institutes that are on American campuses, but in order to get the money from the Communist Party of China, our universities have to agree that these topics are off limits.

The Communist Party of China, in short, requires that these institutes can only teach versions of Chinese history, culture, and current events that are approved by the Communist Party of China. That is about the furthest thing you can imagine from academic freedom.

How am I doing? Is my speech OK? I promise you, I haven’t been drinking.

The first Confucius Institute was formed on an American campus in 2004, and since that time, they have evolved—and not in a good way.

I want to give you a short quotation. You are familiar with the Politburo of the Communist Party of China. Back in 2011, a member of the Politburo, which is the senior leadership in China in its Communist Party, Comrade Li Changchun, described Confucius Institutes in a speech he gave in Beijing in 2011. Comrade Li said:

‘The Confucius Institutes are an appealing brand for us to do business abroad. [They] have made an important contribution toward improving [our] soft power. ‘The ‘Confucius brand has a natural attractiveness. A natural attractiveness. . . using the excuse of teaching Chinese language, everything looks reasonable and logical.’’

But of course it is not. Many of our professors across America have condemned the behavior of the Confucius Institutes. The American Association of University Professors did a comprehensive study of Confucius Institutes in 2014. Here is their report. This is what our professors concluded.

I will quote from their report.

Confucius Institutes function as an arm of the Chinese state and are allowed to ignore academic freedom. Their academic activities are under the supervision of Hanban, a Chinese state agency, chaired by a member of the Politburo and the vice-president of the People’s Republic of China. Most agreements establishing Confucius Institutes feature nondisclosure and unenforceable concessions to the political aims and practices of the government of China. Specifically, North American universities permit Confucius Institutes to cultivate a state agenda in the recruitment and control of academic staff, in the choice of curriculum, and in the restriction of debate.

I don’t want to beat this to death, but I have a number of studies. There is another one right here from the GAO.

I won’t bore you with the details, but here is a 2019 report calling for either the overhaul or the closure of Confucius Institutes in America, which was issued by the United States Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Many U.S. colleges have disbanded Confucius Institutes. I want to be fair. Not that many years ago, there were over 100 of these little symbols. Now there are 72. About 30 universities have said: No, we believe in academic freedom—universities like the University of Chicago, Miami-Dade College, and Pennsylvania State University.

Senator DOUG JONES, our colleague from Alabama, the distinguished junior senator from Alabama, and I enacted a bill. It deals with Confucius Institutes, but it wouldn’t abolish them. It would not. The name of the bill—it is called the Concerns Over Nations Funding University Campus Institutes Act. It was called the CONGUIS Act, by Senator DOUG JONES and myself.

Our bill would reform Confucius Institutes. Our bill would allow them to exist, but it would require all American universities that choose to sign a contract and receive money from and with the Communist Party of China to enter into contracts that require the Confucius Institutes to do the following: The Confucius Institute, by contract, would have to provide that it would protect academic freedom at the university; that it would prohibit the application of any foreign law on any campus of the institution; and that it would grant full managerial control to the Chinese Communist Party. If the Confucius Institutes are going to be part of our universities, they should be part of our democracies.

Freedom of speech, full academic freedom—anything is open for discussion, and we don’t have to have it first approved by the Communist Party of China.

I think Senator JONES’ and my bill would restore balance. It would restore truth. It would restore transparency. I know it would restore academic freedom to these Confucius Institutes that are operating in the United States of America.

Toward that end, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of S. 939—that is the CONFUCIUS Act—and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title. The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 939) to establish limitations regarding Confucius Institutes, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, with gratitude to my coauthor, Senator DOUG JONES, who has done an extraordinary job on this legislation, I 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 939) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 939

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Concerns Over Nations Funding University Campus Institutes Act in the United States Act” or the “CONFUCIUS Act”.

SEC. 2. RESTRICTIONS ON CONFUCIUS INSTITUTES.

(a) Definition. — In this section, the term “Confucius Institute” means a cultural institute directly or indirectly funded by the
Government of the People’s Republic of China.

(b) RESTRICTIONS ON CONFUCIUS INSTITUTES.—An institution of higher education or other postsecondary educational institution (referred to in this section as an “institution”) shall not be eligible to receive Federal funds from the Department of Education (except under Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) or other Department of Education funds that are provided directly to students) unless the institution ensures that any contract or agreement between the institution and a Confucius Institute includes clear provisions that—

(1) protect academic freedom at the institution;

(2) prohibit the application of any foreign law on any campus of the institution; and

(3) grant full managerial authority of the Confucius Institute to the institution, including full control over what is being taught, the activities carried out, the research grants that are made, and who is employed at the Confucius Institute.

Mr. KENNEDY. Thank you.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Ms. STABENOW. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

TAXPAYER FIRST ACT OF 2019—Continued

JUSTICE IN POLICING ACT

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, something is happening in America. People across our country and in my home State of Michigan are coming together for the cause of racial justice in a way that we have not really experienced in a generation.

From Holland, to Bad Axe, to Marquette, people of all ages and faiths and backgrounds have been marching together, singing together, praying together, and kneeling together. In one voice, people are demanding change, imploring our Nation to finally be that place where all men and women are truly created equal. Unfortunately, we know that, far too often throughout our history and even today, our Nation has failed to live up to our highest ideals.

Eight minutes forty-six seconds—that is how long a Minneapolis police officer, Derek Chauvin, knelt on the neck of George Floyd, an unarmed, handcuffed Black man lying on the pavement. For 8 minutes 46 seconds, George Floyd pleaded for his life. He said, “I can’t breathe.” He cried out for his mother. He suffered. Then he was silent.

Millions of Americans watched the video in shock and horror. Why didn’t the officer just lift his knee off of Mr. Floyd’s neck? Why didn’t he just lift his knee up for just a minute—just lift it up? Why didn’t one—just one—of the other officers push his knee off of Mr. Floyd’s neck?

What is happening in America that someone—let alone police officers—thought this was OK? Of course, we know it was not OK. It was not OK. It was a crime. It was murder.

Watching those images has awakened something deep in the souls of Americans across the country. We know that racial disparities in every part of our society—from healthcare, to housing, to jobs, to education, to the air we breathe and the water we drink—have existed in this country since its very beginning. We have known for a long time that experiences with the police are different for Black Americans than for White Americans. Yet, despite all of the other times, this time—this time—there the violence was, right in front of us, in a way that people have decided cannot and will not be ignored.

There is much to do. For each of us, we have a personal journey—a personal journey to take concerning our own behavior with one another, and then we have a public journey together to change laws and policies and work together toward the day when what happened in Minneapolis and across our country never happens again. That is the goal of the Justice in Policing Act. I am honored to co-sponsor it, and I want to thank my friends Senator BOOKER and Senator HARRIS for leading us in this introduction.

The Justice in Policing Act takes important steps to improve transparency by collecting and sharing more accurate data on police misconduct and the use of force. This will help ensure that problem officers aren’t simply getting a job with a police department in another city or State to avoid being held accountable for their previous actions.

The legislation improves police training and practices by ending racial and religious profiling, requiring officers to receive training on racial biases, banning no-knock warrants in drug cases, transfer of military-grade equipment to police departments, and banning chokeholds like the one that ended George Floyd’s life. It finally makes lynching a Federal crime—something that I would have thought we would have done a generation ago. It makes important changes within our criminal justice system to hold police officers and departments accountable for their actions.

This legislation is not about defending the police. It is not about defunding law enforcement. It is about funding the right kind of law enforcement, the kind of law enforcement that protects all of our neighborhoods and the people who live in them; the kind of law enforcement that officers know in Michigan—including in my own family, across Michigan—do every day; the kind of law enforcement I know the majority of police officers believe in.

In short, this legislation is about treating people as professionals, with high standards, and expecting them to meet those standards. In any professional setting, including law enforce-
be the ones working on the frontlines—these are the frontline jobs that can’t be done at home—even though their children are home from school or childcare because they have had to close. They have more costs, but they are on the frontlines, and there are few jobs left. In fact, 41 percent of our essential workers are people of color. The majority are women. That is exposing them to both COVID-19 and now layoffs.

When more than 12 percent of White Americans are out of work, nearly 17 percent of Black Americans have lost their jobs so far. No single piece of legislation, no matter how good, is going to solve these systemic issues all at once. We know that, but our continuing actions can do that, if we are aware and our eyes are open and we are paying attention and we are doing the best we can on everything that we do.

That is why we need to pass the Heroes Act, passed by the House, as soon as possible. We have been waiting so long, since the House took action, and it is critically important that we get that done. This bill gives premium pay to our frontline workers, so we are not just applauding them. That does not pay the bills while they are working or for food or for keeping a roof over their own heads. We need to provide hazard pay, premium pay, for the people who are working when we have the luxury of working at home. The federal unemployment benefits that are critical, strengthens emergency paid leave, and offers food and rent and mortgage assistance to families who need it.

That is why it is so important to pay attention every time legislation comes to the floor and that we evaluate through the lens of how this affects everyone. How does this affect the poor? How does this affect communities of color? Are we doing everything we can to make sure not adding to the racial disparities or economic disparities that have lived with us for way too long?

Senate Democrats, looking at every piece of legislation, paid attention on the Paycheck Protection Act, and we were successful in amending it to ensure that minority-owned businesses and underserved communities would receive the same business help and the same access to capital as majority-White businesses.

It was a real fight to get that done. It was a struggle. It should not have been. When people say racial disparities are in the past, I say it is right here, right now. When we look at moving forward on legislation, we need to see who is helped, who is impacted, is it fair, and does everybody have a fair shot?

Today, once again, we see in Georgia why it is outrageous that Mitch McConnell has been blocking a vote on the Voting Rights Advancement Act that the House passed 187 days ago. It was 187 days ago that they passed a bill to restore the Voting Rights Act, with no action here in the Senate. This needs to be passed immediately. It is another piece of what is happening in terms of the racial inequality in this country.

Racial disparities are not in the past. Racism is not in the past. We are seeing it every day right in front of our eyes. Now is the time to keep our eyes open. Now is the time to lift America up to the best we can be. We need to pass the Justice in Policing Act, and we need to pass the Heroes Act to put people back to work in this pandemic and close the gaps in investments in our communities that have created the racial disparities we see today in every part of our society and in every community, and we need to pass the Voting Rights Advancement Act right now. That would be a great thing to get done this week.

There is not much happening on the Senate floor right now. It would be great if we could come together and all stand behind something as basic as making sure that everybody fully has the right to vote in this country.

One of George Floyd’s high school friends, Jonathan Veal, remembered that on the day of his death he was in 11th grade. George Floyd turned to him and said: “I want to touch the world.” George Floyd has touched the world. He has touched the hearts of people around the world. His horrific murder has inspired a worldwide movement against systemic racism and police brutality. I know that is cold comfort to those who have lost family members or friends, Jonathan Veal, remembered making sure that everybody fully has the right to vote in this country.

That is why it is so important to pay attention every time legislation comes to the floor and that we evaluate through the lens of how this affects everyone. How does this affect the poor? How does this affect communities of color? Are we doing everything we can to make sure not adding to the racial disparities or economic disparities that have lived with us for way too long?

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, the Federal Government currently owns about 640 million acres of land in the United States, which means 640 million acres is owned by the American people, and that is about 28 percent of all the land mass of the United States. If you round the number up, let’s say, a quarter of all the land owned by the United States is owned by the Federal Government. That was denied. They said: No, that is too high. It is not a shock to anyone. I brought proposals to this years ago, saying: Why don’t we split the dollars we have in the land and Water Conservation Fund, and say that 75 percent of the money raised will be used for conservation mitigation. Those are areas where they have land in trust for other aspects.

Today, once again, we see in Georgia why it is outrageous that Mitch McConnell has been blocking a vote on the Voting Rights Advancement Act that the House passed 187 days ago. It was 187 days ago that they passed a bill to restore the Voting Rights Act, with no action here in the Senate. This needs to be passed immediately. It is another piece of what is happening in terms of the racial inequality in this country.

Racial disparities are not in the past. Racism is not in the past. We are seeing it every day right in front of our eyes. Now is the time to keep our eyes open. Now is the time to lift America up to the best we can be. We need to pass the Justice in Policing Act, and we need to pass the Heroes Act to put people back to work in this pandemic and close the gaps in investments in our communities that have created the racial disparities we see today in every part of our society and in every community, and we need to pass the Voting Rights Advancement Act right now. That would be a great thing to get done this week.

There is not much happening on the Senate floor right now. It would be great if we could come together and all stand behind something as basic as making sure that everybody fully has the right to vote in this country.

One of George Floyd’s high school friends, Jonathan Veal, remembered that on the day of his death he was in 11th grade. George Floyd turned to him and said: “I want to touch the world.” George Floyd has touched the world. He has touched the hearts of people around the world. His horrific murder has inspired a worldwide movement against systemic racism and police brutality. I know that is cold comfort to those who have lost family members or friends, Jonathan Veal, remembered making sure that everybody fully has the right to vote in this country.

That is why it is so important to pay attention every time legislation comes to the floor and that we evaluate through the lens of how this affects everyone. How does this affect the poor? How does this affect communities of color? Are we doing everything we can to make sure not adding to the racial disparities or economic disparities that have lived with us for way too long?

Senator McConnell has been blocking a vote on the Paycheck Protection Act, and we were successful in amending it to ensure that minority-owned businesses and underserved communities would receive the same business help and the same access to capital as majority-White businesses.

It was a real fight to get that done. It was a struggle. It should not have been. When people say racial disparities are in the past, I say it is right here, right now. When we look at moving forward on legislation, we need to see who is helped, who is impacted, is it fair, and does everybody have a fair shot?

Today, once again, we see in Georgia why it is outrageous that Mitch McConnell has been blocking a vote on the Paycheck Protection Act, and we were successful in amending it to ensure that minority-owned businesses and underserved communities would receive the same business help and the same access to capital as majority-White businesses.

It was a real fight to get that done. It was a struggle. It should not have been. When people say racial disparities are in the past, I say it is right here, right now. When we look at moving forward on legislation, we need to see who is helped, who is impacted, is it fair, and does everybody have a fair shot?

Today, once again, we see in Georgia why it is outrageous that Mitch McConnell has been blocking a vote on the Paycheck Protection Act, and we were successful in amending it to ensure that minority-owned businesses and underserved communities would receive the same business help and the same access to capital as majority-White businesses.

It was a real fight to get that done. It was a struggle. It should not have been. When people say racial disparities are in the past, I say it is right here, right now. When we look at moving forward on legislation, we need to see who is helped, who is impacted, is it fair, and does everybody have a fair shot?

Today, once again, we see in Georgia why it is outrageous that Mitch McConnell has been blocking a vote on the Paycheck Protection Act, and we were successful in amending it to ensure that minority-owned businesses and underserved communities would receive the same business help and the same access to capital as majority-White businesses.

It was a real fight to get that done. It was a struggle. It should not have been. When people say racial disparities are in the past, I say it is right here, right now. When we look at moving forward on legislation, we need to see who is helped, who is impacted, is it fair, and does everybody have a fair shot?

Today, once again, we see in Georgia why it is outrageous that Mitch McConnell has been blocking a vote on the Paycheck Protection Act, and we were successful in amending it to ensure that minority-owned businesses and underserved communities would receive the same business help and the same access to capital as majority-White businesses.

It was a real fight to get that done. It was a struggle. It should not have been. When people say racial disparities are in the past, I say it is right here, right now. When we look at moving forward on legislation, we need to see who is helped, who is impacted, is it fair, and does everybody have a fair shot?

Today, once again, we see in Georgia why it is outrageous that Mitch McConnell has been blocking a vote on the Paycheck Protection Act, and we were successful in amending it to ensure that minority-owned businesses and underserved communities would receive the same business help and the same access to capital as majority-White businesses.

It was a real fight to get that done. It was a struggle. It should not have been. When people say racial disparities are in the past, I say it is right here, right now. When we look at moving forward on legislation, we need to see who is helped, who is impacted, is it fair, and does everybody have a fair shot?

Today, once again, we see in Georgia why it is outrageous that Mitch McConnell has been blocking a vote on the Paycheck Protection Act, and we were successful in amending it to ensure that minority-owned businesses and underserved communities would receive the same business help and the same access to capital as majority-White businesses.

It was a real fight to get that done. It was a struggle. It should not have been. When people say racial disparities are in the past, I say it is right here, right now. When we look at moving forward on legislation, we need to see who is helped, who is impacted, is it fair, and does everybody have a fair shot?
maintenance is rising up and screaming at us all over the country. Instead of actually deciding how we are going to do it, this is a punt saying we will figure it out later.

Here is the fiscally responsible portion again. We do not do that forever just to work on maintenance backlog. This is just for the next 5 years that we will have additional debt. Every single year we will spend about $2 billion, all in debt money, to be able to do this, and then we will figure out next year how we are able to take care of the rest. The fiscally responsible portion of this is to say we are not doing infinite amounts of debt. It will just be the next 5 years.

The problem is that in the sixth year we will still have a maintenance backlog. We will still have issues, and there is still not a plan to pay for the first $20 billion for what is still coming.

My challenge is figuring out what we can do with a bill that we need to fix. We need to be better managers of our land, but we are managing our land by not managing our debt and not making the hard decisions that people have to take. At your home, you can't just say: Everything needs to be fixed, but I can't afford to take out more debt, and I will fix everything.

We have to make decisions on what is going to have to wait so we can do this because it is more important. That is the kind of thing I would like to be able to see in this bill.

Let me run through basic ideas. They are all amendments that were already brought up that say: Here are logical ways to be able to fix this, beginning with the most basic of them. Take part of the money that already exists for the Land and Water Conservation Fund to purchase new land, and then split it, saying we are going to dedicate dollars to maintenance and also have dollars to buy new properties. We will not be able to do it all as fast as we want. We will not be able to fix as many things as we want, but we are not adding additional debt spending to do it. These are the same decisions that families make all the time. I would love to have the nicer car. I can have the nicer car if I just save up for several years to get it.

That is one recommendation.

There is a second recommendation to this. There is a portion of this that gets the same amount that is doing something that goes on. Part of what is happening to the Land and Water Conservation Fund is moving it—brace yourself from budget gimmicks here—to what is called appropriated dollars that we vote on every year to mandatory. This means every year it keeps going. Think of it like Social Security. Social Security was voted on a long time ago and keeps going year after year. We don't vote on it each year. It happens because it is mandated by law.

The idea in this bill was to move the spending from being appropriated each year like we do with the Department of Defense or Department of Education or Health and Human Services, to take it out of that area and move it toward mandatory. Then they still left the funds over in the appropriated side and said: We are also going to spend those dollars as well.

The gimmick that this sets up is it allows those funds that were spent last year to be spent on the mandatory side this year and leaves a big hole on the normal side that will just plus-up to spend for other things.

My second recommendation is this: If we will not split the dollars we normally use for half of the purchase and half to maintain, at least dedicate the dollars that were left and aren't spent on something else and spend those on maintenance, because then we will only have half a billion dollars of new deficit rather than what this does at $2.5 billion of new deficit spending.

The first challenge is to split it.

The second challenge is to take the dollars that were "left over" in appropriated dollars and just dedicate that to only doing the maintenance funds that need to be done.

The third idea is pretty simple, as well. This has a 5-year plan on it on the maintenance $2 billion a year of additional debt spending. I would just say that if we are only going to do maintenance for 5 years, we should only do the purchasing, which is the big chunk of this, for 5 years, as well, to split both of them. We are not going to have this big plus-up and more and more purchasing at the same time we have no plan to maintain it long term. As long as we are going to maintain it, we will also do purchasing. Just sunset it. That seems common sense as well.

Here is a fourth idea. When you purchase new properties, make sure that with the dollars that are used to purchase it, there are also dollars set aside to fix what needs fixing when you get it.

We often find that when people want to sell property to the Federal Government, it is because there are major problems on the land already, and they can't get another private seller. So they want to sell it to the Federal taxpayer, knowing there are problems in infrastructure on that property.

We buy property with major maintenance needs already on it, and it just backs up our backlog of maintenance issues. It is even tangential to just what happens when we buy property, part of the purchase of it is also setting aside dollars for maintenance, so we have to fix it right then, rather than add it to the backlog of maintenance issues. That makes common sense that we have—maybe not as fast as we want to, but its starts getting after our backlog of maintenance—that continue to allow us to purchase new properties, but to make sure that we are actually managing the properties that we purchase.

It is a frustration for me that we are not having amendments in this process, that we are not having the opportunity to be able to fix some of the things that are wrong with this bill—because we do need to have Federal lands, we do need to maintain the lands that we have, but we do need to honor our budgets for the future, as well.

I would say we really needed to maintain all of this and purchase this, but we don't have a plan for how to do it now and so we will just wait 6 years. We will have 5 years of debt spending, and then we will somehow figure it out 6 years from now.

Five years ago we were talking about this very same issue. We haven't come up with an answer in the past 5 years because no one has been willing to say we have to do less so we can take responsibility for what we have. We just want to do more and not have the accountability. So from 5 years ago to 5 years later now, to 5 years from now, when this bill expires, we will still have maintenance backlog of law. We need to start making hard decisions. Some of those hard decisions deal with the budget and making choices and saying that there aren't any options to instead saying: There are options that I may not like as well as the "just do everything all at once" option.

But there are options on how to do this, and we should have this debate to be able to figure out how to manage these dollars better. Maybe we will 5 years from now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, a free society depends on the rule of law, which is the foundation for public order and peace. Police are the indispensable guardians of that order. We rightfully honor them for the risks they assume every morning when they put on the badge and sometimes the bulletproof vest, knowing they may not come home at night to take them off.

But the police have a sworn duty to wield their power with justice. They take an oath never to betray their character or the public trust. They must hold themselves to the highest standard and overwhelmingly do so.

What happened last week to George Floyd in Minnesota was horrific. He was killed by police officers—dying at the hands of people who protect and serve their communities.

I am glad that justice appears to be moving swiftly in George Floyd's case. The officers who participated have been terminated from the department, and the criminal process is well underway.

But this is little consolation to many Americans, including many Black
Americans, who feel they have experienced unjust, unequal interactions with law enforcement. Many have protested peacefully for change in the finest tradition of our country. And in sharp contrast to the rioters and looters, who have exploited this tragedy for their own gain, the communities that now seek to reveal national unity from the wreckage of broken trust and broken glass on our streets. To do this, we will need to be guided by our Nation’s noblest principles, while rejecting the anti-American suggestions of radicals who want a revolution.

Every American deserves to be treated equally by their government, as guaranteed by our Constitution and our country’s most fundamental principle that all men are created equal. There is no greater bulwark to tyranny and injustice than that old, simple proposition. But we must reject efforts to scatheat and demonize all police for the actions of a few; and we must reject the radical proposals to dismantle and defund police departments, as some have suggested.

These proposals are offered in the spirit of revenge that would lead only to more crime, more lives lost, and more sorrow. The communities that would be hit the hardest by the disappearance of police would be the most disadvantaged. When police are understaffed and undertained, there is greater risk of mistakes and misconduct, not to mention higher rates of crime.

By contrast, a well-staffed, well-trained, and well-respected force is a blessing to its community and a scourge to criminals who threaten it. Defunding the police would be deadly. It isn’t a solution but an insult to good officers, and a threat to law-abiding citizens.

Americans are not blind to injustice. We all understand the hard work that is needed to trust in this country, but defunding the police is not the answer. We need the rule of law and equal justice under law. We need them both.

I urge my colleagues to join with us in passing this resolution, which calls for justice for George Floyd and other victims of excessive use of force, while also honoring the law enforcement officers who keep us safe.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of a resolution that is at the desk, calling for justice for George Floyd and other victims of excessive use of force, while also honoring the law enforcement officers who keep us safe.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, there are millions of people in America marching in the streets to reform our police practices, to ask for equality, to ask for racial justice.

We have seen in the savage death of George Floyd, the murder of Breonna Taylor, Ahmaud Arbery, Eric Garner, and in so many other instances that our police departments need real reform.

There is a demand of Americans that we act—and act soon. The resolution I call for is not rhetoric, and the great worry so many Americans have is that so many on the other side will feel rhetorical and then try to let this go away.

We demand action, and we demand it now—real action, not rhetoric—to reform our police departments in a fair and comprehensive way. That is what the Justice in Policing Act does. We need it on the floor now, as soon as the Senate passes it.

Very gently, we ask that Leader McConnell will put it on the floor, but we want him to. We demand he does.

Again, the resolution by my friend Mr. Schumer will do nothing—nothing. It is rhetoric. We demand action.

And at that point, my friend from Arkansas or anyone else can do whatever they want, but not in an empty field of rhetoric and no action, when Americans demand action.

We need justice. We need racial equality, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SCHUMER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York would like to enter into a colloquy, I did not hear an objection to a single sentence of that resolution, to a clause of that resolution, to a word in that resolution, which calls for justice for George Floyd and other victims of excessive force, and also says that the Senate opposes radical ideas to defund the police.

So if the Senator from New York would like to explain to the Senate that the motion to reconsider he opposes, I would welcome to hear his answer.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I have a resolution at the desk.

Mr. COTTON. Reclaiming my time, I have not yielded the floor.

So I would just point out this. Let’s be clear what just happened here. We have a resolution. It is a couple of pages long. The Democrats have had it for 24 hours. Until just moments ago, we had no indication that they planned to object to it, that they had any other contrary resolution.

We have heard objection from the Senator from New York not to a single word of that resolution itself—a resolution which, I will say again, calls for justice for George Floyd and for all victims of excessive force, as well as opposes radical efforts to defund the police.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, as the gentleman heard, we need action, not rhetoric. That is the objection because we believe that too many on that side of the aisle will not want to act and, therefore, for them to be content with rhetoric will not serve any good purpose.

We can debate all of these issues when we have a real bill on the floor and we are moving forward on justice. My resolution does just that. It says very simply—very simply—that the minute the House passes the Justice in Policing Act, the pending business here in the Senate is that act, so we can debate it and we can hopefully finally hear some of the progressive voices in the House may act on it in whatever way they choose, but rhetoric is no substitute for action when the American people, overwhelmingly, in the streets, peacefully, proudly, strongly demand action.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of a resolution at the desk that would make H.R. 7120, the Justice in Policing Act, the pending business here in the Senate, after it passes the House, be that bill, so that we are forced and required to consider it.

And now, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, we are moving to defund the police. I further ask for racial justice for George Floyd and other victims of excessive force, as well as opposing radical efforts to defund the police. I also ask for racial justice for victims of excessive force, as well as opposing radical efforts to defund the police.
right in front of us that condemns the unjustified killing of George Floyd, calls for justice for his death and all those victims of excessive use of force, and also—since the Senate opposes the radical idea—of defunding the police.

Yet, the Democratic leader, on behalf of himself and all of his party, has objected to that without citing a single word, a single clause, a single sentence that he finds objectionable. I assume it is because they do, in fact, want to defund the police.

I know he keeps talking about rhetoric. I will just remind you that the Senate, on almost every day we are in business, passes multiple resolutions by unanimous consent. If I am not mistaken, I think the Democratic leader was on the floor last week trying to pass a resolution condemning the President once again. So the idea that we don’t pass resolutions expressing the sense of the Senate or, for that matter, there is a choice between passing such a resolution and taking action is simply foreign to the way the Senate acts every single day.

I will just say again that what we are seeing here is the Democratic leader apparently objecting on behalf of the Democratic Party in defense of the radical left, that we should defund the police. I object to the Democratic leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, the gentleman from Arkansas has made my point. He talks about business as usual. This is not business as usual. The typical rhetoric, the kind of avoiding action which has been so, so endemic in this Republican Party is showing itself again. If they wanted to act, they could have supported our resolution. They are trying to avoid it. We will not let that happen.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, if the Democratic leader again, would like to engage in a colloquy, I will ask him, is the bill that he wants to make the immediate pending business of the Senate even written in the House of Representatives?

Since he has departed, I guess the answer to my question is, no, that bill is not even written and filed in the House of Representatives, and certainly it has not been voted upon in the House and sent to the Senate for us to make it the pending business.

So the objection you just heard, again, didn’t object to a single word in our resolution, much less a clause or a sentence—a resolution that calls for justice for George Floyd and the victims of the excessive use of force, while at the same time opposing radical Democratic proposals to defund the police. I can only infer, since I didn’t hear a single objection to the language of our resolution, that the rub of the matter is that the Democrats really do support defunding the police.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.
I couldn’t agree more, Glenn.

Finally, I want to highlight a letter. It is a letter signed by every former Secretary of the Interior, from Secretary Babbitt, who served in 1993, to Montana’s very own Secretary Ryan Zinke.

In fact, Ryan and I were Boy Staters together back in 1979. Ryan was a junior, soon to be a senior, at Whitefish High School, and I was a junior, soon to be senior, at Bozeman High in 1979. Little do we know when we were Boy Staters then that Ryan, after a distinguished military career in the U.S. Navy as a Navy SEAL, would go onto be our Secretary of the Interior.

The letter says this: “The Great American Outdoors Act will help ensure a better, brighter future for nature and for all of us.”

By the way, if you look at those Secretaries, those are Secretaries who served under Democratic Presidents and Republican Presidents.

Needless to say, Montana has its fair share of support for the Great American Outdoors Act, and the list of support goes on.

Montanans know what it takes to conserve land. Ensuring full mandatory funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund will make sure our public lands are managed correctly and that Montanans and Americans around the country will have better access to share public lands.

Dealing with the $12 billion maintenance backlog in our national parks will be so beneficial for the employees who are working so hard in national parks. We are seeing record visitation levels in many of our parks, but our employee housing in many cases is terrible—crumbling infrastructure, waste-water treatment systems that are in desperate need of repair and upgrades. That maintenance backlog needs to be addressed so that will improve the visitor experience.

When I think about our national parks, I think of these parks as the office of first impression. For visitors who come to our great country from around the world, when they visit our national parks, they leave with a profound impression. It is what sets America apart from any other country—our national parks, our outdoor heritage, and preserving and protecting that for generations to come.

The Great American Outdoors Act will directly impact everybody who visits, who recreates, and who enjoys our public lands. This will be truly one of those defining moments for conservation that so many will remember for generations to come. It is one of these laws that we will pass, and when the President signs it, it will truly be a legacy for future generations. It makes me smile just knowing that so many others will be able to have our publication just as my wife and I and my children all have done and continue to do, once we pass the Great American Outdoors Act.

Thank you.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

FREE FILE PROGRAM

Mr. CARPER. Good afternoon, Mr. President and colleagues. Today, I want to highlight some work that we have done on the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations that could help not hundreds, not thousands, not tens of thousands, not hundreds of thousands, but millions of Americans this year and for future years.

As the ranking member of the subcommittee called the Permanent Sub-committee on Investigations in the Senate, my staff and I worked closely with a fellow named Rob Portman of Ohio, who is the chairman of our subcommittee, and with his team. He put us all in a room together—Senator Portman’s team, Republicans; our team, Democrats; and wonder who is who and whose side they are on. You wouldn’t know one side from the other.

It is sort of like the President and I working together on recycling issues, with his team and mine.

Senator Portman, along with our staffs, studied big problems and big challenges facing Americans in America. We tried to identify commonsense solutions in a truly bipartisan, almost nonpartisan approach. That has characterized the work of the subcommittee not just for a couple of years but for decades.

For years, I have heard the following question over and over again back home, and the President and I have answered it many times together. When parents are working so hard to make a living, and they think they get a lot done. It is our bread and butter. I want to talk for a few minutes today about some of the work here on the Senate floor.

Over the past year, our subcommittee has examined a whole bunch of issues, and one of those issues is relating to the IRS Free File Program. Earlier this week, we released a short staff memorandum laying out our findings.

Over the next couple of minutes, I want to explain the genesis and the importance of the Free File Program, what our subcommittee learned about it, and some of the things Congress and the IRS could do to improve the program and better serve taxpayers.

I say to the President, I don’t know if back in your home State you do townhall meetings, but I guess you have done a bunch of them. I did a bunch of them especially when I was a Congressman—hundreds of them—and public events. And I know that the President does as well. It was a real chance to help people in a timely way.

If you take that idea—and that was an idea for, I will say, the 20th century, a 20th century idea, and it was a good idea. But we have a 21st-century idea, and it is called the Free File Program. That is what I want to focus on now.

Some people might be asking: What in the heck is the Free File Program anyway? Going back to 1996—I was Governor then. The President and I, the Presiding Officer might have been a House Member. I am not sure. But Congress directed the IRS to work with the tax preparation industry to create a way for Americans to file their taxes electronically.

This is around the time when the first version of search engines like Yahoo! and Google were being developed and coming forward. Email addresses and web portals, like America Online, were rapidly expanding the availability of internet services not just for homes but for schools and other places too. Suddenly, it was possible to do a whole lot of things on the internet for the first time, including filing our taxes electronically.

Free File is the program that grew out of a mandate Congress issued, and taxpayers were first able to take advantage of the program in 2002. So my guess is the mandate from Congress to the IRS to make Free File available was about two decades ago, and the first time taxpayers were able to take advantage of that was a couple of years later, in 2002.

The program is really a partnership between the IRS on the one hand and tax preparation companies, like H&R Block and Intuit, to offer complete and free online tax preparation and filing services—not to all Americans but to most. Sixty percent was the original goal, the original target. Today, it is available to about 70 percent of all Americans.

This year, most taxpayers earning less than $69,000 could use Free File to file their taxes for free. That is why we call it Free File. I will say that again. This year, most taxpayers earning less than $69,000 could use Free File to file their taxes for free.

A lot of times, when you hear somebody offer you something for nothing, free, for free, you say: Well, I am not sure I will do that. That is why one that a whole bunch of taxpayers—about 100 million of them, in fact—can take real advantage of because according to the
IRS, over 100 million taxpayers are eligible to use this program, Free File.

Over 100 million taxpayers can file their Federal taxes for free. One might ask: Well, how do they do that? All they have to do is to visit this website to get started: IRS.gov/FreeFile. That’s it. That easy, isn’t it? That is IRS.gov/FreeFile.

As much as I do—it is this close. There it is: IRS.gov/FreeFile. I am blind. There it is.

To my staff who prepared this for us, thank you.

From there, whoever clicks on this address can choose to visit the individual Free File website of one of several companies offering this service and choose the one that works best for them. It sounds pretty simple, even to me. But only a few million taxpayers out of 100 million who are eligible use the program every year. Clearly, we can do better than this.

On our subcommittee, we started looking into Free File about a year ago, after reading news reports alleging that some of the companies that participated in the program were making it harder, not easier, for taxpayers to find their Free File websites. This is important colleagues. This is important because very few taxpayers go directly to the IRS.gov address that I mentioned right here—website. Instead, when most taxpayers are ready to file their taxes, they use search engines like Google, and they type in phrases like "free online tax filing" or "free tax return." For search terms like these, Google might return thousands, maybe millions, of results. Those results could oftentimes be confusing. Imagine that you are trying to get some information, and you get thousands of ideas from searching on Google. That can often be very confusing or just too much for a lot of us to try to wade through.

On top of that, we were able to confirm that 5 of the 12 companies that participated in the Free File Program in tax year 2018, 2 years ago—that includes H&R Block, Intuit, TaxHawk, Drake Software, and TaxSlayer—appears not to actually offer a Free File website from even appearing in search results. So when someone searched on Google last year for free tax help, they were likely to land on the website for one of the heavily advertised commercial tax filing products.

Some of those commercial products have names that are similar to the names companies have given their Free File offerings. For example, H&R Block has a commercial product called "Free Online File," and it has one called "Turbo Tax Free Edition." Those names sound a lot like the names given to the IRS Free File products, but they are not the same. In fact, there is no guarantee that they will actually be free, despite their names.

I want to be clear. There is nothing wrong with Free File partner companies having their own successful commercial product and choosing not to continue to innovate. There is nothing wrong with that. I am told there are legitimate reasons someone might want to prevent a website from appearing in a Google search result. However, it is important that we find and err on the side of taxpayers more than they might already be confused when it comes to preparing their tax returns.

It is also imperative to Senator PORTMAN, his staff, and my staff that the lowest income taxpayers are able to access the free filing services that Congress wanted to be sure were available for them. It is too easy for a taxpayer to click on a search result that looks like a free filing option and wind up being charged for extra services they didn’t want and, frankly, didn’t need.

In fact, the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration estimates that more than 14 million taxpayers who qualified for the Free File Program used commercial software offered by a Free File partner company and may have paid a fee to file their 2018 Federal tax return when they did not need to do so. Just think about that. Fourteen million taxpayers could have filed their returns completely free but instead ended up paying a fee.

While it is entirely possible that some of those 14 million people knew they were using a commercial product and chose to pay more, many simply didn’t know they might have a better option. We have an obligation to make sure they know about it. Both Congress and the IRS need to do more to make certain that taxpayers who are eligible for a Free File partner and choose a commercial product don’t end up paying for something they should not have to pay for. It is that simple.

So how did this happen? Well, we have learned that part of the blame belongs to the IRS, which apparently has designated only three full-time employees—think about that—for how many people we have in this country? Three hundred-plus million? The IRS has designated only three full-time employees to actually work on Free File and, I am told, has not conducted sufficient oversight over the program for years. For example, our Subcommittee on Investigations learned that the IRS has not completed a customer satisfaction survey for the Free File Program since 2004. That is 11 years. That is right, since 2009, even though the Treasury Department’s Inspector General for Tax Administration recommended greater use of customer satisfaction surveys not last year or the year before that, but as far back as 2007.

Despite Americans’ growing tendency to use search engines like Google to navigate the internet, the IRS and its Free File partner companies apparently never discussed online search practices until very recently. This allowed individual companies to make their own choices about how their Free File websites could be accessed.

There is also the fact that the IRS has not had a marketing budget for the Free File Program in more than 6 years. When we asked IRS officials to explain the lack of marketing, they told us a couple of things. Here is one of the things we were told: “Well, it may have been an IRS budget decision as part of the broader reduction in spending the agency received over the last several years.” He said as part of the broader reduction in spending.” Actually, it was the broader reduction in appropriations the Agency received over the last several years.

The Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration came to pretty much the same conclusion. That is what we got from the Inspector General of the Treasury: The IRS was trying to “save money and be more efficient.”

Well, we should make sure that we save American taxpayers money, no doubt, especially at a time when every dollar counts for our family and, frankly, for our government.

With that said, what can Congress do? What is our role here? The Senate, the House, in the Congress, and in the White House, in the executive branch of our government and Treasury?

As senior members of the Finance Committee, Senator PORTMAN and I have listened to former IRS Commissioner John Koskinen, a great leader, and to the Government Accountability Office led by Gene Dodaro, a wonderful Comptroller General. We listened to lament the fact that over the last decade, Congress has appropriated the IRS with far less money than it needs to provide adequate tax enforcement and good customer service, as well as to better ensure that all Federal taxpayers are paying their fair share to fund our government and meet our many obligations.

Despite a recent bump up in funding for the IRS in the past year, since fiscal year 2010—so over the last decade—funding for the IRS overall has declined by $3.1 billion, after accounting for inflation, while the number of individual taxpayers has increased by 13 million. That makes no sense to me. More taxes is it doesn’t make much sense to most people. Let’s listen to that again. Funding for the IRS—our job is to appropriate money, among other things. Funding for the IRS, overall, has declined by over $3 billion, according to the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration recommended greater use of customer satisfaction surveys not last year or the year before that, but as far back as 2007.

Despite Americans’ growing tendency to use search engines like Google to navigate the internet, the IRS and its Free File partner companies apparently never discussed online search practices until very recently. This allowed individual companies to make their own choices about how their Free File websites could be accessed.

There is also the fact that the IRS has not had a marketing budget for the Free File Program in more than 6 years. When we asked IRS officials to explain the lack of marketing, they told us a couple of things. Here is one of the things we were told: “Well, it may have been an IRS budget decision as part of the broader reduction in spending the agency received over the last several years.” He said as part of the broader reduction in spending.” Actually, it was the broader reduction in appropriations the Agency received over the last several years.

The Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration came to pretty much the same conclusion. That is what we got from the Inspector General of the Treasury: The IRS was trying to “save money and be more efficient.”

Well, we should make sure that we save American taxpayers money, no doubt, especially at a time when every dollar counts for our family and, frankly, for our government.

With that said, what can Congress do? What is our role here? The Senate, the House, in the Congress, and in the White House, in the executive branch of our government and Treasury?

As senior members of the Finance Committee, Senator PORTMAN and I have listened to former IRS Commissioner John Koskinen, a great leader, and to the Government Accountability Office led by Gene Dodaro, a wonderful Comptroller General. We listened to lament the fact that over the last decade, Congress has appropriated the IRS with far less money than it needs to provide adequate tax enforcement and good customer service, as well as to better ensure that all Federal taxpayers are paying their fair share to fund our government and meet our many obligations.

Despite a recent bump up in funding for the IRS in the past year, since fiscal year 2010—so over the last decade—funding for the IRS overall has declined by $3.1 billion, after accounting for inflation, while the number of individual taxpayers has increased by 13 million. That makes no sense to me. More taxes is it doesn’t make much sense to most people. Let’s listen to that again. Funding for the IRS—our job is to appropriate money, among other things. Funding for the IRS, overall, has declined by over $3 billion, according to the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration recommended greater use of customer satisfaction surveys not last year or the year before that, but as far back as 2007.

Despite Americans’ growing tendency to use search engines like Google to navigate the internet, the IRS and its Free File partner companies apparently never discussed online search practices until very recently. This allowed individual companies to make their own choices about how their Free File websites could be accessed.

There is also the fact that the IRS has not had a marketing budget for the Free File Program in more than 6 years. When we asked IRS officials to explain the lack of marketing, they told us a couple of things. Here is one of the things we were told: “Well, it may have been an IRS budget decision as part of the broader reduction in spending the agency received over the last several years.” He said as part of the broader reduction in spending.” Actually, it was the broader reduction in appropriations the Agency received over the last several years.

The Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration came to pretty much the same conclusion. That is what we got from the Inspector General of the Treasury: The IRS was trying to “save money and be more efficient.”

Well, we should make sure that we save American taxpayers money, no doubt, especially at a time when every dollar counts for our family and, frankly, for our government.

With that said, what can Congress do? What is our role here? The Senate, the House, in the Congress, and in the White House, in the executive branch of our government and Treasury?
the number of employees assigned to answer telephone calls. The inevitable result is fewer taxpayer calls answered, longer wait times to get through to the IRS representative, and a lot of needless frustrations from the people we and the IRS are serving, the people who have sent us here to work for them.

All of this was before the coronavirus pandemic forced the IRS to send thousands of its employees home. So as I prepare to wrap up here today, let me say to all of our colleagues, those who are gathered here and those who are not—our colleagues both here in the Senate and in the House of Representatives at the other end of this building—while it is important that we ask why the IRS didn’t do a better job of overseeing the Free File Program and make clear that it must do more, it is equally important that we in the legislative branch of government and in the administration—this administration and future administrations—provide the IRS with the tools and resources it needs to do the important job it does.

The last time the IRS had a marketing campaign for the Free File Program, it spent between $750,000 and $1.5 million marketing the program annually to, gosh, probably 200—over 100 million—we will say close to 200 million taxpayers. That sounds like a lot of money, but when you are talking about $100 million in taxpayer dollars, it doesn’t go that far. I am not sure that is a big enough budget given the large number of taxpayers who seem to be unaware of Free File. Even a modest amount of funding would go a long way toward ensuring that millions of eligible taxpayers do not have to pay a dime to file their taxes online.

Well, colleagues, my staff and my other colleagues often hear me say these—I think they are called aphorisms. One of my favorites is, find out what works and do more of that. Think about it. Find out what works. Do more of that. Well, we found out on our subcommittee how we can strengthen and support this Free File Program. Let’s do it. Let’s not just talk about it. Let’s not just complain about it. Let’s do it. Let’s begin by doing our part to provide—this year and in the years that follow—the IRS with the resources it needs and, where necessary, the additional resources it needs to make Free File work the way we intended it to work almost two decades ago.

Another thing I would like to say is that in adversity lies opportunity. Think about that. I wish I could claim that as my own. That is Einstein. In the midst of the coronavirus pandemic, the filing deadline for taxpayers has been pushed back, as we know, to July 15—not April 15, a month or a month and a half ago, but July 15. Here is what it means—we have taxpayers have—we have more time to get the word out, the IRS has more time to get the word out to eligible Americans that they can file their taxes for free—more time to get the word out to eligible Americans that they can file their taxes for free. Get the word out to whom? To tens of millions of American taxpayers.

I would ask one of them to help spread the word. Talk to your friends. Talk to your family. When you are cooped up at home and you can’t go anywhere, you are still locked down in quarantine, what will you talk about? Talk about Free File: here is a way we maybe could save some money, and our friends could too—instead of taking a different course.

That is it. I will close with this. I like movies. I know the Presiding Officer Mr. Cruz mentioned the time to get the word out to eligible taxpayers has been pushed back, as we know, to July 15. Here is what that means. It means we have—

Americans that they can file their taxes for free—more time to get the word out to eligible taxpayers to visit IRS.gov/freefile—right here—IRS.gov/freefile—to ensure that they have access to the free resources that are available to them.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, there is no doubt that there is a lot of anger in our country right now. We have seen that anger being given voice all throughout our communities and small towns and big cities. We have seen it in our households, our families, our children, our friends. The killing of George Floyd has shocked us all. The video of a police officer so nonchalantly kneeling on George’s neck as he begged to be released and three other officers standing by as if nothing was happening, as if it weren’t a human being’s life being taken—this shocked us.

Now, we all know how George Floyd called out, calling out for his mother, who had passed years ago, a mother who loved him, whom he must have seen coming to him in his final moments. “I can’t breathe,” he said—the last words of a man on a street in Minneapolis that has sent shockwaves throughout our nation. That is what was taken away from Native Americans and Alaska Natives when they were forced off their lands.

The freedom to breathe and your life as your own are what were taken from men and women and their children when they were ripped from their country and brought across this continent and this nation. That is what was taken away from Native Americans and Alaska Natives when they were forced off their lands.

The freedom to take the full breath of life is what is taken away from people when they are denied a quality education or housing in safe neighborhoods; when they are denied jobs or promotions when they get those jobs; when they are viewed, because of the color of their skin, as less deserving or as less able.

I applaud those who have peacefully taken to the streets throughout our communities to protest against racism, and I also applaud the brave police officers and National Guard members all across the country who are protecting those who need protecting and reaching out to constructively engage peaceful protesters. The vast, vast majority of these law enforcement officers are honorably and risk their lives daily for the people of the United States and our communities, and we need to remember that.

We are witnessing something that I believe is an important moment, one that has potential to move our country in a direction toward a more perfect Union. This moment has promise.

Senators are discussing with each other what kind of legislative action should be taken. For example, we had a very good discussion on these issues yesterday led by my friend and colleague Senator Tim Scott of South Carolina. State and community leaders are also having these discussions.

Of course, we are a big country, and what might seem to be a good idea in one place wouldn’t be a good idea in some other place. For example, one of the enormous challenges in the great State of Alaska that I have been focused on for years is not enough law enforcement, particularly in our rural and Native communities, dozens of whom don’t have law enforcement officers at all. So this is a huge problem in Alaska that can create horrible situations, particularly when it comes
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George Floyd death. I would recommend that everybody take a look at that. In the Air Force, he says he was often the only African American in his squadron, and as a senior general officer, the only African American in the entire roost. What is he thinking about during these challenging times? "I'm thinking about wearing the same flight suit with the same wings on my chest as my peers and then being questioned by another military member, are you a pilot?"

What else is he thinking? "I'm thinking about my mentors and how rarely I had a mentor who looked like me."

"I'm thinking about the pressure I felt to perform error-free, especially for supervisors I perceived had expected less of me as an African American."

He continues saying he was thinking about the conversations he was having with his sons and the immense responsibility that comes from his historic nomination. He was thinking about how with this confirmation, he could make things better in the Air Force and America.

Here is how I am going to take up Condoleezza Rice's challenge, as she put forth for each individual American. I am going to ask questions—as she prod us to do in this piece—on why, until yesterday, no African-American four-star had ever been confirmed to be a service chief in the U.S. military in the history of our country.

We are introducing an amendment to this year's NDAA to get data on minorities and senior enlisted and officer billets in the military—African Americans, Alaska Natives, Native Americans, Hispanic Americans and others. We know these are very patriotic segments of our population. For example, Alaska Natives and American Indians serve at higher rates in the military than any other ethnic group in the country—what I refer to as special patriots.

Is this patriotic service reflected at the highest leadership ranks of our military? If not, then, why not?

I suspect that a lot of our military leaders who have risen to the general officers ranks—like General Brown or other outstanding African-American generals whom I have gotten to know or have the privilege of serving with, like Army GEN Vincent Brooks, former CENTCOM Commander GEN Lloyd, Marine Corps Lt. Gen. Ron Bailey—will have insightful recommendations and as a collective force for good in our society and to enable members of the military to achieve their full potential and as a whole, protect and defend our nation, but also for those who seek and for those in need.

Our military is something I am very passionate about, not only because it protects and defends our Nation, but because it has provided Americans of all colors and creeds with the opportunity to rise up individually and as a collective force for good in our society and to enable members of the military to achieve their full potential and as a whole, protect and defend our nation.

If there is some kind of obstacle for minority advancement that stifles opportunities at the highest ranks of our military, then we need to know why and we need to work on addressing it together. As a matter of fact, I just came from a full day of marking up the NDAA with Democratic and Republican Senators, and we will be trying to look at this issue in a greater depth and we had a great discussion on in our markup today. We need our military—like we need the rest of the country—to be a place where everyone who joins can breathe freely. This is one of the ways I am going to challenge Gen. Rice's challenge to her fellow Americans—this important challenge—and I hope my fellow Americans will find their own individual ways to do this, as well.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 4, 2020]

**THIS MOMENT CRIES OUT FOR US TO CONFRONT RACE IN AMERICA**

**Condoleezza Rice** was secretary of state from 2005 to 2009. She is a professor at Stanford University's Graduate School of Business and a senior fellow on public policy at the Hoover Institution, where she will become director on Sept. 1.

Words to describe the pain of George Floyd's family. Like many black families before them, they find themselves in the spotlight for reasons that every parent, sibling and grandparent knows: Floyd's death has catalyzed a symbolic call to action, he was not a symbol to his loved ones—he was a father, brother and son. I can only pray that they find the words to express their pain that is so palpable.

In the wake of Floyd's death, Americans and people around the world are experiencing shock, grief, outrage—a set of emotions that too often are repeated. If the past is a guide, these feelings will fade and we will return to our lives.

But, something tells me—not this time. Floyd's horrific death should be enough to finally move us to positive action.

Perhaps this is like the moment in 1955 when Rosa Parks refused to move to the back of the bus. Or perhaps this is like that fateful Sunday in September 1963, quite personal to me, when a bomb in a Birmingham church killed four young children and shook our nation to its core. Some six decades later, perhaps all of us—regardless of skin color—are, to quote Mississippi sharecropper and civil rights activist Fannie Lou Hamer, "sick and tired of being sick and tired."

Our country has often moved forward and been made better through peaceful protests. But our cities must stop burning. Innocent people, including many minority and immigrant business owners, are watching their livelihoods destroyed. There is no excuse for looting and criminality, and offenders must be stopped. But a call for calm is not enough, either. This time, we must remain vigilant and maintain our determination to make a difference.

Beyond justice for Floyd, systemic change is necessary to make our institutions more fair. Just yet all the structural reforms in the world are insufficient to remove the shadow hanging over every incident of this kind. To be black is to be forced to overcome implicit and explicit stigma and color of your skin. It might be dismissiveness or underestimation or presumption of how you think. In some circumstances, it might be fear. We encounter them among decent people who sincerely do not want to react that way. The good news is that these emotions can be overcome—and often are—with the respect that builds when people know one another as human beings—as friends, neighbors, co-workers and teammates.
South Korea has better doctors or because South Korea has harder workers. It is because of leadership.

Of course, Mr. President, you know because you ran against him. You know the President is going to deny responsibility for the problems he caused. He is going to blame others. It is what he did as a failed businessman. It is what he did as a TV celebrity. It is what he did as a Presidential candidate running against you, and it is what he has done as President. It is his whole life. He has denied responsibility. He pointed fingers. He has blamed others. My colleagues all know that the buck never stops in this Oval Office.

But what is disappointing is the whisper-in-the-woods silence and feet-in-concrete inaction on the part of so many of my friends this side of the aisle. We know the President's playbook is to divide, to distract, to play to race, to divide the country and distract from his failed leadership. So far, it has marginally been "like President, like Senator."

Yesterday, the President started attacking a private citizen whom he is supposed to serve, spreading conspiracy theories about a 75-year-old man peacefully working for change. What is my colleagues' reaction? It was the same whisper-in-the-woods silence, the same feet-in-concrete inaction, the hiding behind a column, behind a desk, hiding behind a post, hiding from the media. When the free press tried to ask him about it, when one journalist even printed out a copy of the President's statement, some of my colleagues physically refused to look at it.

You might be able to escape to your office in this building, but you can't ignore the people in cities and towns and neighborhoods in your State—in all of our States—who are demanding change. You can't ignore the people whom we serve. I implore my colleagues to listen to the calls for change. The President may ignore them. When he is not dividing, he is ignoring what citizens want to do, but we can do better in the Senate. We can answer those calls for change. We can tackle the problems we face as a country.

We can start with the proposed solutions my colleagues and I have introduced to help people get through this pandemic, a rental assistance bill to help people pay their bills and stay in their home. Can you imagine anything worse than when the unemployment benefit runs out at the end of July?

In the State of Texas, there are twice as many. In my State alone, there are more than a million people unemployed. They are not all going to get called back to work by the end of July. If the unemployment benefit stops, as a number of people and Senator McConnell seem to want it to, there will be evictions. There will be a wave of evictions and people losing their apartments. Can you imagine anything more ludicrous in the middle of a pandemic than that people are put on the streets or people are forced to move in with a cousin in an already-crowded second-floor apartment? Do you think that is not going to spread this pandemic even worse?

We have to have a rental assistance bill. We have a plan to put more money in people's pockets so they can stay afloat and keep spending in our communities. We have a plan to actually protect workers on the job so they feel safe going back to work.

Yesterday, in committee, the Secretary of Labor told us there have been 5,000 workplace complaints against employers by employees saying their workplace wasn't safe. Do you know how many citations the Department of Labor issued? One. There were 5,000 complaints and 1 citation. The Department of Labor is supposed to represent—surprise—labors, not corporate interests who have corporate leaders who have no interest in keeping their workplace safe.

We have a plan to truly scale up testing in this country so we can begin the real test-trace-isolate plan we need to reopen safely. Leader McConnell, the leader of this body, the Republican leader—elected, I assume, unanimously by his Republican caucus—says he sees no urgency. Those are his words. He sees no urgency on any of this.

We also have solutions to begin to finally tackle systemic racism that puts Black and Brown American lives at risk. This week my Democratic colleagues and I joined Senator Booker and Senator Harris to introduce legislation to make real meaningful reforms on how we do policing in this country. Americans of both parties agree we need to rethink the role of the police and how we invest our tax dollars in education, healthcare, and housing, and so much else.

I am introducing a resolution declaring racism a public health emergency. Let's be clear: This pandemic and racism in America are not separate problems. They are intimately connected. A headline in the Atlantic put it well: "The Coronavirus Was an Emergency Until Trump Found Out Who Was Dying."

It is disproportionately Black and Brown Americans dying of this virus. It is Black and Brown workers who have been on the job for months, exposing themselves to the virus so grocery stores stay stocked and packages keep getting delivered and hospital linens keep getting changed. It is Black and Brown communities grieving the losses of their friends and neighbors.

Hoisting what I wish much of my colleagues would understand: They are our neighbors too. Breonna Taylor was our neighbor. George Floyd was our neighbor. The 110,000 Americans who have died of this virus were our neighbors.

Some of you expressed words of sympathy. Thank you for that. Some of you issued statements saying you want to see reform and you will not tolerate racism. All of you wish the President would stop tweeting. But those words aren't good enough. People are dying. Platitudes and press releases don't get us very far. They are not enough. You need to put actions behind your words.

It is time for colleagues to join us to pass real solutions. It is time to stand up to Leader McConnell and say: Let us do our jobs. President Trump is not doing his job; that is for sure. Leader McConnell is not doing his job; that is for sure. It is time for all of us in this body to do our job.

It is time to stand up to the President, to use every ounce of leverage we all have to stop the racism, to stop the division, to stop inciting violence. There is a leadership void in this country. I am waiting for my colleagues to join us to fill it.

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.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Cramer). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. Cassidy, Mr. President, right now we are debating the Great American Outdoors Act, which would be great if only it were better. My problem with the Great American Outdoors Act is that it spends billions on places where we vacation, but the authors of the bill would not allow a few million to be spent to protect the places where we live and we work and we help create livelihoods for many.

There is an amendment that would do that that is bipartisan and that would not take any money away from the billions that the bill is already allocating for those places where we vacation.

First, let me kind of make my point. Forty-two percent of Americans live in a coastal county or parish adjacent to a coastline. Eighty-five percent of Americans live in a coastal State. But of the billions that go into the Great American Outdoors Act, of those billions, 50 to close to 60 percent are spent in seven States, seven localities, and if you exclude Washington, DC, and areas around Washington, it is not spent on coastal areas.

We are spending billions on places where we go to vacation, but the authors of the bill will not allow millions to be spent to protect where we live. That is foolish public policy. We should be investing in coastal resiliency.

Now, of course, the irony is, we are going to spend billions on the coast. Why? We have seen it. Harris County flooded that is Houston; Florida flooded that is the panhandle and other parts of Florida; Puerto Rico; the American Virgin Islands; North Carolina; South Carolina; Georgia; Hurricane Sandy in New
Jersey and New York: Hurricanes Rita and Katrina on the coast of Louisiana; also Mississippi and Alabama.

We are going to spend billions. We are going to spend billions, but we are going to spend those billions in the wrong places. We are going to spend those billions on the coast, repairing damage that could have been prevented if we had spent millions now.

I draw attention to a flood wall, a levy, in Terrebonne Parish, LA, which was recently completed. So we had a high-water event where flooding came off the Gulf of Mexico. Ten thousand homes were not flooded because that flood protection had been erected. Ten thousand homes were not flooded.

All I am asking is for the authors of this bill to allow a few million to be spent where people live, where people work, where people help others earn their living, and they can still have their billions to spend on the places where we vacation, where we want to be.

I don’t want to minimize the need to take care of our national parks. When someone speaks of a leaky roof, and if you fix it early, then fixing it early keeps the damage from getting greater—that makes sense. We should find a way to pay for it, but it makes sense that you would do that. How much more so when we are speaking about coastal resiliency?

I was told recently that the Army Corps of Engineers wants to build a $3.5 billion levee in Miami to prevent Miami from flooding—$3.5 billion. We are going to spend billions on the coast; it is just a question of whether we do it in reaction, or whether we do it in kind of “we have to fear the worst,” or whether we do it like in Terrebonne Parish—building a flood wall now so that 10,000 homes don’t flood.

It is my disappointment that the authors of this legislation will not allow this bipartisan amendment to be added.

By the way, we have heard that Democrats are OK with the amendment, but for whatever reason, the authors will not allow it.

Let me show you one other thing, just to make the point. The Great American Outdoors Act actually has two pots of dollars, if you will. One is for deferred maintenance—again, 50 to 60 percent of that goes to seven States. But this shows where the Land and Water Conservation Fund money goes. These are the coastal States. This is where people live, and these States, on average, per capita, get $7.53 from the Land and Water Conservation money goes. But this shows where the Land and Water Conservation money goes.

60 percent of that goes to seven States. The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:
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LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, under normal circumstances, thousands of visitors, staff, and members file through the United States Capitol and Senate and House offices every day. As we slowly begin to reopen our economy, businesses, and other public places, all eyes on Capitol Hill turn to the guidance and counsel of Dr. Brian Monahan, the attending physician of the U.S. Congress and Supreme Court. Since 2009, when he joined us in the Capitol, Dr. Monahan has been a trusted voice of reason and an exceptional healthcare provider to me and hundreds of other lawmakers.

Dr. Monahan is an accomplished physician and rear admiral of the U.S. Navy. He began his career as a public servant after college, when he joined the Navy as a member of the Health Professions Scholarship Program. In 1989, while working as a resident at the National Naval Medical Center, Dr. Monahan discovered a connection between cardiac arrhythmias and the antihistamine, Seldane, a discovery that lead to the removal of the drug from the market. Dr. Monahan has spent years working in the attending physician’s office, as a staff physician and later as the assistant attending physician. Dr. Monahan has also served as the chairman of the Department of Medicine at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences and taught at the university as a professor of pathology and medicine focusing on cancer, oncology, and hematology. Dr. Monahan’s many achievements, medical expertise, and decades of public service make him an asset to the Capitol and an invaluable colleague.

Dr. Monahan has played a particularly important role lately, as both the Senate and the House of Representatives work to strike a balance between limiting exposure to a pandemic and continuing to work for the American people. Dr. Monahan has provided remarkable guidance to House and Senate leaders on how to safely conduct business and operate in the Capitol. Moving forward, as we continue to deal with the COVID-19 pandemic’s economic and public health consequences, I am grateful to have Dr. Monahan to guide us along the way.

Dr. Monahan is an accomplished photographer, and I have had the privilege of seeing many of his photographs and being with him in different parts of the world when he has taken some. All make one seeing them wish they were there. The reality that the artistry of his photographs are wonderful. Visits to his office are healthy and healing in so many ways.

Dr. Monahan was recently profiled in The New York Times, and I ask unanimous consent that the article, “Doctor to Congress and Supreme Court Toils to Sidestep Politics amid Pandemic,” be printed in the Record.
DR. BRIAN P. MONAHAN HAS FOUND HIMSELF IN TROUBLE THE FIRST TIME HE MET A CLIENT, which also includes the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine senators he serves, including the nine Senators who have been asked to re-convene in the Capitol with Covid-19 still spreading—a debate in the political dimensions of the divide was being played across the country over how quickly to re-open. Dr. Monahan was less absolute. Returning to Washington carried health risks he warned and taking advice from Speaker Nancy Pelosi of California and Representative Steny H. Hoyer of Maryland, the majority leader. But it was up to them to decide what to do. They opted to delay their return, and on Friday, partly because of Dr. Monahan’s warnings, moved forward with plans to institute new protocols. It was typical of Dr. Monahan, the 59-year-old Navy rear admiral who is known in the halls of the Capitol as much for his meticulous attention to medical detail as he is for his efforts to stay out of politics. “He is both an executive with lots of health care responsibilities—particularly now—and also has the unique relationship with members that a small-town doctor would have with the patients he knows and sees,” said Senator Roy Blunt, Republican of Missouri, and chairman of the Senate Rules Committee. “He’s in a unique role at a unique time.” As government doctors have emerged as trusted public voices and political figures in the face of a fearsome pandemic—appearing in White House news conferences and as witnesses to congressional hearings—Dr. Monahan has maintained an uncommonly low profile. He never issued a public statement offering his opinion on whether Congress should re-convene, although he shared his warnings with House leaders and privately told senior Republican officials that his office did not have the capacity to screen all 100 senators for the virus when they returned to work. When Alex M. Azar II, the health secretary, said he would send 1,000 tests to Capitol Hill to accommodate them, Ms. Pelosi and Senator Chuck Grassley of Iowa, the Republican majority leader, turned down the offer, wary of the optics of receiving special treatment at a time when testing was scarce—and prompting President Trump to suggest on Twitter that “maybe you need a new Doctor over there.” Dr. Monahan, who declined to be interviewed, said his calm and professional voice of reason during the pandemic, according to interviews with more than two dozen lawmakers, Capitol officials and medical professionals, was his trump card. They saw him as someone who has taken a personal interest in his influential clientele, which also includes the nine Supreme Court justices, even as he fields political questions about reopening, testing and precautionary measures. Operating out of a nondescript clinic tucked away in the basement of the Capitol, Dr. Monahan and a small staff have been exceedingly busy since the pandemic took hold, consulting with lawmakers who have contracted Covid-19 or exposed to someone infected with it, doling out health recommendations in detailed memos ahead of votes, and producing videos re-uploaded on an internal website to educate lawmakers and their staff on how to protect themselves. Dr. Monahan has filmed and produced the videos by himself in his office, often seated next to an elaborate bouquet of white flowers and a tiny plastic model of a pangolin, the scaly mammal that may have been an intermediary carrier of the virus. In the videos, he typically walks through the most recent recommendations offered by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and demonstrates medical equipment, such as a thermometer and a variety of hand sanitizers. “Conducted by Dr. Monahan, using a black shopping bag and a sewing machine,” Dr. Monahan told Mr. Barrasso, directing him to use masks (including one made by his wife, using a black shopping bag and a sewing machine). “He has a big job—two houses of Congress, two parties to deal with—but he’s not political to the point that he treats us all with respect, and we respect his judgment in return.” Dr. Monahan, now in 2009 became the seventh man to serve as attending physician, taking up a position that has always been held by a Navy doctor. The House first approved a Navy offer for taking up the position of chief physician in 1928 after one lawmaker died and two collapsed, with several hours passing before a doctor could arrive in each case. Two years later, the Senate extended that offer to other lawmakers for a fee, as well as offering some services and emergency care to staff and tourists. The first physician, Dr. George W. Calver, who began his work just before the start of the Great Depression, displayed placards in cloakrooms and elevators across the Capitol with his health warnings—“Know it, Ignore it, Do It” (including “Accept Inevitables (don’t worry) and “Relax Completely.” Dr. Monahan was born in Connecticut, the son of an Air Force officer who came to the United States in the 1950s. His mother grew up in Killkee, while his father grew up in a house with a thatched roof without running water or electricity. The first in his family to attend college, he worked full-time at a supermarket while commuting in a yellow Volkswagen Beetle to Fairfield University, a Jesuit college—an education, he would tell graduates in 2011, that meant, “you are called to be ‘men and women for others.’” He studied biology and chemistry, and after graduating, joined the Navy through its Health Professions Scholarship Program, entering in 1986 as a medical intern and a living allowance in exchange for a commitment to three years of service. “Being the one who advised me to go to the hospital,” said Representative Ben McAdams, Democrat of Utah and one of the first lawmakers to contract the virus, said of Dr. Monahan. “He was clear: I strongly recommend you go to the hospital—this is serious.” The congressman has spoken with the doctor at least a dozen times since, he said in an interview on Thursday—but had yet to meet Dr. Monahan in person. An avid photographer, Dr. Monahan’s photos are present in offices around the Capitol—and he has been known to offer advice on how to best capture a scenic landmark or view on trips overseas. He checks in with his powerful patients frequently, including long after they have recovered. “I’ve been around for a long period of time, and he just takes more of a personal interest than anyone else I’ve ever known in that position,” said Senator James M. Inhofe, Republican of Oklahoma and chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, who has been on Capitol Hill for more than three decades. “He just seems to be genuinely interested in me—and he’s that way with everybody.” ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS RECOGNIZING THE STUDENT ARTISTS WINNING THE STATE OF THE ARTS AWARD • MR. CRAMER, Mr. President. I want to recognize four outstanding North Dakota students whose artwork will be on display in my State offices this year. They are the winners of the State of the Arts Awards in this year’s North Dakota Juried Student Art Show. Held by the Taube Museum of Art in Minot, this year’s contest had more than 300 entries from students across North Dakota. The four State of the Arts awards are among 116 awards presented to our State’s young artists in this competition. The students whose art was selected for my offices are: Matthew Upton, Artwork Title: “Eagle,” Grade 8, South Middle School, Grand Forks; Ashlyn...
Hartwell, Artwork Title: “Heart Sun-set,” Grade 5, Washington Elementary, Valley City; Sydney Nelson, Artwork Title: “Welding in the Fall,” Grade 12, Valley City High School, Valley City, and Olivia Dorsher, Artwork Title: “Good Boring Days,” Grade 11, Grand Forks Central High School, Grand Forks.

I congratulate these students and thank them for sharing their talents with my North Dakota constituents who are the State officers this year. They are an inspiration to all of us who appreciate the gift artists have for capturing the beauty all around us. I also commend those who judge this annual competition and the teachers and parents who have nurtured the emerging skills of these young North Dakota artists.

VERMONT STATE OF THE UNION ESSAY WINNERS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, since 2010 I have sponsored a State of the Union essay contest for Vermont high school students. This contest gives students in my State the opportunity to articulate what issues they would prioritize if they were President of the United States.

This is the contest’s 10th year, and I would like to congratulate the 536 students who participated. It is truly heartening to see so many young people engaged in finding solutions for the problems that face our country. To my mind, this is what democracy is all about.

A volunteer panel of Vermont teachers reviewed the essays, and chose Isabelle Hiller as this year’s winner. Isabelle, a junior at Woodstock Union High School, wrote about reforming our incarceration system. Lucas Whitaker, a sophomore at Hazen Union High School, was the second place winner. Lucas wrote about youth suicide and the need for comprehensive mental health care. Maya Marcy, a junior at Long Trail School, was the third place winner, with an essay on the cost of college.

I am very proud to enter into the Congressional Record the essays submitted by Isabelle, Lucas and Maya.

WINNERS, ISABELLE HILLER, WOODSTOCK UNION HIGH SCHOOL, JUNIOR, EDUCATION IN INCARCERATION

Our country’s federal prison system is stuck, and we seem to be making the same mistakes over and over again. We have our prisons, our sentencing laws, and our punishment laws, all in the name of ‘protecting the public.’

The Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP) claims that public safety is the goal of detention, but without any mental shift in convicts, all we do is lock people up for years on end. The Bureau of Justice Statistics recently found that 44,000 inmates—about 17% of the population of the entire designated inmate population was enrolled in one or more education or recreation programs. Furthermore, participation decreases 16 percent in the recidivism population. The only academic requirement in our federal prison system is that inmates without a high school diploma or a General Education Development have to enroll in a literacy program, and need to be successful for good conduct. However, even for this requirement alone, there is a stopgap that usually includes high school equivalency exams for over 16,000 inmates—that’s a lot of potential students. Plus, although mock job and resume builder classes are offered, inmates do not have the knowledge of occupational training program participants are 33 percent less likely to recidivate.

By increasing funding of education, we ensure equal accessibility to all courses for those 16,000 or more inmates wanting to take college courses. Education will reduce, decreasing our total prison population, and lower the overall government spending on imprisonment as a whole. By treating inmates in their time of rehabilitation, with a lower recidivism rate, we more confidently ensure public safety when 4,000 convicts are released each year. Strengthening the Department of Justice’s prison system core ideologies. Although we have the right end goal, we need to rethink the process by which we get there for the sake of the public’s safety and security.

SECOND PLACE, LUCAS WHITAKER, HAZEN UNION HIGH SCHOOL, SOPHOMORE

One of the biggest issues in America’s society today is the crisis in our youth, relating back to the lack of mental health services in our schools. In many cases, this leads to preventable death by suicide. According to the American Foundation for Suicide Prevention (AFSP), suicide is the 10th leading cause of death in the U.S. However, only 10% of those who attempt suicide with a near 260% overall increase compared to a near 3% increase in the past 40 years. Accompanying the growth in attendance is the skyrocketing of tuition, a near 260% overall increase compared to a 120% average inflation consumer product increase, according to Business Insider. With this disparity in tuition cost vs. income, the difference has resulted in the form of $1.5 trillion of student debt among more than 40 million Americans, as reported by TIME.

With this, why is so little of the federal budget set aside for such a vital part of our society? There is a simple solution. There is no need, that in a time of peace, The United States should be spending upwards of $690 billion per year on the military. According to the annual fiscal Department of Defense budget report, in the most recent proposal to Congress, President Donald Trump has introduced an almost 10% increase in military spending, increasing the budget to $690 billion. Almost $500 billion more than the United States spends on education. This comes with a lot of numbers, with a little over 10% of the entirety of the military spending budget—approximately $60 billion—the United States should be spending on one-year college education for every aspiring student in the country. Putting this plan into action
would provide an opportunity for millions of deserving, hardworking students.

The opportunity to obtain an education is one that many in the United States take for granted. It is also one that many in the United States have to many of the most distinguished Universities, programs, and professors in the world. However, the inability to acknowledge and tackle the underlying factors of how economic disparity affects the education system remains apparent. Too often marginalized groups are kept from succeeding in comparison to their privileged peers. Wealth and the quality of schooling have collided for too long. Every young adult has the right to a deserving and fulfilling academic career. We must realize now that the only way to fix the education system is to approach it as an economic matter. From then on, we will achieve equity and prosperity through the American college system.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–4772. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “1-Aminocyclopentane-1-carboxylic Acid (ACC), Temporary Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance” (FRL No. 10009–44–OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4773. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Bacillus thuringiensis Cry 1Ab-1 Protein in Soybean; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance” (FRL No. 10008–72–OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4774. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Oxathiapiprolin; Pesticide Tolerances” (FRL No. 10009–93–OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4775. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Indaziflam; Pesticide Tolerances” (FRL No. 10008–92–OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4776. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Jersey; Gasoline Vapor Recovery Requirements” (FRL No. 10009–52–Region 2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4777. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; California; Ventura County; 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area Requirements” (FRL No. 10009–22–Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4778. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Virginia; Emission Standards for Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills” (FRL No. 10004–07–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4779. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality State Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Revisions to the Utah Division of Administrative Rules; R307–101–3” (FRL No. 10010–35–Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4780. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Jersey; Ammonia, Methane, Nitrogen Oxides, and Particulate Matter; Final Approval and Promulgation of an Air Quality Implementation Plan and Redesignation Request” (FRL No. 10010–18–Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4781. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2019 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard” (FRL No. 10009–54–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4782. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Quality State Implementation Plans; Approvals and Promulgations; Montana; Campbell and Lewis Counties; Revisions to Permitting Rules” (FRL No. 10008–55–Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4783. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Wisconsin; Second Mainstream Coalition; NAAQS; Door County, Kewaunee County, Manitowoc County, and Milwaukee-Racine Area” (FRL No. 10009–91–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4784. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Clean Water Act Section 401 Certification; Idaho; Teton County” (FRL No. 10012–26–Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4785. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Policy Statement on Demurrage and Accessorial Rules and Charges” (Docket No. EP 759) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 20, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4786. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Policy Statement on Demurrage and Accessorial Rules and Charges” (Docket No. EP 759) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 20, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4787. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment to Section 73.3580 of the Commission’s Rules Regarding Public Notice of the Filing of Applications; Modernization of Media Regulation Initiative; Proposed Rule” (FCC 20–65) (MB Docket No. 20–110–5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 19, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4791. A communication from the Chairwoman of the Commission, Commerce Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Delay of Effective Date” (FCC Docket No. 20–99 (47 CFR Part 71)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4792. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment to Section 73.3580 of the Commission’s Rules Regarding Public Notice of the Filing of Applications; Modernization of Media Regulation Initiative; Proposed Rule” (FCC 20–65) (MB Docket No. 20–110–5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 19, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4793. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Pension Plan and Redesignation Request” (FRL No. 10007–86–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4794. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Pension Plan and Redesignation Request” (FRL No. 10007–86–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4795. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Pension Plan and Redesignation Request” (FRL No. 10007–86–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4796. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Pension Plan and Redesignation Request” (FRL No. 10007–86–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4797. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Pension Plan and Redesignation Request” (FRL No. 10007–86–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4798. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Pension Plan and Redesignation Request” (FRL No. 10007–86–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.
law, the report of a rule entitled “Low Power FM Radio Service Technical Rules: Part 11—Emergency Alert System (EAS); Part 73—Radio Broadcast Services; Part 74—Experimental Station Special Service and Other Program” ((FCC 20–53) (MB Docket No. 19–193, and 17–105)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 19, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4794. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Office of the President, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Implementation of Section 1003 of the Television Viewer Protection Act of 2019” ((FCC 20–63) (MB Docket No. 20–31)) received in the Office of the President on May 20, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4795. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Office of the President, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Docket No. 18–313”) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 19, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4796. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Implementation of the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Low Power FM Radio Service Technical Rules: Part 11—Emergency Alert System (EAS); Part 73—Radio Broadcast Services; Part 74—Experimental Station Special Service and Other Program” ((FCC 20–53) (MB Docket No. 19–193, and 17–105)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 19, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4797. A communication from the Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment and Implementation of the Privacy Act of 1974; Notice of Privacy Amendment; Project Open Vault” (20–190) (MB Docket No. 20–65) (FCC 20–54) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 19, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4798. A communication from the Acting Chief, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Unlicensed Use of the 6 GHz Band; Expanding Flexible Use in Mid-Band Spectrum Between 3.7 and 2.4 GHz” ((FCC 20–51) (ET Docket No. 18–293)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 28, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4799. A communication from the Acting Chief, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “In the Matter of Mitigation of Orbital Debris in the Near Earth Environment (NEE) and the Use of Earth Stations in Motion Communications - Final Report” ((FCC 20–54) (WT Docket No. 20–31)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 20, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4800. A communication from the Acting Chief, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment and Implementation of the Privacy Act of 1974; Notice of Privacy Amendment; Project Open Vault” (20–190) (MB Docket No. 20–65) (FCC 20–54) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 19, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.


EC–4802. A communication from the Acting Chief, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Section 1.80 of the Commission’s Rules Implementing Section 3 of the F.C.C. 1984 Act” (DA–000) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 28, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4803. A communication from the Acting Chief, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment and Implementation of the Privacy Act of 1974; Notice of Privacy Amendment; Project Open Vault” (20–190) (MB Docket No. 20–65) (FCC 20–54) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 19, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4804. A communication from the Acting Chief, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment and Implementation of the Privacy Act of 1974; Notice of Privacy Amendment; Project Open Vault” (20–190) (MB Docket No. 20–65) (FCC 20–54) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 19, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4805. A communication from the Acting Chief, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment and Implementation of the Privacy Act of 1974; Notice of Privacy Amendment; Project Open Vault” (20–190) (MB Docket No. 20–65) (FCC 20–54) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 19, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4806. A communication from the Acting Chief, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment and Implementation of the Privacy Act of 1974; Notice of Privacy Amendment; Project Open Vault” (20–190) (MB Docket No. 20–65) (FCC 20–54) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 19, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.
the Louisiana delegation to the Congress of the United States, and the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

POM-203. A petition from a citizen of the State of Texas relative to medical equipment and medical supply manufacturing; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES
The following reports of committees were submitted:
By Mr. WICKER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. 2638. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require small hub airports to construct areas for nursing mothers, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116–232).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE
The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:
By Mr. JOHNSON for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:
*Russell Vought, of Virginia, to be Director of the Office of Management and Budget.
*William Zollars, of Kansas, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service for a term expiring December 6, 2022.
*Catherine Bird, of Texas, to be General Counsel of the Federal Labor Relations Authority for a term of five years.
*Craig Edward Leon, of the District of Columbia, to be Inspector General, Office of Personnel Management.

Donald Lee Moak, of Florida, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service for a term expiring December 6, 2022.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee’s commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.
(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS
The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:
By Mr. PETERS:
S. 3292. A bill to require the President to develop a plan for the continuity of the economy in response to a significant event, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS:
S. 3929. A bill to authorize pilot programs on the remote provision by the National Guard to State governments and National Guards in other States of cybersecurity technical assistance in training, preparation, and response to cyber incidents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WICKER:
S. 3930. A bill to reauthorize the Maritime Administration and to reauthorize the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Commissioned Officer Corps Act of 2002; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. SCHAFER, and Mr. VAN HOLLAND):
S. 3931. A bill to prevent the militarization of Federal, State, and local law enforcement by Federal excess property transfers and grant programs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROUNDS:
S. 3932. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to carry out a pilot program under the TRICARE pharmacy benefits program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CORYN (for himself, Mr. WARGER, Mr. RUSCH, Mr. RUBIO, and Ms. SINEMA):
S. 3933. A bill to restore American leadership in semiconductor manufacturing by increasing federal incentives in order to enable advanced research and development, secure the supply chain, and ensure long-term national security and economic competitiveness; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. BUCHER, Mr. MARKET, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. WARREN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):
S. 3934. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to provide for the participation of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in the supplemental nutrition assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:
S. 3935. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to prohibit the burial in Arlington National Cemetery, Virginia, of any President or former President who is not a member or veteran of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY:
S. 3936. A bill to maintain the ability of the United States Armed Forces to deny a fait accompli by the People's Republic of China against Taiwan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Ms. SINEMA, and Ms. MURkowski):
S. 3937. A bill to extend section 330C of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize special programs for Indians for providing services for the prevention and treatment of diabetes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS
The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. FEINSTEIN, Mr. McCONNELL, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. TOOMY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. Cramer, Mr. Hawley, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Inhoffe, Mr. Lee, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Rubio, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. Moran, Mr. Rounds, Mr. Wicker, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. Graham, Mr. Boozman, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):
S. Res. 613. A resolution calling for justice for George Floyd and opposing calls to defund the police; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS
S. 319
At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 319, a bill to improve the reproductive assistance provided by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs to severely wounded, ill, or injured members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their spouses or partners, and for other purposes.

S. 350
At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 350, a bill to restore the application of the trust laws to the business of health insurance to protect competition and consumers.

S. 598
At the request of Mr. Peters, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. Ernst) was added as a cosponsor of S. 598, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase certain funeral benefits for veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 785
At the request of Mr. Tester, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 785, a bill to improve mental health care provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 939
At the request of Mr. Kennedy, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. Blackburn) was added as a cosponsor of S. 939, a bill to establish limitations regarding Confucius Institutes, and for other purposes.

S. 1906
At the request of Mr. Boozman, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. Collins) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1906, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide financial assistance to eligible entities to provide and coordinate the provision of suicide prevention services for veterans at risk of suicide and at risk for suicide, and to veteran families through the award of grants to such entities, and for other purposes.

S. 2623
At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. Sullivan) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2623, a bill to require the Administrator of Federal Aviation Administration to establish a pilot program to provide flight training services to veterans.

S. 2912
At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. Sullivan) and the Senator from California (Ms. Feinstein) were added as cosponsors of S. 2912, a bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes.

S. 3188
At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. Lankford) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3188, a bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act
to establish demonstration and pilot projects to facilitate education and training programs in the field of advanced manufacturing.

At the request of Mr. Toomey, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. McSally) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3296, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently allow a tax deduction at the time an investment in qualified property is made, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Tester, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. Hassan) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3350, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to deem certain State Veterans homes meeting certain health and safety standards as meeting conditions and requirements for skilled nursing facilities under the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

At the request of Mr. Tester, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Markey), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. Cortez Masto), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Casey) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Bennet) were added as cosponsors of S. 3393, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for concurrent receipt of veterans’ disability compensation and retired pay for disability retirees with fewer than 20 years of service and a combat-related disability, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Tester, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Reed) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3657, a bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to extend, lease protections for servicemembers under stop movement orders in response to a local, national, or global emergency, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. Klobuchar, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. Smith) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3747, a bill to help charitable non-profit organizations provide services to meet the increasing demand in community needs caused by the coronavirus pandemic, preserve and create jobs in the nonprofit sector, reduce unemployment, and promote economic recovery.

At the request of Mr. Booker, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. Hirono), the Senator from New York (Mrs. Gillibrand), the Senator from California (Ms. Harris), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Blumenthal), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Merkley), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Markey), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. Warren) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. Reiford) were added as cosponsors of S. 3799, a bill to expand access to health care services, including sexual, reproductive, and maternal health services, for immigrants by removing legal and policy barriers to health insurance coverage, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Sullivan, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. Murkowski) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3898, a bill to provide flexibility for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs in caring for homeless veterans during a covered public health emergency, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Blumenthal, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Wyden) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3892, a bill to amend the Insurrection Act to curtail violations against the civil liberties of the people of the United States, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. Duckworth, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Warner) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3903, a bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to enter into an agreement with a federally funded research and development center for a study on the barriers to minority participation in the elite units of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Roberts, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 502, a resolution recognizing the 75th anniversary of the amphibious landings on the island of Iwo Jima during World War II and the raisings of the flag of the United States on Mount Suribachi.

At the request of Mr. Toomey, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. Crapo), the Senator from Florida (Mr. Scott) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. Tester) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 509, a resolution calling upon the United Nations Security Council to adopt a resolution on Iran that extends the dates by which Annex B restrictions under Resolution 2231 are currently set to expire.

At the request of Mr. Menendez, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Leahy) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 567, a resolution commending career professionals at the Department of State for their extensive efforts to repatriate United States citizens and legal permanent residents during the COVID–19 pandemic.

At the request of Mrs. Murray, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. Feinstein) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1591 intended to be proposed to S. 3591, a bill to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to provide for water pollution control activities and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. Baldwin, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Sanders) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Casey) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1596 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1957, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 613—CALLING FOR JUSTICE FOR GEORGE FLOYD AND OPPOSING CALLS TO DEFUND THE POLICE

Mr. Cotton (for himself, Mrs. Blackburn, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Cruz, Ms. Ernst, Mr. McConnell, Ms. McSally, Mr. Toomey, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Cramer, Mr. Hawley, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Inhofe, Mr. Lee, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Rubio, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Barrasso, Mr. Daines, Mr. Moran, Mr. Rounds, Mr. Wicker, Mrs. Hyde-Smith, Mr. Graham, Mr. Boozman, and Mr. Scott of South Carolina) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

Resolved by the Senate (S. Res. 613)

Whereas a free society depends on the rule of law, which is the foundation for the preservation of public order, peace, and individual rights;

Whereas the United States has a troubled history of racism that includes slavery, the terror of lynching mobs, segregation, and Jim Crow, and that history leaves the United States with important work to accomplish;

Whereas the just and unbiased enforcement of the rule of law and the protection of innocent individuals against lawbreakers is the essential function of government at the local, State, and Federal levels;

Whereas the law enforcement profession is inherently dangerous, and police officers risk their lives every day;

Whereas, in 2019, 89 Federal, State, local, and Tribal law enforcement officers were killed in the line of duty;

Whereas law enforcement officers are entrusted by the public to enforce the law, employ excessive force, or exhibit bias because the public trust and undermine the rule of law;

Whereas the killing of George Floyd on May 25, 2020, at the hands of law enforcement was a horrific act that violated the public trust and was inconsistent with the values and conduct expected of law enforcement officers;

Whereas the law enforcement officers who abuse their positions, engage in corruption, employ excessive force, or exhibit bias betrayed the public trust and undermined the rule of law;

Whereas the law enforcement officers involved in the killing of George Floyd have been terminated from their positions and charged with crimes relating to their conduct and their contribution to the death of George Floyd;

Whereas good law enforcement cannot exist without accountability and justice;

Whereas underfunded police departments and undertrained police officers increase the risk of encounters that result in the use of force; and

Whereas defunding the police would leave police departments understaffed and undertrained, while also increasing the risk of violent crime to the communities of the United States, especially vulnerable communities: Now, therefore, be it

AMENDMENT NO. 1593

At the request of Mrs. Murray, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. Feinstein) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1593 intended to be proposed to S. 3591, a bill to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to provide for water pollution control activities and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1596

At the request of Ms. Baldwin, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Sanders) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Casey) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1596 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1957, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE
Resolved, That the Senate—
(1) calls for justice for George Floyd; and
(2) opposes efforts to defund the police.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1623. Mr. Cassidy (for himself and Mr. Whitehouse) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. Gardner (for himself, Mr. Manchin, Mr. Daines, Mr. Warner, Mr. Portman, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Alexander, Mr. King, Mr. Burr, Mr. Tester, Ms. Collins, Mr. Udall, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Schumer, Mr. Blunt, Ms. Harris, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Peters, Mr. Tillis, Ms. Baldwin, Ms. McSally, Mr. Graham, Mr. Heinrich, Mr. Bennet, Ms. Feinstein, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Booker, Ms. Cortez Masto, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Wyden, Ms. Kaine, Ms. Sinema, Mr. Brown, Ms. Hirono, Ms. Warnen, Mr. Murphy, Ms. Klobuchar, Ms. Duckworth, Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Leahy, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Markley, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Cramer, and Mr. Schatz) to the bill H.R. 1897, supra.

SA 1627. Mr. McConnell proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1626 proposed by Mr. McConnell to the amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. Gardner (for himself, Mr. Manchin, Mr. Daines, Mr. Warner, Mr. Portman, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Alexander, Mr. King, Mr. Burr, Mr. Tester, Ms. Collins, Mr. Udall, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Schumer, Mr. Blunt, Ms. Harris, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Peters, Mr. Tillis, Ms. Baldwin, Ms. McSally, Ms. Casey, Ms. McSally, Ms. Kasey, Mr. Graham, Mr. Heinrich, Mr. Bennet, Ms. Feinstein, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Booker, Ms. Cortez Masto, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Wyden, Mr. Kaine, Ms. Sinema, Ms. Rosen, Ms. Coons, Ms. Smith, Ms. HasSan, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mrs. Murray, Mr. Durbin, Ms. Shaheen, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Jones, Mr. Van Hollen, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Brown, Ms. Hirono, Ms. Warnen, Mr. Murphy, Ms. Klobuchar, Ms. Duckworth, Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Leahy, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Markley, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Cramer, and Mr. Schatz) to the bill H.R. 1897, supra.

SA 1628. Mr. McConnell proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1897, supra.

SA 1629. Mr. McConnell proposed an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1897, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1630. Mr. McConnell proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1897, supra.

SA 1631. Mr. McConnell proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1630 proposed by Mr. McConnell to the bill H.R. 1897, supra.

SA 1632. Mr. McConnell proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1631 proposed by Mr. McConnell to the bill H.R. 1897, supra.

SA 1633. Mr. Rubio (for himself and Mr. Scott of Florida) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. Gardner (for himself, Mr. Manchin, Mr. Daines, Mr. Warner, Mr. Portman, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Alexander, Mr. King, Mr. Burr, Mr. Tester, Ms. Collins, Mr. Udall, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Schumer, Mr. Blunt, Ms. Harris, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Peters, Mr. Tillis, Ms. Baldwin, Ms. McSally, Ms. Casey, Mr. Graham, Mr. Heinrich, Mr. Bennet, Ms. Feinstein, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Booker, Ms. Cortez Masto, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Wyden, Mr. Kaine, Ms. Sinema, Ms. Rosen, Ms. Coons, Ms. Smith, Ms. HasSan, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mrs. Murray, Mr. Durbin, Ms. Shaheen, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Jones, Mr. Van Hollen, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Brown, Ms. Hirono, Ms. Warnen, Mr. Murphy, Ms. Klobuchar, Ms. Duckworth, Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Leahy, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Markley, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Cramer, and Mr. Schatz) to the bill H.R. 1897, supra.

SA 1634. Mr. Johnson (for himself, Ms. Baldwin, Mr. Enzi, and Mr. Barrasso) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. Gardner (for himself, Mr. Manchin, Mr. Daines, Mr. Warner, Mr. Portman, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Alexander, Mr. King, Mr. Burr, Mr. Tester, Ms. Collins, Mr. Udall, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Schumer, Mr. Blunt, Ms. Harris, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Peters, Mr. Tillis, Ms. Baldwin, Ms. McSally, Ms. Casey, Ms. McSally, Ms. Kasey, Mr. Graham, Mr. Heinrich, Mr. Bennet, Ms. Feinstein, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Booker, Ms. Cortez Masto, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Wyden, Mr. Kaine, Ms. Sinema, Ms. Rosen, Ms. Coons, Ms. Smith, Ms. HasSan, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mrs. Murray, Mr. Durbin, Ms. Shaheen, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Jones, Mr. Van Hollen, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Brown, Ms. Hirono, Ms. Warnen, Mr. Murphy, Ms. Klobuchar, Ms. Duckworth, Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Leahy, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Markley, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Cramer, and Mr. Schatz) to the bill H.R. 1897, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1639. Mr. Lee submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. Gardner (for himself, Mr. Manchin, Mr. Daines, Mr. Warner, Mr. Portman, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Alexander, Mr. King, Mr. Burr, Mr. Tester, Ms. Collins, Mr. Udall, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Schumer, Mr. Blunt, Ms. Harris, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Peters, Mr. Tillis, Ms. Baldwin, Ms. McSally, Ms. Casey, Mr. Graham, Mr. Heinrich, Mr. Bennet, Ms. Feinstein, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Booker, Ms. Cortez Masto, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Wyden, Mr. Kaine, Ms. Sinema, Ms. Rosen, Ms. Coons, Ms. Smith, Ms. HasSan, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mrs. Murray, Mr. Durbin, Ms. Shaheen, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Jones, Mr. Van Hollen, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Brown, Ms. Hirono, Ms. Warnen, Mr. Murphy, Ms. Klobuchar, Ms. Duckworth, Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Leahy, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Markley, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Cramer, and Mr. Schatz) to the bill H.R. 1897, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1635. Mr. Braun (for himself, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Inhofe, Mr. Scott of South Carolina, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Menendez) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. Gardner (for himself, Mr. Manchin, Mr. Daines, Mr. Warner, Mr. Portman, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Alexander, Mr. King, Mr. Burr, Mr. Tester, Ms. Collins, Mr. Udall, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Schumer, Mr. Blunt, Ms. Harris, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Peters, Mr. Tillis, Ms. Baldwin, Ms. McSally, Ms. Casey, Mr. Graham, Mr. Heinrich, Mr. Bennet, Ms. Feinstein, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Booker, Ms. Cortez Masto, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Wyden, Mr. Kaine, Ms. Sinema, Ms. Rosen, Ms. Coons, Ms. Smith, Ms. HasSan, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mrs. Murray, Mr. Durbin, Mrs. Shaheen, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Jones, Mr. Van Hollen, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Brown, Ms. Hirono, Ms. Warnen, Mr. Murphy, Ms. Klobuchar, Ms. Duckworth, Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Leahy, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Markley, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Cramer, and Mr. Schatz) to the bill H.R. 1897, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1636. Mr. Cardin submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1897, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1657. Mr. Braun (for himself, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Inhofe, Mr. Scott of South Carolina, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Menendez) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. Gardner (for himself, Mr. Manchin, Mr. Daines, Mr. Warner, Mr. Portman, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Alexander, Mr. King, Mr. Burr, Mr. Tester, Ms. Collins, Mr. Udall, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Schumer, Mr. Blunt, Ms. Harris, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Peters, Mr. Tillis, Ms. Baldwin, Ms. McSally, Ms. Casey, Mr. Graham, Mr. Heinrich, Mr. Bennet, Ms. Feinstein, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Booker, Ms. Cortez Masto, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Wyden, Mr. Kaine, Ms. Sinema, Ms. Rosen, Mr. Coons, Ms. Smith, Ms. HasSan, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mrs. Murray, Mr. Durbin, Mrs. Shaheen, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Jones, Mr. Van Hollen, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Brown, Ms. Hirono, Ms. Warnen, Mr. Murphy, Ms. Klobuchar, Ms. Duckworth, Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Leahy, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Markley, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Cramer, and Mr. Schatz) to the bill H.R. 1897, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MCORMICK, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. Cramer, and Mr. SCHATSCHPLAUS) to the bill H.R. 167, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1644. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MCORMICK, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. Cramer, and Mr. SCHATSCHPLAUS) to the bill H.R. 167, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1644. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MCORMICK, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. Cramer, and Mr. SCHATSCHPLAUS) to the bill H.R. 167, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1644. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MCORMICK, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. Cramer, and Mr. SCHATSCHPLAUS) to the bill H.R. 167, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1644. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MCORMICK, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. Cramer, and Mr. SCHATSCHPLAUS) to the bill H.R. 167, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1644. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MCORMICK, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. Cramer, and Mr. SCHATSCHPLAUS) to the bill H.R. 167, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1659. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1623. Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALBANY, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZER, Ms. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Ms. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1665. Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALBANY, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZER, Ms. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Ms. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. I43KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SEC. 4. OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES.

(a) Gulf of Mexico Outer Continental Shelf Revenues.—Section 102(9)(A)(i) of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109–432) is amended—

(1) by striking "fiscal year 2017 and each fiscal year thereafter, all rentals, royalties and other revenues from the Outer Continental Shelf;" and

(2) by inserting ". . . " before "and each fiscal year thereafter, all rentals, royalties and other revenues from the Outer Continental Shelf;"

(b) Alaska Outer Continental Shelf Revenues.—Section 102(9)(A)(ii)(I) of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109–432) is amended by inserting "and each fiscal year thereafter, all rentals, royalties and other revenues from the Outer Continental Shelf;" before the period at the end.

(c) Gulf Coast Outer Continental Shelf Revenues.—Section 102(9)(A)(ii)(II) of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109–432) is amended—

(1) by striking "fiscal year 2006 and each fiscal year thereafter, all rentals, royalties and other revenues from the Outer Continental Shelf;"; and

(2) by inserting "and each fiscal year thereafter, all rentals, royalties and other revenues from the Outer Continental Shelf;" before the period at the end.

(d) Purposes.—Section 105 of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109–432) is amended—

(1) by striking "fiscal year 2017 and each fiscal year thereafter, all rentals, royalties and other revenues from the Outer Continental Shelf;"; and

(2) by inserting "and each fiscal year thereafter, all rentals, royalties and other revenues from the Outer Continental Shelf;" before the period at the end.

(e) Definitions.—Section 4 of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109–432) is amended—

(1) by striking "(a), (b), (c), (d), or (e) of section 102(9)(A) of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109–432)"; and

(2) by inserting "(1) D EFINITION OF QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES.—Paragraph (1) of section 105 of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109–432) is amended—

(i) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking "fiscal year 2006 and each fiscal year thereafter, all rentals, royalties and other revenues from the Outer Continental Shelf;"; and

(ii) in subclause (I), by striking "fiscal year 2006 and each fiscal year thereafter, all rentals, royalties and other revenues from the Outer Continental Shelf;"; and

(iii) in subclause (II), by striking "fiscal year 2017 and each fiscal year thereafter, all rentals, royalties and other revenues from the Outer Continental Shelf;"; and

(iv) by inserting "and each fiscal year thereafter, all rentals, royalties and other revenues from the Outer Continental Shelf;" before the period at the end.

(f) Outer Continental Shelf Lease Proceeds.—Section 102(9)(B)(i) of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109–432) is amended—

(1) by striking "fiscal year 2006 and each fiscal year thereafter, all rentals, royalties and other revenues from the Outer Continental Shelf;"; and

(2) by inserting "and each fiscal year thereafter, all rentals, royalties and other revenues from the Outer Continental Shelf;" before the period at the end.
(1) LIMITATIONS ON AMOUNT OF DISTRIBUTED QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES.—

(2) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the total amount of distributed qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues made available under subsection (a)(2) shall not exceed—

(A) $500,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2019; and

(B) $650,000,000 for fiscal year 2020.

(2) EXPENDITURES.—

(A) FISCAL YEARS 2016 THROUGH 2020.—For the purpose of paragraph (1)(A), for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020, expenditures under subsection (a)(2) shall be net of receipts from that fiscal year from any area in the 181 Area in the Eastern Planning Area and the 181 South Area.

(B) FISCAL YEARS 2021 THROUGH 2055.—For the purpose of paragraph (1)(B), for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2055, expenditures under subsection (a)(2)(B) shall be net of receipts from that fiscal year from any area in the 181 Area in the Eastern Planning Area and the 181 South Area.

(3) PRO RATA REDUCTIONS; REVERSION.—

(A) FISCAL YEARS 2016 THROUGH 2020.—If paragraph (1)(A) limits the amount of distributed qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues that would be paid under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (a)(2)—

(i) the Secretary shall reduce the amount of distributed qualified Outer Continental Shelf revenues provided to each recipient on a pro rata basis; and

(ii) any remainder of the qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues shall revert to the general fund of the Treasury.

(B) FISCAL YEARS 2021 THROUGH 2055.—If paragraph (1)(B) limits the amount of distributed qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues that would be paid under subsection (a)(2)(B), any remainder of the qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues shall be deposited in the National Oceans and Coastal Security Fund established under section 904 of the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act (16 U.S.C. 7503b). (b) ALASKA OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) COASTAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISION.—The term "coastal political subdivision" means—

(i) a county-equivalent subdivision of the State;

(ii) all or part of which lies within the coastal zone as defined in section 301 of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1453) of the State; and

(iii) the closest coastal point of which is not more than 200 nautical miles from the geographical center of any leased tract in the Alaska outer Continental Shelf region; and

(B) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term "institution of higher education" has the meaning given the term in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002).

(C) QUALIFIED REVENUES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The term "qualified revenues" means amounts derived from—

(A) rents, royalties, bonus bids, and other sums due and payable to the United States from energy development in the Alaska outer Continental Shelf region.

(B) INCLUSION.—The term "qualified revenues" does not include—

(i) revenues generated from leases subject to section 8(g) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(g)); or

(ii) revenues from the forfeiture of a bond or other surety securing obligations other than royalties, or royalties taken by the Secretary in-kind and not sold.

(D) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(E) STATE.—The term "State" means the State of Alaska.

(2) DISPOSITION OF QUALIFIED REVENUES IN ALASKA.—Notwithstanding section 9 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1338) and subject to the other provisions of this subsection, for fiscal year 2021 and each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury shall—

(A) 50 percent of qualified revenues in the general fund of the Treasury;

(B) 42.5 percent of qualified revenues in a special account in the Treasury, to be distributed by the Secretary to the State; and

(C) 7.5 percent of qualified revenues in a special account in the Treasury, to be distributed by the Secretary to coastal political subdivisions.

(3) ALLOCATION AMONG COASTAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS.—Of the amount paid by the Secretary to coastal political subdivisions under paragraph (2)(C)—

(A) 90 percent shall be allocated among coastal political subdivisions described in paragraph (1)(A)(i) in amounts (based on a formula established by the Secretary by regulation) that are inversely proportional to the respective distances between the point in each coastal political subdivision that is closest to the geographic center of the applicable leased tract and not more than 200 miles from the geographic center of the leased tract; and

(B) 10 percent shall be divided equally among each coastal political subdivision described in paragraph (1)(A)(ii).

(4) TIMING.—The amounts required to be deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year—

(A) shall be made available for, the Fund for each fiscal year immediately following the applicable fiscal year;

(B) remain available until expended; and

(C) are appropriated or otherwise made available for the Fund.

(5) AUTHORIZED USES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the State shall use all amounts received under paragraph (4) in accordance with all applicable Federal and State laws, for 1 or more of the following purposes:

(i) Projects and activities for the purposes of coastal protection, conservation, and restoration, including onshore infrastructure and relocation of communities directly affected by coastal erosion, melting permafrost, or climate change-related losses.

(ii) Mitigation of damage to fish, wildlife, or natural resources.

(iii) Mitigation of the impact of outer Continental Shelf activities through the funding of onshore infrastructure projects and related rights-of-way.

(iv) Adaptation planning, vulnerability assessments, and emergency preparedness assistance to coastal, rural, and resilient communities.

(v) Installation and operation of energy systems to reduce energy costs and greenhouse gas emissions, as determined by the Governor of the State, with approval from the State legislature.

(vi) Planning assistance and the administrative costs of complying with this subsection.

(B) LIMITATION.—Not more than 3 percent of the amounts received by the State under paragraph (2)(B) may be used for the purposes described in subparagraph (A)(vii).

(6) ADMINISTRATION.—Amounts made available under subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (2) shall—

(A) be made available, without further appropriation, in accordance with this subsection;

(B) remain available until expended; and

(C) be in addition to any amounts appropriated under any other provision of law.

(7) NATIONAL OCEANS AND COASTAL SECURITY FUND; PARITY IN OFFSHORE WIND REVENUE SHARING.—

(a) DEFINITIONS IN THE NATIONAL OCEANS AND COASTAL SECURITY ACT.—Section 902 of the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act (16 U.S.C. 7503) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

(5) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term 'Indian tribe' has the meaning given that term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304); and

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking "as has been used in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(g))" and inserting "as has been used in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(g)) and the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of 2004 (43 U.S.C. 1337a(g))".

(b) NATIONAL OCEANS AND COASTAL SECURITY FUND.—Section 904 of the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act (16 U.S.C. 7503b) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (a), by inserting "and jointly manage" after "establish";

(2) in subsection (b), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

(1) the Fund shall consist of such amounts as—

(A) are deposited in the Fund under section 103(b)(6)(B) of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1337 note; Public Law 109–342);

(B) are deposited in the Fund under paragraph (C)(ii)(x)(bb) of section 8(p)(2) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(p)(2)); and

(C) are appropriated or otherwise made available for the Fund.

(3) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

(d) EXPENDITURE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Of the amounts deposited into, and amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for, the Fund for each fiscal year—

(i) not more than 75 percent may be used for the award of grants under section 906(b);

(ii) not more than 20 percent may be used for the award of grants under section 906(c); and

(iii) not more than 5 percent may be used by the Administrator and the Foundation for administrative expenses to carry out this title.

(B) LIMITATION.—If less than $50,000,000 is deposited into, or appropriated or otherwise made available for, the Fund for a fiscal year—

(i) the amounts in the Fund shall be used for the award of grants only under section 906(c); and

(ii) not more than 5 percent may be used by the Administrator and the Foundation for administrative expenses to carry out this title.
FUND.—Section 905 of the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act (16 U.S.C. 7505) is amended—

(a) IN GENERAL.—Amounts in the Fund may be administered by the Administrator and the Foundation for the purposes described in this subsection.

(b) PURPOSES DESCRIBED.—The purposes described in this subsection are the following:

(1) Ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes restoration and protection, including efforts to address potential impacts to natural resources, communities, and coastal economies of sea level change, sedimentation, erosion, changes in ocean chemistry, hurricanes and other extreme coastal storms, flooding, and changes in ocean temperature.

(2) Ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes recreation, or maintenance of ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources and marine habitats.

(3) Science, planning management, planning, or resiliency and readiness at a regional scope, such as through regional ocean partnerships or similar bodies, including sustainable coastal development.

(4) Scientific research that contributes to the understanding and mitigation of ecological, economic, societal, and national security threats driven by sea level change, sedimentation, erosion, changes in ocean chemistry, hurricanes and other extreme weather that result in declarations of major disasters pursuant to section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170), flooding, and changes in ocean temperature, including specific attention to how those conditions impact commercial and recreational fishing businesses, aquaculture, boat building, ports, or other coastal-related businesses.

(5) Efforts to assist coastal States in strengthening, stabilizing, elevating, modifying, repositioning, or otherwise enhancing the resiliency of onshore infrastructure, including shoreline structures, affected by coastal land loss or erosion, hurricanes or other extreme coastal storms, or flooding from sea level change.

(6) Ocean data compilation, and sharing of data that supports and includes regular stakeholder engagement to minimize actual or potential conflicts among ocean users.

(c) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR LITIGATION OR OTHER PURPOSES.—No funds made available under this title may be used—

(1) to fund litigation against the Federal Government; or

(2) to fund the creation of national marine monuments, marine protected areas, or marine spatial plans.

(d) GRANTS UNDER THE NATIONAL OCEANS AND COASTAL SECURITY ACT.—Section 906 of the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act (16 U.S.C. 7505) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking paragraph (2); and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2); and

(2) by striking subsection (b).
(A) to carry out, in partnership with other individuals and entities, the management plan for a National Heritage Area; and

(B) to operate the National Heritage Area, including through the implementation of projects and programs among diverse partners in the National Heritage Area.

(2) NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA.—The term ‘‘National Heritage Area’’ means the management plan for a National Heritage Area as described in subsection (b)(2).

(3) NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA SYSTEM.—The term ‘‘National Heritage Area System’’ means the system established by subsection (b)(2).

(4) PROPOSED NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA.—The term ‘‘proposed National Heritage Area’’ means an area that is proposed to be designated as a National Heritage Area.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term ‘‘Secretary’’ means the Secretary of the Interior.

(6) TRIBAL GOVERNMENT.—The term ‘‘Tribal government’’ means the governing body of an Indian Tribe designated by Congress before or on the date of enactment of this Act.

§ 1624A. Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, and Mr. MARKET) submitted an amendment[...]

(A) to carry out, in partnership with other individuals and entities, the management plan for a National Heritage Area; and

(B) to operate the National Heritage Area, including through the implementation of projects and programs among diverse partners in the National Heritage Area.

(2) NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA.—The term ‘‘National Heritage Area’’ means the management plan for a National Heritage Area as described in subsection (b)(2).

(3) NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA SYSTEM.—The term ‘‘National Heritage Area System’’ means the system established by subsection (b)(2).

(4) PROPOSED NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA.—The term ‘‘proposed National Heritage Area’’ means an area that is proposed to be designated as a National Heritage Area.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term ‘‘Secretary’’ means the Secretary of the Interior.

(6) TRIBAL GOVERNMENT.—The term ‘‘Tribal government’’ means the governing body of an Indian Tribe designated by Congress before or on the date of enactment of this Act.

§ 1624A. Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, and Mr. MARKET) submitted an amendment[...]

(A) to carry out, in partnership with other individuals and entities, the management plan for a National Heritage Area; and

(B) to operate the National Heritage Area, including through the implementation of projects and programs among diverse partners in the National Heritage Area.

(2) NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA.—The term ‘‘National Heritage Area’’ means the management plan for a National Heritage Area as described in subsection (b)(2).

(3) NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA SYSTEM.—The term ‘‘National Heritage Area System’’ means the system established by subsection (b)(2).

(4) PROPOSED NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA.—The term ‘‘proposed National Heritage Area’’ means an area that is proposed to be designated as a National Heritage Area.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term ‘‘Secretary’’ means the Secretary of the Interior.

(6) TRIBAL GOVERNMENT.—The term ‘‘Tribal government’’ means the governing body of an Indian Tribe designated by Congress before or on the date of enactment of this Act.
Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives reports describing the activities conducted with respect to National Heritage Areas in accordance with this section.

(5) AUTHORITIES.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary may—

(A) conduct or review, as applicable, feasibility studies in accordance with subsection (c)(1);

(B) conduct an evaluation of the accomplishments of, and submit to Congress a report that includes recommendations regarding the role of National Park Service with respect to, each National Heritage Area, in accordance with subsection (d);

(C) use amounts made available under subsection (i) to provide technical and financial assistance, on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis, as determined by the Secretary, for—

(i) the development and implementation of management plans for National Heritage Areas;

(ii) the administration of National Heritage Areas;

(D) enter into cooperative agreements with other Federal agencies, States, Tribal governments, local governments, local coordinating entities, and other interested individuals and entities to achieve the purposes of the National Heritage Area System;

(E) provide information, promote understanding, and encourage research regarding National Heritage Areas, in partnership with local entities and communities; and

(F) provide national oversight, analysis, coordination, technical and financial assistance, and support to ensure consistent and accountable implementation of the National Heritage Area System.

(c) DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL HERITAGE AREAS.—

(I) STUDIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may carry out or review a study to assess the suitability and feasibility of each proposed National Heritage Area for designation as a National Heritage Area.

(B) PREPARATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—A study under subparagraph (A) may be carried out—

(aa) by the Secretary, in consultation with State, local, and Tribal governments, and other governmental and private entities; and

(bb) by interested individuals or entities, if the Secretary certifies that the completed study meets the requirements of subparagraph (C).

(ii) CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 1 year after receiving a study carried out by interested individuals or entities under clause (i), the Secretary shall review and certify whether the study meets the requirements of subparagraph (C).

(C) REQUIREMENTS.—A study under subparagraph (A) shall include analysis, documentation, and determinations on whether the proposed National Heritage Area—

(i) has an assemblage of natural, historic, and cultural resources that—

(aa) represent distinctive aspects of the heritage of the United States;

(bb) are worthy of recognition, conservation, interpretation, and continuing use; and

(cc) would be best managed—

(aa) through partnerships among public and private entities; and

(bb) to the extent practicable and sometimes noncontiguous resources and active communities;

(ii) reflects traditions, customs, beliefs, and cultural resources that—

(aa) are the subject of the relevant feasibility study; and

(bb) are the subject of the relevant management plan;

(iii) has a conceptual boundary map that—

(aa) clearly delineates the boundaries of the National Heritage Area; and

(bb) is developed through public participation processes, including a description of—

(aa) the means by which the management plan will be implemented; and

(bb) the stakeholders involved in the process; and

(iv) is based on an inventory of the natural, historic, cultural, and scenic resources of the National Heritage Area relating to the nationally significant themes and events of the region that should be protected, enhanced, interpreted, managed, or developed;

(v) includes comprehensive goals, strategies, policies, and recommendations for—

(aa) demonstrating the heritage represented by the National Heritage Area; and

(bb) encouraging long-term resource protection, enhancement, interpretation, and development;

(vi) has a potential management entity to work in partnership with the individuals and entities described in clause (v) to develop the proposed National Heritage Area while encouraging State and local economic activity; and

(vii) includes a business plan for the local coordinating entity that, at a minimum, addresses—

(aa) the means by which the management plan will be implemented and updated; and

(bb) the manner in which the management plan will be evaluated and updated;

(viii) includes a business plan for the local coordinating entity that, at a minimum, addresses—

(aa) the means by which the management plan will be implemented and updated; and

(bb) the manner in which the management plan will be evaluated and updated;

(ix) includes a business plan for the local coordinating entity that, at a minimum, addresses—

(aa) the means by which the management plan will be implemented and updated; and

(bb) the manner in which the management plan will be evaluated and updated; and

(x) includes a business plan for the local coordinating entity that, at a minimum, addresses—

(aa) the means by which the management plan will be implemented and updated; and

(bb) the manner in which the management plan will be evaluated and updated; and

(c) APPLICABILITY.—The requirements described in subparagraph (B) shall not apply to any management plan or other similar plan in effect on the date of enactment of this Act with respect to a National Heritage Area described in subsection (b)(2)(A).

(d) EVALUATION.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—At reasonable and appropriate intervals, as determined by the Secretary, the Secretary may—

(A) conduct an evaluation of the accomplishments of a National Heritage Area in accordance with paragraph (2); and

(B) prepare and submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report that includes recommendations for the continued role of the National Park Service with respect to a National Heritage Area in accordance with paragraph (3).

(2) COMPONENTS.—An evaluation under paragraph (1)(A) shall—

(A) assess the progress of the applicable local coordinating entity of a National Heritage Area with respect to—

(I) opportunities for stakeholders (such as community members, local and regional governments, Tribal governments, businesses, nonprofit organizations, and others) to be involved in the planning process; and

(bb) review and comment on the draft plan; and

(ii) documentation of the planning and public participation processes, including a description of—

(aa) the means by which the management plan was prepared; and

(bb) the stakeholders involved in the process; and

(iii) the timing and method of stakeholder involvement; and

(ii) include an inventory of the natural, historic, cultural, and scenic resources of the National Heritage Area relating to the nationally significant themes and events of the region that should be protected, enhanced, interpreted, managed, or developed;
(i) accomplishing the purposes of the applicable National Heritage Area; and
(ii) achieving the goals and objectives of the management plan;
(B) Federal, State, local, Tribal government, and private investments in the National Heritage Area to determine the leverage and impact of the investments; and
(C) management, partnerships, relationships, and funding of the National Heritage Area for purposes of identifying the critical components for sustainability.

(3) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Each report under paragraph (1)(B) shall include—
(A) if the report contains a recommendation that Federal funding for the applicable National Heritage Area should be continued, an analysis of any means by which that Federal funding may be reduced or eliminated over time; and
(B) if the report contains a recommendation that Federal funding for the applicable National Heritage Area should be reduced, an analysis of the critical components for sustainability.

(4) AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may provide assistance to a National Heritage Area during any fiscal year for which appropriations are authorized under paragraph (1).

SA 1625. Mr. WHITEHOUSE for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. REED, Mr. COONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. Kaine, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURREN, Mr. THETFORD, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Ms. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Ms. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. BROWN, Ms. DOGGETT, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. Kaine, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHNI, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. VALENZUELA, Mr. MANZANEDA, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKET, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill S. 1116, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 906(a).—Amounts in the Fund shall be used for the award of grants only under section 906(c); and
(B) not more than 5 percent may be used by the Administrator and the Foundation for administrative expenses to carry out this title.

(3) DIVISION OF AMOUNTS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—The amounts referred to in paragraphs (1)(C) and (2)(B) shall be divided among the Administrator and the Foundation pursuant to an agreement reached and documented by both the Administrator and the Foundation.

(4) (in subsection (e)(2), by striking “section 906(a)(1)” and inserting “section 906(a)(1)”.

(c) ELIGIBLE USES OF AMOUNTS IN THE NATIONAL OCEANS AND COASTAL SECURITY FUND.—Section 9 of the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act (16 U.S.C. 7504) is amended to read as follows:

(a) IN GENERAL.—Amounts in the Fund may be allocated by the Administrator and the Foundation to support programs and activities carried out by Federal, State, local, Tribal governments, Indian tribes, and intergovernmental collaborative partnerships, and academic institutions for the purposes described in subsection (b).

(b) PURPOSES DESCRIBED.—The purposes described in this subsection are the following:

(1) Ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes restoration and protection, including efforts to mitigate the potential impacts of climate change on sources, communities, and coastal economies of sea level change, sedimentation, erosion, changes in ocean chemistry, hurricanes and other extreme coastal weather events, including flooding and changes in ocean temperature.

(2) Restoration, protection, or maintenance of ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources and marine habitats.

(3) Projects to address management, planning, or resiliency and readiness at a regional, scale, such as through regional ocean partnerships or similar bodies, including sustainable coastal development.

(4) Scientific research that contributes to the understanding and mitigation of ecological, economic, societal, and national security threats driven by sea level change, sedimentation, erosion, changes in ocean chemistry, hurricanes and other extreme weather events that result in declarations of major disasters pursuant to section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170), flooding, and changes in ocean temperature, including specific attention to how those conditions impact commercial and recreational fishing businesses, aquaculture, boating, ports, and other coastal-related businesses.

(5) Efforts to assist coastal States in strengthening, stabilizing, elevating, modifying, repositioning, or otherwise enhancing the resilience of coastal infrastructure, including public infrastructure, affected by coastal land loss or erosion, hurricanes or...
other extreme coastal storms, or flooding from sea level change.

"(6) The collection, compilation, and sharing of data that supports and includes regular and accurate management to minimize actual or potential conflicts among ocean users.

"(c) Prohibition on Use of Funds for Litigation or Other Purposes.—No funds made available under this title may be used—

"(1) to fund litigation against the Federal Government; or

"(2) to fund the creation of national marine monuments, marine protected areas, or marine spatial plans.

(d) Grants Under the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act.—Section 906 of the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act (16 U.S.C. 7505) is amended—

"(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking paragraph (2);

(B) by striking "(a) ADMINISTRATION OF GRANTS."— and all that follows through "the following:" and inserting the following:

"(a) ADMINISTRATION OF GRANTS.—Not later than 30 days after funds are deposited into the Fund available under this Act, the Administrator and the Foundation for administrative purposes, the Administrator and the Foundation shall establish the following:

(C) in (A), by striking "such subsections" and inserting "this section";

(D) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

"(B) Procedures and criteria for the awarding of grants under this section that require consultation with the Administrator and the Secretary of the Interior.

(E) in subparagraph (C), by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

"(ii) a description of each such project and program; and

(F) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (H) as paragraphs (1) through (8), respectively, and moving such paragraphs, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the left.

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

"(b) Grants to Coastal States.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall award grants to coastal States as follows:

(A) 50 percent of available amounts shall be allocated equally among coastal States.

(B) 25 percent of available amounts shall be allocated based on the ratio of the total shoreline miles in a coastal State to the total shoreline miles of all coastal States.

(C) 25 percent of available amounts shall be allocated based on the ratio of the population density of the coastal counties of a coastal State to the average population density of all coastal counties based on the most recent data available from the Bureau of the Census.

"(2) Maximum allocation to States.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), not more than 5 percent of the total funds distributed under this subsection may be allocated to any single coastal State. Any amount exceeding that limitation shall be redistributed equally among the remaining coastal States.

"(3) Requirement to submit plans.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection, a coastal State shall submit to the Administrator for review and approval a 5-year plan, which shall include the following:

"(i) Criteria to determine eligibility for entities that may receive funding under this subsection.

"(ii) A description of the process the coastal State uses to develop a non-Federal source to match the limitation under subsection (a).

"(aa) The coastal State zone management program approved under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.), if the coastal State has such a program; and

"(bb) any sea grant program (as defined in section 203 of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (32 U.S.C. 1222)), if the coastal State has such a program; and

"(ii) a demonstration the process is consistent with the procedures established by the Administrator and the Foundation under subsection (a).

"(iii) A process to certify that a project or program carried out using amounts received under this subsection, and the awarding of a contract for the expenditure of such amounts, are consistent with the standard procurement rules and regulations governing a comparable project or program in the coastal State, including competitive bidding and audit requirements.

"(iv) Procedures to make publicly available in the plan, projects and programs receiving amounts under this subsection that includes, at a minimum—

(A) an identification of each entity receiving amounts under this subsection;

(B) the amount of funds received by each such entity;

(C) a description of each such project and program; and

(D) a statement of the status of each such project and program.

"(B) Updates.—As a condition of receiving a grant under this subsection, a coastal State shall submit to the Administrator, not less frequently than once every 5 years, an update to the plan submitted by the coastal State under subparagraph (A) for the 5-year period immediately following the most recent submittal under this paragraph.

"(C) INaugural Year.—In the first year after the plan submitted by the coastal State under subparagraph (A) for the 5-year period immediately following the most recent submittal under this paragraph—

(A) a plan approved under this paragraph shall not be required; and

(B) a coastal State may use amounts received under this subsection to develop a plan for approval under this paragraph to receive funding in future years.

"(D) OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT.—In determining whether to approve a plan or an update to a plan under paragraph (3), the Administrator shall provide the opportunity for, and take into consideration, public input and comment on the plan.

"(E) NONPARTICIPATION BY A STATE.—In any year, if a coastal State does not submit a plan as required by paragraph (3) or declines amounts distributed under this subsection, the amounts that would have been allocated to the coastal State shall be redistributed equally among the remaining coastal States; and

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(B)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking "; and" and inserting a semicolon;

(ii) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (iv); and

(iii) by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

"(uu) nongovernmental organizations; and"

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(c) Matching Requirement.—As a condition of receiving a grant under this subsection, the entity seeking to receive the grant shall demonstrate that funds are available in non-Federal sources to match the limitation of the grant.

"(4) Exclusion of Funds from Limitation.—The amount of a grant awarded under this subsection shall not be subject to the limitation under subsection (b)(2) on funding to coastal States through grants awarded under subsection (b).

"(5) Annual Report on Operation of the National Oceans and Coastal Security Fund.—Section 907(a) of the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act (16 U.S.C. 7506(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (2);

(B) by striking subsection (a), and

(C) by striking "the Foundation" and inserting "not later than 60 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Administrator and the Foundation.


"(7) Extension of Constitution, Laws, and Jurisdiction of the United States to Enforce Conventions and Treaties relating to the Outer Continental Shelf.—Section 4(a)(1) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1333(a)(1)) is amended—

(A) by striking "(a) ADMINISTRATION OF GRANTS. "—and all that follows through "the Foundation" and inserting the following:

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C), the Secretary;" and

(2) by inserting "and other" after "That mineral", "PRIORITY IN OFFSHORE WIND REVENUE SHARING.—Section 8(p)(2) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(p)(2)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking "(A) The Secretary"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(C) DISPOSITION OF REVENUES FOR PROJECTS LOCATED WITHIN 3 NAUTICAL MILES OF STATE SUBMERGED LAND.—The Secretary; and

(3) by striking "or the "energy" after "that mineral", "OFFSHORE WIND PROJECTS IN CERTAIN AREAS.—

"(i) Definitions.—In this subparagraph:

"(I) Covered offshore wind project.—The term ‘covered offshore wind project’ means a wind energy generation project in a wind energy area on the outer Continental Shelf that is not wholly or partially located within an area subject to subparagraph (B).

"(II) Eligible State.—The term ‘eligible State’ means a State a point on the coastline of which is located within 75 miles of the geographic center of the covered offshore wind project.

"(ii) Requirement.

"(I) In general.—Of the operating fees, rentals, bonuses, royalties, and other payments that are paid to the Secretary under subparagraph (A) from covered offshore wind projects—

"(aa) 50 percent shall be deposited in the Treasury and credited to miscellaneous receipts;

"(bb) 12.5 percent shall be deposited in the National Oceans and Coastal Security Fund; and

(c) 37.5 percent shall be deposited in a special account in the Treasury, from which the Secretary, subject to subsection (d), shall disburse to each eligible State an amount
(based on a formula established by the Secretary of the Interior by rulemaking not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Great American Outdoors Act) that is adversely proportioned to the respective distances between—

“(AA) the point on the coastline of each eligible State that is closest to the geographic center of the leased tract; and

“(BB) the geographic center of the leased tract.

(II) Minimum allocation.—The amount allocated to an eligible State each fiscal year under item (cc) of subclause (I) shall be at least 10 percent of the amounts available under that item.

(III) Timing.—The amounts required to be deposited under item (cc) of clause (II)(I) for the applicable fiscal year shall be made available with that item during the fiscal year immediately following the applicable fiscal year.

(IV) Authorized uses.—

(I) In general.—Subject to subclause (II), each State shall use all amounts received under clause (ii)(I)(cc) in accordance with all applicable Federal and State laws, only for 1 or more of the following purposes:

(aa) Projects and activities for the purposes of coastal protection, including conservation, coastal restoration, hurricane protection, and infrastructure directly affected by coastal wetland losses.

(bb) Mitigation of damage to fish, wildlife, or natural resources.

(cc) Implementation of a federally approved marine, coastal, or comprehensive conservation management plan.

(dd) Mitigation of the impact of outer Continental Shelf activities through the funding of onshore infrastructure projects.

(ee) Planning assistance and the administrative costs of complying with this section.

(II) Limitation.—Of the amounts received by a State under clause (ii)(I)(cc), not more than 3 percent shall be used for the purposes described in subclause (I)(ee).

(III) Administration.—Subject to clause (v)(III), amounts made available under clause (ii)(I) shall—

(I) be made available, without further appropriation, in accordance with this paragraph;

(II) remain available until expended; and

(III) be in addition to any amount appropriated under any other Act.

(V) Reporting requirement.—

(I) In general.—Not later than 180 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Governor of each eligible State that receives amounts under clause (ii)(I)(cc) for the applicable fiscal year shall submit to the Secretary a report that describes the use of the amounts by the eligible State during the period covered by the report.

(II) Public availability.—On receipt of a report under subclause (I), the Secretary shall make the report available to the public on the website of the Department of the Interior.

(III) Limitation.—If the Governor of an eligible State that receives amounts under clause (ii)(I)(cc) for the applicable fiscal year fails to submit the report required under subclause (I) by the deadline specified in that subclause, any amounts that would otherwise be provided to the eligible State under clause (ii)(I) for the succeeding fiscal year shall be deposited in the National Oceans and Coastal Security Fund established under section 906(a) of the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act (16 U.S.C. 7509a(a)).

(I) Exemption of certain payments from sequestration.—

(1) General.—Section 256(g)(1)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 905(g)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting after “Payments to Social Security Trust Funds (28:0904–0:1–651),” the following:

“Payments to States pursuant to subparagaph (d) (subparagraph (d)/(p)(2) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(p)(2))).”.

(2) Application.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to any sequestration order issued under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 906 et seq.) on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 1626. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. McCONNELL, Ms. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. Cramer, and Mr. SCHULTZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike “3 days” and insert “4 days”
purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 4. REISSUANCE OF FINAL RULES REGARDING GRAY WOLVES IN WESTERN GREAT LAKES AND WYOMING.

(a) Reissuance of Final Rule Regarding Gray Wolves in Western Great Lakes.—Before the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall reissue the final rule published on December 28, 2011 (76 Fed. Reg. 81666), without regard to any other provision of statute or regulation that applies to issuance of such rule. Such reissuance shall not be subject to judicial review.

(b) Reissuance of Final Rule Regarding Gray Wolves in Wyoming.—The final rule published on September 10, 2012 (77 Fed. Reg. 55530) that was reissued on March 3, 2017, by order of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia (No. 14-5300) and further reissued on May 1, 2017 (82 Fed. Reg. 20294–65) that repeals the removal of Federal protections for the gray wolf in Wyoming under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, shall not be subject to judicial review.

SA 1635. Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. ENZI, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BROWN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HINICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KANE, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. McCONNELL, Mr. MARKET, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. Cramer, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1607, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 5. CONFORMING ADJUSTMENT OF DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

Section 251(c)(B) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(c)(6)(B)) is amended by striking "$626,050,000,000" and inserting "$626,500,000,000".

SA 1636. Mr. CARDJIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1607, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION TO ESTABLISH COMMEMORATIVE WORK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Fallen Journalists Memorial Foundation shall establish a commemorative work on Federal land in the District of Columbia and its environs to commemorate and preserve the memory of journalists who have sacrificed their lives in their line of work.

(b) COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS FOR COMMEMORATIVE WORKS.—The establishment of the commemorative work under this section shall be in accordance with chapter 89 of title 40, United States Code, which subsections (a) and (b) of such chapter are not applicable.

(c) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS.—(1) IN GENERAL.—Federal funds may not be used to pay any expense of the establishment of the commemorative work under this section.

SA 1638. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BROWN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HINICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KANE, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. McCONNELL, Mr. MARKET, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. Cramer, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1607, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 7. PROHIBITION OF USE OF FUNDS TO IMPLEMENT PROCLAMATION MODIFYING THE NORTHEAST CANYONS AND SATURDAY MARINE NATIONAL MONUMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—
(1) the Presidential Proclamation of June 5, 2020, relating to “Modifying the Northeast Canyons and Seamounts Marine National Monument” is illegal and should not be carried out.
(2) the President does not have the legal authority under the Constitution of the United States or any Federal law to eliminate the protections necessary for the "proper care and management" of the "objects of scientific and historic interest" at a national monument, as required under chapter 3203 of title 54, United States Code;
(3) only Congress may make a significant change in the protection of a national monument;
(4) in attempting to roll back the protections for the Northeast Canyons and Seamounts Marine National Monument under Presidential Proclamation 9486, as issued on September 15, 2016 (54 U.S.C. 320301 note), the action of the President on June 5, 2020, was unlawful; and
(5) Congress should not provide funds to implement the modifications to Presidential Proclamation 9486, as issued on September 15, 2016 (54 U.S.C. 320301 note).

(b) PROHIBITION.—No funds, resources, or fees made available to the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Interior, or any other official of a Federal agency for any fiscal year may be used to implement or enforce the Presidential Proclamation issued on June 5, 2020, which eliminates the protections for the Northeast Canyons and Seamounts Marine National Monument.

SA 1639. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASSEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. Kaine, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. ROSEN, Ms. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 113, as follows:
On page 14, strike line 19 and all that follows through page 9, line 2, and insert the following:

"(d) SUBMISSION OF ANNUAL LIST OF PROJECTS TO CONGRESS.—Until the date on which all of the amounts in the Fund are expended, the President shall annually submit to Congress, together with the annual budget of the United States—

(1) a list of projects that are to be funded from the Fund for the applicable fiscal year that includes a detailed description of each project, including the estimated expenditures from the Fund for the project for the applicable fiscal year;

(2) a list of projects that received funding during the preceding fiscal year from the Fund that includes a detailed description of each project, including—

(A) the total amount of expenditures expended for the projects listed as of the date on which the list is submitted;

(B) the total amount of expenditures estimated to be required to complete the projects listed;

On page 18, after the matter following line 15, add the following:

SEC. 4. CERTAIN REPORTS REQUIRED PRIOR TO ACQUISITION OF LAND USING AMOUNTS FROM THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.
Section 200306 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

(e) REPORTS REQUIRED PRIOR TO ACQUISITION.—Before acquiring any land under this section, the Secretary or the Secretary of Agriculture, as applicable, shall submit—

(1) to Congress a report that describes the estimated cost to the Secretary or the Secretary of Agriculture, as applicable, of acquiring, administering, and maintaining the land; and

(2) to the State and unit of local government in which the land is located a report that provides an estimate of the property tax revenue that would be lost as a result of the acquisition by the Secretary or the Secretary of Agriculture, as applicable.''

SA 1640. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASSEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. Kaine, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 113, as follows:
On page 14, in paragraph (1) (as so designated), in the second sentence, after "Appropriations" and inserting the following:

(1) ACQUISITION.—Appropriations;" and

(2) in paragraph (2) (as so designated), in the second sentence, after "Appropriations" and inserting the following:

(2) OTHER PURPOSES.—Appropriations;" and

(3) in paragraph (3) (as so designated), by striking "vested in the United States under the Public Land Survey System" and inserting "vested in the United States under the Public Land Survey System, the objects of scientific and historic interest, and the property tax revenue that would be lost as a result of the acquisition by the Secretary or the Secretary of Agriculture, as applicable".''

SA 1641. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASSEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. Kaine, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 113, as follows:
On page 14, in paragraph (3) (as so designated), by striking "vested in the United States under the Public Land Survey System" and inserting "vested in the United States under the Public Land Survey System, the objects of scientific and historic interest, and the property tax revenue that would be lost as a result of the acquisition by the Secretary or the Secretary of Agriculture, as applicable''.

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 5. LIMITATION ON THE EXTENSION OR ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL MONUMENTS IN THE STATE OF UTAH.
Section 32001(d) of title 54, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking "WYOMING" and inserting "THE STATE OF WYOMING OR UTAH";

(2) by striking "Wyoming" and inserting "the State of Wyoming or Utah".
SA 1642. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Mr. COTTESTE, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. Cramer, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. 3. CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS.**

Section 200402 of title 54, United States Code (as added by section 2(a)), is amended by adding at the end the following:

"'(1) NEPA PROCESS TIMELINES.—

'(1) Definitions.—In this subsection:

'(a) 'Environmental impact statement'— means the entirety of every process, analysis, or other measure, including an environmental impact statement, required to be carried out by a covered agency under title I of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4331 et seq.) before the covered agency undertakes the proposed action.

'(b) 'Period'— For purposes of clause (1), the 'period' means:

'(I) begins on the date on which the head of a covered agency receives an application for a proposed action from a project sponsor; and

'(II) ends on the date on which the covered agency issues, with respect to the proposed action:

'(aa) a record of decision, including, if necessary, a revised record of decision; or

'(bb) a finding of no significant impact; or

'(cc) a categorical exclusion under title I of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4331 et seq.).

'(C) Project sponsor.— The term 'project sponsor' means a covered agency or other entity, including a private or public-private entity, that seeks approval of a proposed action.

'(D) Proposed action.—The term 'proposed action' means a 'project sponsor' with respect to the proposed action (within the meaning of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.)) to carry out a project using amounts made available under the Fund.

'(E) NEPA PROCESS.—

'(1) General.— In carrying out a proposed action, the head of a covered agency shall complete the NEPA process for a proposed action of the covered agency, as described in paragraph (1)(B)(ii)(II), not later than 2 years after the date described in paragraph (1)(B)(ii)(I).

'(ii) Environmental documents.—Within the period described in paragraph (1)(B)(ii)(I), the head of the covered agency shall, with respect to the proposed action:

'(1) issue—

'(aa) a finding that a categorical exclusion applies to the proposed action; or

'(bb) a finding of no significant impact; or

'(ii) publish a notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement in the Federal Register.

'(iii) Environmental impact statement.— If the head of a covered agency publishes a notice of intent described in clause (ii)(I), within the period described in clause (i) and not later than 1 year after the date described in paragraph (1)(B)(ii)(I), the head of the covered agency shall, with respect to the proposed action:

'(1) any necessary permit or authorization to carry out the proposed action; or

'(2) a denial of the permit or authorization necessary to carry out the proposed action.

'(iv) Effect of failure to issue authorization or permit.— If a permit or authorization described in clause (i) is not issued or denied within the period described in subparagraph (ii), the permit or authorization shall be considered to be approved.

'(iv) Denial of permit or authorization.—

'(1) General.— If a permit or authorization described in clause (i) is denied, the head of the covered agency shall describe to the project sponsor with respect to how to address the denial:

'(aa) the basis of the denial; and

'(bb) recommendations for the project sponsor with respect to how to address the reasons provided for the denial.

'(v) Recommended changes.—If the project sponsor carries out the recommendations of the head of the covered agency under clause (iv), not later than 90 days after the date described in paragraph (1)(B)(ii)(II), the head of a covered agency shall issue a

'(a) any necessary permit or authorization to carry out the proposed action; or

'(b) a denial of the permit or authorization necessary to carry out the proposed action.

'(v) Submittal of annual list of projects to Congress.—Until the date on which all of the amounts in the Fund are expended, the President shall submit to Congress, together with the annual budget of the United States:

'(1) a list of projects that are to be funded from amounts made available under the Fund in the applicable fiscal year that includes a detailed description of each project, including the estimated expenditures from the Fund for the project for the applicable fiscal year; and

'(2) a list of projects that received funding during the preceding fiscal year from the Fund that includes a detailed description of each project, including:

'(A) the total amount of expenditures expended for the projects listed as of the date on which the list is submitted; and

'(B) the total amount of expenditures estimated to be required to complete the projects listed.

SA 1644. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. Kaine, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BERNSTEIN, Mr. BERNSTEIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. Cramer, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. 4. REUSE OF WORK UNDER NEPA.**

Section 200402 of title 54, United States Code (as added by section 2(a)), is amended by adding at the end the following:

'(1) Reuse of work under NEPA—
“(1) Definitions.—In this subsection:

(A) Environmental impact statement.—

The term ‘environmental impact statement’ means a detailed statement required under section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

(B) NEPA process.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘NEPA process’, with respect to a proposed action, means the entirety of every process, analysis, or other measure, including an environmental impact statement, required to be carried out by a covered agency under title I of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) before the covered agency undertakes the proposed action.

(ii) Period.—For purposes of clause (i), the NEPA process is—

(I) the time on the date on which the head of a covered agency receives an application for a proposed action from a project sponsor; and

(II) ends on the date on which the covered agency issues, with respect to the proposed action—

(aa) a record of decision, including, if necessary, a revised record of decision; or

(bb) a finding of no significant impact; or

(cc) a categorical exclusion under title I of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); or

(B) REUSE OF WORK UNDER NEPA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), in carrying out the NEPA process for a proposed action, the head of a covered agency shall—

(I) use any applicable findings and research from a prior NEPA process of any covered agency; and

(ii) incorporate the findings and research described in clause (i) into any applicable analysis under the NEPA process.

(B) REUSE OF THE REUSE OF FINDINGS AND RESEARCH.—The head of a covered agency may reuse the applicable findings and research described in subparagraph (A) if—

(I) the project for which the head of the covered agency is seeking to reuse the findings and research was in close geographic proximity to the proposed action; and

(II) the head of the covered agency determines that the conditions under which the applicable findings and research were issued have not substantially changed; or

(ii) the project for which the head of the covered agency is seeking to reuse the findings and research was not in close geographic proximity to the proposed action; and

(II) the head of the covered agency determines that the proposed action was similar in nature or decisions to the project.

SA 1645. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. Gardner (for himself, Mr. Manchin, Mr. Daines, Mr. Warner, Mr. Portman, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Alexander, Mr. King, Mr. Burr, Mr. Tester, Ms. Collins, Mr. Udall, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Schumer, Mr. Blunt, Ms. Harris, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Peters, Mr. Tillis, Ms. Baldwin, Ms. McSally, Mr. Casey, Mr. Graham, Mr. Heinrich, Mr. Bennet, Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Booker, Ms. Cortez Masto, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Wyden, Mr. Kaine, Ms. Sinema, Ms. Rosen, Mr. Coons, Ms. Smith, Ms. Hassan, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mr. Boxer, Mr. Duckworth, Ms. Shaheen, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Jones, Mr. Van Hollen, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Brown, Ms. Hirono, Ms. Warren, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Klobuchar, Ms. Duckworth, Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Leahy, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Markley, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Cramer, and Mr. Schatz) to the bill S. 982, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 2. PROHIBITIONS UNDER NEPA ANALYSIS.

Section 200402 of title 54, United States Code (as added by section 2(a)), is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(1) Prohibitions Under NEPA Process.—

(i) In general.—The term ‘NEPA process’, with respect to a proposed action, means the entirety of every process, analysis, or other measure, including an environmental impact statement, required to be carried out by a covered agency under title I of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) before the covered agency undertakes the proposed action.

(ii) Period.—For purposes of clause (i), the NEPA process—

(1) begins on the date on which the head of a covered agency receives an application for a proposed action from a project sponsor; and

(2) ends on the date on which the covered agency issues, with respect to the proposed action—

(aa) a record of decision, including, if necessary, a revised record of decision; or

(bb) a finding of no significant impact; or

(cc) a categorical exclusion under title I of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); or

(B) REUSE OF WORK UNDER NEPA.—

(A) Definitions.—In this subsection:

(I) Environmental impact statement.—

The term ‘environmental impact statement’ means a detailed statement required under section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

(B) NEPA process.—

(i) In general.—The term ‘NEPA process’, with respect to a proposed action, means the entirety of every process, analysis, or other measure, including an environmental impact statement, required to be carried out by a covered agency under title I of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) before the covered agency undertakes the proposed action.

(ii) Period.—For purposes of clause (i), the NEPA process—

(1) begins on the date on which the head of a covered agency receives an application for a proposed action from a project sponsor; and

(2) ends on the date on which the covered agency issues, with respect to the proposed action—

(aa) a record of decision, including, if necessary, a revised record of decision; or

(bb) a finding of no significant impact; or

(cc) a categorical exclusion under title I of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); or

(B) Project sponsor.—The term ‘project sponsor’ means a covered agency or other entity, including a private or public-private entity, that seeks approval of a proposed action.

(D) Proposed action.—The term ‘proposed action’ means a proposed action (without regard to whether or not a record of decision, finding of no significant impact, or categorical exclusion has been issued) if the proposed action is not—

(I) made available under the Fund.

(ii) the project for which the head of a covered agency is seeking to reuse the findings and research was in close geographic proximity to the proposed action; and

(ii) the head of the covered agency determines that the conditions under which the applicable findings and research were issued have not substantially changed; or

(iii) the project for which the head of the covered agency is seeking to reuse the findings and research was not in close geographic proximity to the proposed action; and

(ii) the head of the covered agency determines that the proposed action was similar in nature or decisions to the project.

SA 1646. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. Gardner (for himself, Mr. Manchin, Mr. Daines, Mr. Warner, Mr. Portman, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Alexander, Mr. King, Mr. Burr, Mr. Tester, Ms. Collins, Mr. Udall, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Schumer, Mr. Blunt, Ms. Harris, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Peters, Mr. Tillis, Ms. Baldwin, Ms. McSally, Mr. Casey, Mr. Graham, Mr. Heinrich, Mr. Bennet, Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Booker, Ms. Cortez Masto, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Wyden, Mr. Kaine, Ms. Sinema, Ms. Rosen, Mr. Coons, Ms. Smith, Ms. Hassan, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mr. Boxer, Mr. Duckworth, Ms. Shaheen, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Jones, Mr. Van Hollen, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Brown, Ms. Hirono, Ms. Warren, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Klobuchar, Ms. Duckworth, Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Leahy, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Markley, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Cramer, and Mr. Schatz) to the bill S. 982, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 2. CERTAIN REPORTS REQUIRED PRIOR TO ACQUISITION OF LAND USING AMOUNTS IN THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE, AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.

Section 200402 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(e) Reports Required Prior to Acquisition.—Before acquiring any land under this section, the Secretary of Agriculture, as applicable, shall submit—

(1) to Congress a report that describes the estimated cost to the Secretary or the Secretary of Agriculture, as applicable, of acquiring, administering, and maintaining the land; and

(2) to the State and unit of local government in which the land is located a report that provides an estimate of the property tax revenue that would be lost as a result of the acquisition by the Secretary or the Secretary of Agriculture, as applicable."
purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

"(e) State Approval Required Prior to Acquisition. — An interest in land or water may be acquired under this section only if the Secretary or the Secretary of Agriculture, as applicable, has received notice of intent, the head of the covered agency published a notice of intent described in clause (ii)(II), not later than 2 years after the date described in paragraph (1)(B)(ii)(II), the head of the covered agency shall, with respect to the proposed action—

(1) issue—

(aa) a finding that a categorical exclusion applies to the proposed action; or

(bb) a final NEPA compliance date; or

(cc) a categorical exclusion under title I of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

(ii) Period.—For purposes of clause (i), the NEPA process begins on the date on which the head of a covered agency receives an application for a proposed action from a project sponsor; and

(ii) ends on the date on which the head of the covered agency has complied with clause (ii) for that proposed action.

(b) Proposed Action.—The term ‘proposed action’ means a proposed action (within the meaning of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to which the permitting process is directed) which may be approved or disapproved.

(1) Definition.—In carrying out a proposed action, the head of a covered agency shall complete the NEPA process for a proposed action of the covered agency, as described in paragraph (1)(B)(ii)(II), not later than 2 years after the date described in paragraph (1)(B)(ii)(I).

(ii) Environmental Documents.—Within the period described in clause (i), not later than 1 year after the date described in paragraph (1)(B)(ii)(I), the head of the covered agency shall, with respect to the proposed action—

(1) issue—

(aa) a final NEPA compliance date, the head of the covered agency has complied with clause (ii) for that proposed action.

(bb) a categorical exclusion under title I of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

(ii) Period.—For purposes of clause (i), the NEPA process begins on the date on which the head of a covered agency receives an application for a proposed action from a project sponsor; and

(ii) ends on the date on which the head of the covered agency has complied with clause (ii) for that proposed action.

(b) Proposed Action.—The term ‘proposed action’ means a proposed action (within the meaning of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to which the permitting process is directed) which may be approved or disapproved.

(1) Definition.—In carrying out a proposed action, the head of a covered agency shall complete the NEPA process for a proposed action of the covered agency, as described in paragraph (1)(B)(ii)(I), not later than 2 years after the date described in paragraph (1)(B)(ii)(I).

(ii) Environmental Documents.—Within the period described in clause (i), not later than 1 year after the date described in paragraph (1)(B)(ii)(I), the head of the covered agency shall, with respect to the proposed action—

(1) issue—

(aa) a final NEPA compliance date, the head of the covered agency has complied with clause (ii) for that proposed action.

(bb) a categorical exclusion under title I of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

(ii) Period.—For purposes of clause (i), the NEPA process begins on the date on which the head of a covered agency receives an application for a proposed action from a project sponsor; and

(ii) ends on the date on which the head of the covered agency has complied with clause (ii) for that proposed action.

(b) Proposed Action.—The term ‘proposed action’ means a proposed action (within the meaning of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to which the permitting process is directed) which may be approved or disapproved.

(1) Definition.—In carrying out a proposed action, the head of a covered agency shall complete the NEPA process for a proposed action of the covered agency, as described in paragraph (1)(B)(ii)(I), not later than 2 years after the date described in paragraph (1)(B)(ii)(I).

(ii) Environmental Documents.—Within the period described in clause (i), not later than 1 year after the date described in paragraph (1)(B)(ii)(I), the head of the covered agency shall, with respect to the proposed action—

(1) issue—

(aa) a final NEPA compliance date, the head of the covered agency has complied with clause (ii) for that proposed action.

(bb) a categorical exclusion under title I of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

(ii) Period.—For purposes of clause (i), the NEPA process begins on the date on which the head of a covered agency receives an application for a proposed action from a project sponsor; and

(ii) ends on the date on which the head of the covered agency has complied with clause (ii) for that proposed action.
SA 1649. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. Harris, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. HARRIS, Ms. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENTNET, Ms. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAIN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKET, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 2. CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS.

Section 200402 of title 54, United States Code (as added by section 2(a)), is amended by adding at the end the following:

`(i) CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS.—

`(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

`(A) Environmental Assessment.—The term ‘environmental assessment’ has the meaning given the term in section 1508.9 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation).

`(B) Environmental Impact Statement.—The term ‘environmental impact statement’ means a detailed statement required under section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4322(2)(C)).

`(2) CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS.—

`(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and subject to subparagraph (B), in carrying out projects using amounts from the Fund, the head of a covered agency may, without further approval, use a categorical exclusion under title I of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) that has been approved by—

`(1)(I) another covered agency; and

`(II) the Council on Environmental Quality; or

`(ii) an Act of Congress.

`(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The head of a covered agency may use a categorical exclusion described in subparagraph (A) if the head of the covered agency—

`(1) carefully reviews the description of the proposed action to ensure that it fits within the category of actions described in the categorical exclusion; and

`(2) considers the circumstances associated with the proposed action to ensure that there are no extraordinary circumstances that warrant the preparation of an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement.

SA 1651. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. Harris, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKET, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 200402(b) of title 54, United States Code (as added by section 2(a)), strike paragraph (1) and insert the following:

`(1) SOURCE OF DEPOSITS.—

`(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31, 2020, the Secretary shall—

`(i) examine the most recent inventory of all federally owned public land, and the resources and other values of that land, maintained pursuant to section 203(a) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1711(a));

`(ii) of the public land included in the inventory described in clause (i), identify parcels with a cumulative value equal to not more than $12,000,000,000 that would be appropriate to sell, in accordance with section 203 of that Act (43 U.S.C. 1713); and

`(B) COOPERATION BY COVERED AGENCIES.—

`(i) examine the most recent inventory of all federally owned public land, and the resources and other values of that land, maintained pursuant to section 203(a) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1711(a));

`(ii) of the public land included in the inventory described in clause (i), identify parcels with a cumulative value equal to not more than $12,000,000,000 that would be appropriate to sell, in accordance with section 203 of that Act (43 U.S.C. 1713); and

`(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The head of a covered agency may use a categorical exclusion described in subparagraph (A) if the head of the covered agency—

`(1) carefully reviews the description of the proposed action to ensure that it fits within the category of actions described in the categorical exclusion; and

`(2) considers the circumstances associated with the proposed action to ensure that there are no extraordinary circumstances that warrant the preparation of an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement.
“(I) the Fund shall consist only of the net proceeds deposited in the Fund pursuant to clause (i); and

“(II) no amounts other than the amounts referred to in clause (I) may be deposited in the Fund.

In section 20402(c) of title 54, United States Code (as added by section 2(a)), strike “subject to the condition that the sales shall be”—

“(aa) conducted as soon as practicable during each scheduled fiscal year to allow for appropriate planning in expending amounts in the Fund;” and

“(bb) conducted through—

“(AA) public auction; or

“(BB) closed-bid auction; and

“(cc) to the maximum extent practicable, projected to generate total proceeds equal to not less than $1,900,000,000 during each of fiscal years 2021 and 2022.”

“(B) cooperation by agencies.—

The head of each covered agency shall sell each parcel of public land identified by the Secretary under subparagraph (A)(I) that is under the jurisdiction of the covered agency, in accordance with the schedule published by the Secretary under subparagraph (A)(II).”

“(C) deposit in fund.—

“(I) in general.—The net proceeds from each sale of public land pursuant to this paragraph deposited in the Fund pursuant to clause (i); and

“(II) no amounts other than the amounts referred to in clause (I) may be deposited in the Fund.

SA 1652. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. Kaine, Ms. SINEIMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBuchar, Ms. SMITH, Ms. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 20402(c) of title 54, United States Code (as added by section 2(a)), strike paragraph (1) and insert the following:

“(1) SOURCE OF DEPOSITS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The net proceeds from each sale of public land pursuant to this paragraph deposited in the Fund pursuant to clause (i); and

“(B) TREATMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Fund shall consist only of the net proceeds deposited in the Fund pursuant to clause (i); and

“(C) DEPOSIT IN FUND.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The net proceeds from each sale of public land pursuant to this paragraph deposited in the Fund pursuant to clause (i); and

“(II) no amounts other than the amounts referred to in clause (I) may be deposited in the Fund.

SA 1653. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1657 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. Kaine, Ms. SINEIMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBuchar, Ms. DUCKworth, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 3, strike line 22 and all that follows through page 5, line 5, and insert the following:

“(b) Deposits.—The Fund shall consist of such amounts as are deposited in the Fund under section 20303(b), and

On page 8, lines 20 and 21, strike “Until the date on which all of the amounts in the Fund are expended, the” and insert “The”.

On page 14, after the matter following line 16, add the following:

(d) Allocation of Funds.—Section 20303(b) of title 54, United States Code, is amended—

“(1) in paragraph (1)—

“(A) by striking “40 percent” and inserting “35 percent”; and

“(B) by striking “and” at the end;

“(2) in paragraph (2)—

“(A) by striking “40 percent” and inserting “35 percent”; and

“(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

“(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) not less than 15 percent shall be deposited into the National Land Legacy Restoration Fund established by section 20402(a).”
SA 1656. Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. Johnson) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. Gardner (for himself, Mr. Manchin, Mr. Daines, Mr. Warner, Mr. Portman, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Alexander, Mr. Burr, Mr. Tester, Ms. Collins, Mr. Udall, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Schumer, Mr. Blunt, Ms. Harris, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Peters, Mr. Tillis, Ms. Baldwin, Ms. McSally, Mr. Casey, Mr. Graham, Mr. Heinrich, Mr. Bennet, Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Booker, Ms. Cortez Masto, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Wyden, Mr. Kaine, Ms. Sinema, Ms. Rosen, Mr. Coons, Ms. Smith, Ms. Hassan, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mrs. Durbin, Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Jones, Mr. Van Hollen, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Brown, Ms. Hirono, Ms. Warren, Mr. Murphy, Ms. Klobuchar, Ms. Duckworth, Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Leahy, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Markley, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Purdue, Mr. Crapo, and Mr. Schatz) to the bill H.R. 1597, 116th Congress, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 3 of the amendment, strike line 22 and all that follows through page 5, line 5, and insert the following:

"(b) FUNDING.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Fund shall consist of such amounts as are 

"(A) appropriated to the Fund pursuant to section 200303(d); and 

"(B) transferred to the Fund pursuant to section 200310(c).

"(2) DISABILITY.—Amounts in the Fund shall remain available until expended. On page 11 of the amendment, between lines 17 and 18 of page 11, insert the following:

(d) TRANSFERS TO NATIONAL PARKS AND PUBLIC LAND LEGACY RESTORATION FUND.—

1. IN GENERAL.—Section 200310 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(c) Transfers to National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund.—

For each fiscal year in which a Federal land-holding agency has a deferred maintenance backlog in excess of $2,000,000,000, if discretionary appropriations (as defined in section 250(c)) of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act of 1997 (16 U.S.C. 1050(d)) are made available for the acquisition of land, on an interest in land or water under section 200303(a)(2) during the preceding fiscal year (referred to in this subsection as the 'transfer amount')—

"(1) made available from the Fund under section 200303(a) for the applicable fiscal year for the acquisition of land, water, or an interest in land or water under section 200303(a)(2) shall be reduced by the transfer amount; and 

"(2) there shall be transferred from the Fund to the National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund for the applicable fiscal year an amount equal to the transfer amount."

SA 1657. Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. Inhofe) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. Gardner (for himself, Mr. Manchin, Mr. Daines, Mr. Warner, Mr. Portman, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Alexander, Mr. King, Mr. Burr, Mr. Tester, Ms. Collins, Mr. Paul, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Blunt, Ms. Harris, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Peters, Mr. Tillis, Ms. Baldwin, Ms. McSally, Mr. Casey, Mr. Graham, Mr. Heinrich, Ms. Bennett, Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Booker, Ms. Cortez Masto, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Wyden, Mr. Kaine, Ms. Sinema, Ms. Rosen, Mr. Coons, Ms. Smith, Ms. Hassan, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mrs. Durbin, Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Jones, Mr. Van Hollen, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Brown, Ms. Hirono, Ms. Warren, Mr. Murphy, Ms. Klobuchar, Ms. Duckworth, Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Leahy, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Markley, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Purdue, Mr. Crapo, and Mr. Schatz) to the bill H.R. 1597, 116th Congress, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 3, add the following:

(d) SUNSET.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective on the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, subsections (a), (b), and (c) and the amendments made by those subsections are repealed.

(2) APPLICATION.—Effective on the date described in paragraph (1), chapter 2003 of title 54, United States Code, shall be applied and administered as if subsections (a), (b), and (c) and the amendments made by those subsections had not been enacted.

SA 1659. Ms. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms. Collins) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1597, 116th Congress, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 2. LIMITATION REGARDING CERTAIN INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.

(a) DEFINITION OF AFFECTED PROJECT.—In this section, the term 'affected project' means an infrastructure project or proposed infrastructure project any phase of which requires the issuance by a Federal department or agency of an order or a permit, or as a condition of, which a measure of environmental mitigation may be required.

(b) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in any case in which Federal land suitable for environmental mitigation is located within a 100-mile radius of an affected project, no Federal department or agency may require a sponsor of the affected project to acquire, or otherwise pay for the use of, private land to offset the environmental impacts of the affected project.

SA 1658. Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. Risch, and Mr. Inhofe) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. Gardner (for himself, Mr. Manchin, Mr. Daines, Mr. Warner, Mr. Portman, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Alexander, Mr. King, Mr. Burr, Mr. Tester, Ms. Collins, Mr. Paul, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Blunt, Ms. Harris, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Peters, Mr. Tillis, Ms. Baldwin, Ms. McSally, Mr. Casey, Mr. Graham, Mr. Heinrich, Mr. Bennett, Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Booker, Ms. Cortez Masto, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Wyden, Mr. Kaine, Ms. Sinema, Ms. Rosen, Mr. Coons, Ms. Smith, Ms. Hassan, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mrs. Murray, Mr. Durbin, Ms. Shaheen, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Jones, Mr. Van Hollen, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Brown, Ms. Hirono, Ms. Warren, Mr. Murphy, Ms. Klobuchar, Ms. Duckworth, Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Leahy, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Markley, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Cramer, and Mr. Schatz) to the bill H.R. 1597, 116th Congress, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, I have 4 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the majority and minority leaders.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, I have 4 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the majority and minority leaders.

Mr. President. Without objection, the Senate stands adjourned.
The Committee on Armed Services

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 393, S. 149.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 149) to establish a Senior Scams Prevention Advisory Council.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Stop Senior Scams Act".

SEC. 2. SENIOR SCAMS PREVENTION ADVISORY GROUP.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a Senior Scams Prevention Advisory Group (referred to in this Act as the "Advisory Group").

(b) MEMBERS.—The Advisory Group shall be composed of stakeholders such as the following individuals or the designees of those individuals:

(1) The Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission.

(2) The Secretary of the Treasury.

(3) The Attorney General.

(4) The Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

(5) Representatives from each of the following sectors, including trade associations, to be selected by Federal Trade Commission:

(A) Retail.

(B) Gift cards.

(C) Telecommunications.

(D) Wire-transfer services.

(E) Senior peer advocates.

(F) Consumer advocacy organizations with efforts focused on preventing seniors from becoming the victims of scams.

(G) Financial services, including institutions that engage in digital currency.

(H) A member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.


(J) The Director of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network.

(K) Any other Federal, State, or local agency, industry representative, consumer advocate, or entity, as determined by the Federal Trade Commission.

(c) NO COMPENSATION FOR MEMBERS.—A member of the Advisory Group shall serve without compensation in addition to any compensation received for the service of the member as an officer or employee of the United States, if applicable.

(d) DUTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Advisory Group shall—

(A) collect information on the existence, use, and success of educational materials and programs for retailers, financial services, and wire-transfer companies, which—

(i) may be used as a guide to educate employees on how to identify and prevent scams that affect seniors; and

(ii) include—

(I) useful information for retailers, financial services, and wire-transfer companies for the purpose described in clause (i);

(II) training for employees on ways to identify and prevent scams; and

(III) best practices for keeping employees up to date on current scams;

(B) based on the findings in subparagraph (A)—

(i) identify inadequacies, omissions, or deficiencies in those educational materials and programs for the categories listed in subparagraph (A) and their execution in reaching employees to protect older adults; and

(ii) create model materials, best practices guidance, or recommendations to fill those inadequacies, omissions, or deficiencies that may be used by industry and others to help protect older adults from scams.

(2) ENCOURAGED USE.—The Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission shall—

(A) make the materials or guidance created by the Federal Trade Commission described in paragraph (1) publicly available; and

(B) encourage the use and distribution of the materials created under this subsection to prevent scams affecting seniors by governmental agencies and the private sector.

(3) REPORTS.—Section 101(c)(2) of the Elder Abuse Prevention and Prosecution Act (34 U.S.C. 2111(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting ";"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(E) the Federal Trade Commission, in relevant years, information on—

(i) the newly created materials, guidance, or recommendations of the Senior Scams Prevention Advisory Group established under section 2 of the Stop Senior Scams Act, and any relevant views or considerations made by members of the Advisory Group that were not included in the Advisory Group’s model materials or considered an official recommendation by the Advisory Group;

(ii) the Senior Scams Prevention Advisory Group’s findings about senior scams and industry educational materials and programs; and

(iii) any other considerations on ways stakeholders can continue to work together to reduce scams affecting seniors.

(f) TERMINATION.—This Act and the amendments made by this Act, cease to be effective on the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 149), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AMENDING THE SERVICEMEMBERS CIVIL RELIEF ACT TO EXTEND LEASE PROTECTIONS FOR SERVICEMEMBERS UNDER STOP MOVEMENT ORDERS IN RESPONSE TO A LOCAL, NATIONAL, OR GLOBAL EMERGENCY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 3637 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3637) to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to extend lease protections for servicemembers under stop movement orders in response to a local, national, or global emergency, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I 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.

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

The bill (S. 3637) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 3637

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF LEASE PROTECTIONS FOR SERVICEMEMBERS UNDER STOP MOVEMENT ORDERS IN RESPONSE TO LOCAL, NATIONAL, OR GLOBAL EMERGENCY.

(a) TERMINATION.—Subsection (a)(1) of section 305 of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (30 U.S.C. 3955) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking "or" and inserting a semicolon; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; or".

(b) COVERED LEASES.—

(1) The date of the lessee’s stop movement order described in paragraph (1)(C) or (2)(C) of subsection (b), as the case may be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee reported an amendment to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee reported an amendment to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is in order.

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

The amendment was agreed to.
ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 2020

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, June 11; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired; the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day and that morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of Calendar No. 75, H.R. 1957.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:35 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, June 11, 2020, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 10, 2020:

FOREIGN SERVICE


DISCHARGED NOMINATIONS

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations was discharged from further consideration of the following nominations by unanimous consent and the nominations were confirmed: