



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2020

No. 107

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

### 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.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

### THE FIRST AMENDMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, yesterday, I explained that we cannot

let the First Amendment become another casualty of this troubled moment. No matter how charged the issue, peaceful protests must be protected, from suppression by governments or hijackings by violent mobs. In the United States of America, people get to protest.

In our country, people also get to worship. As I explained yesterday, local officials cannot selectively enforce health restrictions to privilege some First Amendment gatherings over others. If mayors are posing for photographs in massive demonstrations, there is no reason why small, careful church services should stay banned.

These are formal constitutional questions, but our American culture of free expression and open debate is not only threatened from the top down by the government, it can also dry up from beneath.

If we are to maintain the civic discourse that has made us great, American citizens and American institutions need to want it. In the last several years, the New York Times has published op-eds from Vladimir Putin, the foreign minister of Iran, and a leader of the Muslim Brotherhood. They have published an essay arguing for greater normalization of pedophilia. As far as I know, none of those decisions occasioned public revolts from the paper's staff, hand-wringing apologies from the editors, or an overhaul of the masthead. Presumably, it was understood that pushing the envelope and airing disagreements are necessary in a free market of ideas.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S2839

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 Trump should use Federal 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 the mob. In Chicago, we have since learned, even Democratic aldermen were literally crying and pleading with their Democratic mayor to do something, they said. So a U.S. Senator wrote about it.

Immediately, his idea was met with strong criticism. Now, that ought to be par for the course. In a free and open society, speech begets speech. Arguments beget counterarguments. We discuss and debate as fellow citizens. But that is not quite what happened. Instead of trying to win the argument, the far left tried to end the discussion.

By now, we all know the routine. We have seen this movie before. Rather than actually rebut speech, the far left tried to silence the speaker with a mixture of misrepresentations, sanctimonious moralizing, and bizarre, emotional word salads that nobody else could have standing to question. This silencing tactic has escaped from the ivory tower and is spreading throughout American life. This sounds like Mad Libs mixture between a therapy session and a university's H.R. department.

So, sure enough, instead of attempting to defeat Senator COTTON's ideas, the left set out to ban him from polite society. Some New York Times employees flooded social media to claim their bosses have risked reporters' physical safety with the Senator's scary words. Outside leftists blasted the paper for airing the argument. The Times itself began lying about what Senator COTTON had said. The paper's own Twitter account has claimed he had called for a crackdown on peaceful protests, when he specifically distinguished them from violent rioters.

One of the Times' own opinion writers devoted her own column the next day to calling his view "fascist" and proclaiming him outside "the bounds of legitimate debate."

Remember, this is a sitting Senator discussing a proposition that had the majority of support from the American people, discussing a power that Congress gave to Presidents 213 years ago and which Presidents in the past have exercised.

Oh, but the facts couldn't hold a candle to the hurt feelings. The New York Times erred grievously by making people confront a different viewpoint. They had hurt their feelings by making them confront a different viewpoint. They had to atone. So when the dust settled, a top opinion editor was gone. His deputy was reassigned. The piece was pulled out of the print edition, and a wandering multiparagraph apology now precedes it online. We are talking the New York Times. I understand the new editor has made it clear that staff should notify her immediately if any published opinion makes them uncomfortable—if any published opinion makes them uncomfortable?

One of our Nation's most storied newspapers just had its intellectual independence challenged by an angry mob, and they folded like a house of cards. A jury of people on Twitter indicted them as accessories to a thought crime, and instead of telling them to go take a hike, the paper pleaded guilty and begged for mercy. Their readers' comfortable bubble was re-inflated. 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 professions of outrage or the use of magic words like "problematic." His only bosses are 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 America 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 watching major universities slowly exchange debate for uniformity and rigor for psychological comfort. Now, we see the free press repeating that error.

Let's hope we look back on this as a silly anomaly and not a sad turning point for our democracy.

#### 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 treasured in every State of our Union by the hunters and anglers who look forward to the morning stillness of the Black Hills and the Big

South Fork of the Cumberland, by the hikers who camp and plot weekend escapes in Shenandoah and Joshua Tree, by the school groups and researchers who connect with history at Gettysburg and Mesa Verde.

Every year, hundreds of millions of our people—our fellow Americans and visitors from around the world—share the gift of our Nation's public lands. Even more Americans in surrounding communities benefit from the jobs and the prosperity that are supported by tourism and recreation.

This country's public lands comprise a tremendously diverse array of landscapes, wildlife, historic sites, and natural resources. They are spread out across 419 parks, 568 refuges, and hundreds of millions of acres of managed space.

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. It is the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which this legislation will give permanent support, that makes them accessible for generations to come.

Today, 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 one of my colleagues is equally proud of similar efforts in their own States. This bill advances a noble cause that has added benefit of being a sound investment.

According to one recent analysis, every dollar spent through the Land and Water Conservation Fund turns out \$4 in economic benefit. Every \$1 million directed toward the LWCF in

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. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 entire Floyd family 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 misconduct 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 police departments have had large input into the bill.

We need action on the Justice in Policing Act as soon as possible, and we Democrats in the Senate will 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 worry that is what our Republican colleagues intend to do. We need a strong bill. The Justice in Policing Act is where we should begin.

The Senate is a collaborative institution, at least by design, but there is one person alone who decides 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 Senate Republicans 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 at 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 Black Americans. Communities of color have less access to quality healthcare, greater food insecurity, greater percentages of poverty, and a disproportionate number of our front-line essential workers—41.2 percent—are African American and Latino. Yet you are starting to hear my friends on the other side strum sunny chords because 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 horrible 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 the Republican caucus not to expect another relief bill until late July at the earliest—late July at the earliest, 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—Justin 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 regressiveness—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 2016 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 Putin interfered in our democracy. 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. If 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 about what they are 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 contradictory 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 one. We seem, in Trump land, in the Trump world, to live in a world of conspiracy theories. Some crazy, discredited, rightwing blogger—sometimes with Russian information—tweets or writes something, and then President Trump goes right ahead and tweets 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—but yesterday 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 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 slander a 75-year-old protester recovering in a hospital? This is the President of the United States, you have to remind yourself from time to time. This is what the President of the United States is doing—acting like a little 12-year-old schoolyard bully.

Apparently, the conspiracy theory the President repeated on Twitter was originally posted on an anonymous blog and then amplified by a reporter who used to work for a Russian state media organization.

It feels like it shouldn't need to be said, but it has to be in a democracy where we believe in facts and truth: The President has an obligation to check out information before giving a platform to crazy conspiracy theories. He is the President, not just some guy. He can't shrug his shoulders and say: Hey, I am just asking questions. He has access to national intelligence.

I call on the President to apologize. I don't expect he will. He never does. So I will just say to my Republican colleagues: You know how wrong his behavior is. You know it. Say so. Say so. Say something. How much do you let this President get away with? How long will you grimace inside or whisper to each other how crazy he is but not say a thing? You, my Republican Senate colleagues, may be the one check left on this President. Where are you? Where are you?

I applaud the few Republicans who have spoken out, but just far too many

have danced the familiar “hear no evil, see no evil” routine. Leader McCONNELL was directly asked and couldn't conjure a word of criticism for the President.

If Republicans can't call out the President on this instance, then what the heck are they doing here? If we can't do legislation on the floor, even during one of the greatest national crises this country has faced, then what the heck are our Republican friends doing here?

On COVID, on police reform, and all too often when the time comes to place a check on the President, the Republican majority is simply missing in action.

#### GEORGIA PRIMARY

Madam President, one final word on the Georgia primary—yesterday, the State of Georgia held its primary election. Across numerous counties and dozens of polling locations, Georgians waited 3, 4, and in some cases up to 7 hours to cast a ballot. I saw the pictures of the long lines. Numerous polling places failed to open on time; new voting machines may have malfunctioned. Most disgracefully, many of the problems we saw yesterday occurred in precincts with high populations of people of color.

Of course, in past years, the Voting Rights Act would have empowered the Federal Government to oversee and approve the changes that the State of Georgia made to its election process—changes that may well have caused this election disaster. But the Roberts Court, in one of the most misguided decisions in recent Supreme Court history, gutted the Voting Rights Act in the Shelby County decision and opened the door for the confusion we saw yesterday.

The idea that seems to be in the Court's mind—at least the majority of the Court—that the need for section 5 preclearance had passed is clearly refuted by what happened in Georgia yesterday. We have legislation passed by the House that would fix this problem and protect voters against racial discrimination and disenfranchisement, but it has been gathering dust here in the Senate, condemned to Leader McCONNELL's all too full legislative graveyard. Once again—once again—the Republican majority is missing in action, and this time it is on voting rights.

The right to vote in a free and fair election is sacrosanct in this country. Yesterday, Georgia failed miserably for the second election in a row. There ought to be an immediate investigation, and the errors ought to be corrected before the general election. The Senate should take up H.R. 4 and at the very least deliver the necessary resources to election officials in the next COVID relief bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip is recognized.

#### HEALTHCARE

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, one of the things that we have really seen

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 don't have to think too much 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. In fact, there is a good chance you will have a choice—a wide range of choices for cardiologists. If you have a heart attack, you know you are in reach of at least one hospital and maybe 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 are essential to 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 from 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 of all types 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 2032. 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 convenience 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.

I 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 Secretary of Health and Human 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 we 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. Access to on-demand support from providers equipped to treat seniors would enable a nursing home's on-site staff to immediately address a patient's needs without waiting for emergency room transport or for a doctor to arrive. As a result, patients would be more likely to receive early intervention and avoid hospital visits, which can pose significant risk to the elderly, especially, of course, during the current pandemic.

Reducing the costs that come from untreated medical complications or expensive emergency room visits would also be a win for taxpayers and for the Medicare Program. One healthcare provider in my home State of South Dakota conducted a telehealth pilot program to provide specialized care to nursing home patients and ended up saving Medicare more than \$342 per beneficiary per month. That is a sig-

nificant savings. It is a savings that came from providing nursing home patients with better and faster care.

One of the many reasons I push so hard to expand access to high-speed internet in rural areas and to ensure that rural communities have access to 5G is because of the opportunities this provides for the expanded use of telehealth, which translates into greater access to care for rural Americans.

I will continue to do everything 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.

DACA

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 America affect 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 country for at least 2 years and to remain in a reserve, if needed, for medical emergency. What would they receive in return? Forgiveness of the cost of their medical education.

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? Some have even more. Imagine if those 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?

When 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 Illinois Dental Society. I have seen it. It is remarkable, and my hat is off to the dental society and the dentists who 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 protected by DACA, 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 this country going to our schools, 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 have no legal right 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 introduced 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 of the United States—then 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 pay a substantial filing fee, go through a criminal background check, and be given, for 2 years, the—be spared of any threat of deportation and be given the right to legally 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 minutes 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 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 next week or in the 2 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 healthcare services in this pandemic that we are facing as a nation, 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 serv-

ices 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—Mariana Galati. This is her photograph. 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, or purpose, or chance of a better life. The fear with DACA is that it can go away—an expiration date approaching that means that I would 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 health hero. She is putting herself and her family at risk to save American lives. She shouldn't have to worry about whether she is going to be deported next week.

We can do better for Mariana and for thousands of other DACA recipients just like her. They are counting on those of us who serve in the Senate to solve this crisis that President Trump created.

I cannot imagine, as I tell the 122nd story of a Dreamer on the floor of the Senate, that anyone listening believes we would be a better country if Mariana were deported. That is the option that the President has created. He has

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 be elected 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 from medical assistant 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 issue 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 ever will 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.

H.R. 1957

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 building back up after COVID-19 is going to be enormously challenging. So the Senate ought to be looking at every good idea that can help get these rural economies moving again.

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 because with this program you focus 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 MERKLEY, and Senator RISCH—trying to help secure two economic lifelines for the rural communities of the Northwest and for much of our Nation. I am talking about Secure Rural Schools and Payments in Lieu of Taxes Programs. They are known as SRS 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—a number of years ago—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.

But after a while, Secure Rural Schools got caught up in the knock-down, 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.

I remember one year that to keep the Secure Rural Schools Program up, the distinguished Senator from Alaska, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and I were involved in selling off the helium reserves. That gave us some money—some key money—for the Secure Rural Schools Program in the West. I remember when we sold off the helium 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 a lot of hot air.

The point is, we have got to end that cycle, that boom-and-bust cycle, instead 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, which would establish a 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. You have 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.

The 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 make sure that counties have 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 support.

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 ought to cut the unemployment benefits in half, but it is fine to 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 have conversations with folks 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 got 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 rural roads and 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.

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. WHITEHOUSE. 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. 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, per capita, coastal States just got 40 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 Commerce 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 where beaches are 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' Flood and Coastal Storm Damage 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: \$19 to 1 coastal dollar was 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 dire warnings of coastal property value crash. Freddie Mac, which is not an environmental group, has estimated that somewhere between \$238 and \$507 billion worth of coastal real estate will be gone, below sea level, by 2100. Freddie Mac warns about 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 \$15 billion hit due to sea level rise. The Providence Journal, using First Street and Columbia University 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 Rhode Island 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 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 not only 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 beaches due to toxic algae as the oceans there warm. 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 swathes 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 flood in the 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 sea levels, 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 Union of Concerned Scientists: "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 public lands 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 partisan 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 and its upland bias intact. It separately provides coastal revenues dedicated from offshore wind and renewable energy de-

velopment 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, unlike offshore oil and gas energy revenues, which go in significant part both to Gulf Coast States 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 coasts. There should be a 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 nothing added for coasts, and 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 help to make a dent—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 most recent purchases 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 lead on 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.

There are some who believe this 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 to take 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 and reaffirmed by this Congress in the permanent authorization in the John Dingell Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act by a vote of 92 to 8—to make sure those funds would not get diverted and to stop funds from being syphoned off and instead go to what they 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 new. This is 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, indeed, 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 \$28 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 emptied. This bill will create over 100,000 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 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 protect our environment, to catch up on deferred maintenance, but also to grow our economy when our economy needs the growth.

After spending the last several months in the great indoors, it is time to get out to the great outdoors, and this bill accomplishes both of those goals.

It is historic in another way. We received support from over 850 groups

across the country representing significant spectrums of purposes and ideologies, from sportsmen, to The Nature Conservancy, to all the groups who touted this effort. This is a list of over 850 groups strongly supporting this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter from these 850-plus organizations be printed in the RECORD.

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

[May 11, 2020]

#### SUPPORT FOR THE GREAT AMERICAN OUTDOORS ACT

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL, SPEAKER PELOSI, MINORITY LEADER SCHUMER, AND MINORITY LEADER MCCARTHY: Our organizations, and the members we represent, strongly support passage and subsequent enactment of the Great American Outdoors Act (S. 3422) as quickly as possible. This bill is necessary to support the public lands we all rely upon by achieving the twin goals of protecting America's special places and repairing deteriorating infrastructure. We urge you to vote in favor of this crucial legislation and to oppose any amendments to it.

The bill will help address priority 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 dedicate \$900 million per year already being deposited into the Land and Water Conservation Fund, our nation's most important conservation program, to ensure protection of and access to irreplaceable lands and local recreation opportunities.

This legislation was introduced on March 9 and has the strong bipartisan support of a majority of the Senate. It is consistent with legislation supported by a surpassing bipartisan majority in the House, and the President has specifically requested this bill for his signature, creating an unprecedented opportunity for a historic win for the American public and the places they care about.

The Great American Outdoors Act 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 the outdoors for hundreds of millions of people every year and habitat for some of our country's most iconic wildlife. These treasured places also tell the stories that define and unite us as a nation. Funds provided in this bill will secure these vital resources while preserving water quantity and quality, sustaining working landscapes and rural economies, increasing access for recreation for all Americans no matter where they live, and fueling the juggernaut of our outdoor economy.

In 2018, over 318 million national park visits led to \$20.2 billion in direct spending at hotels, restaurants, outfitters, and other amenities in gateway communities, supporting over 329,000 jobs and generating over \$40.1 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, and 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,

#### NATIONAL

American Battlefield Trust; American Conservation Coalition; American Endurance Ride Conference; American Forests; American Hiking Society; American Horse Council; American Littoral Society; American Mountain Guides Association; American Rivers; American Society of Civil Engineers; American Sportfishing Association; American Trails; American Woodcock Society; Appalachian Mountain Club; Appalachian Trail Conservancy; Archery Trade Association; Audubon Naturalist Society; Back Country Horsemen of America; Backcountry Hunters & Anglers; Bonefish & Tarpon Trust; Boone and Crockett Club; City Parks Alliance; Clean Water Action; Cliff Garten and Associates Inc.; Coalition for American Heritage; Coalition to Protect America's National Parks; Coalitions & Collaboratives.

Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation; Continental Divide Trail Coalition; Defenders of Wildlife; Diving Equipment & Marketing Association; Docomomo US; Environment America; Fly Fishers International; GreenLatinos; Heart of the Rockies Initiative; HECHO (Hispanics enjoying Camping Hunting and the Outdoors); Hipcamp; Hispanic Access Foundation; Hispanic Federation; Izaak Walton League of America; Just Get Outdoors; Land Trust Alliance; League of Conservation Voters; Marine Retailers Association of the Americas; Moonshot Missions; Motorcycle Industry Council; National Association of RV Parks and Campgrounds; National Coast Trail Association; National Deer Alliance; National Forest Recreation Association; National Marine Manufacturers Association; National Park Foundation; National Park Hospitality Association.

National Parks Conservation Association; National Recreation and Park Association; National Shooting Sports Foundation; National Trust for Historic Preservation; National Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route Association; National Wildlife Federation; National Wildlife Refuge Association; Natural Gear Camouflage; Natural Resources Defense Council; Outdoor Alliance; Outdoor Industry Association; Outdoor Recreation Roundtable; Pacific Crest Trail Association; Partnership for the National Trails System; Patagonia; PeopleForBikes; Piragis Northwoods Co; Public Lands Alliance; Quality Deer Management Association; Recreational Off-Highway Vehicle Association; REI Co-op; Ruffed Grouse Society; RV Industry Association; Scenic America; Sierra Club; Society of Outdoor Recreation Professionals; Specialty Equipment Marketing Association.

Specialty Vehicle Institute of America; Student Conservation Association; Surfrider Foundation; The Archaeological Conservancy; The Brice Institute; The Conservation Alliance; The Conservation Fund; The Corps Network; The Cougar Fund; The Evangelical Environmental Network; The Garden Club of America, Inc.; The Lyme Timber Company; The Nature Conservancy; The Pew Charitable Trusts; The Trumpeter Swan Society; The Trust for Public Land; The Trust for the National Mall; The Wilderness Land Trust; The Wilderness Society; The Wildlife Society; Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership; United States Tour Operators Association; UrbanPromise Ministries; US Water Alliance; Wildlands Network; Winter Wildlands Alliance.

#### REGIONAL

Accokeek Foundation; American Farmland Trust—Pacific Northwest; Assateague Coast-

al Trust; Blue Mountain Land Trust; Chesapeake Conservancy; Damascus Citizens For Sustainability; Eastern PA Coalition for Abandoned Mine; Reclamation; Great Divide Pictures; Great Smoky Mountains Association; Kaniksu Land Trust; MassConn Sustainable Forest Partnership; Montana Conservation Corps; Natchez Trace Parkway Association; National Bobwhite Conservation Initiative; New England Forestry Foundation; Nez Perce Trail Foundation; Northeastern Minnesotans for Wilderness; Northern Forest Center; Northwest Youth Corps; Northwoods Alliance Inc.; Nuestra Tierra Conservation Project; Old Spanish Trail Association.

Opacum Land Trust; Open Space Institute; Openlands; Partners in Forestry Coop; Partnership for the Delaware Estuary; Potomac Chapter, American Society of Landscape Architects; Potomac Riverkeeper Network; Potomac Valley Audubon Society; Rock Creek Conservancy; San Juan Citizens Alliance; Santa Fe Trail Assoc; Singletrack Trails Inc.; Southeast Tourism Society; Southeastern Climbers Coalition; Southern Appalachian Highlands Conservancy; Sustainable Northwest; The Anza Trail Foundation; The Lands Council; The Mountain Pact; Upper Saco Valley Land Trust; Western National Parks Association; Western Rivers Conservancy; Wild Salmon Center.

#### STATE AND LOCAL

10,000 Friends of Pennsylvania; 15 Minute Field Trips; 1785 Inn; 350 Maine; 508 Main St; A Walk in the Woods; AdventureKEEN; Adventures on the Gorge; Ala Kahakai Trail Association; Alachua Conservation Trust; Alamosa Convention & Visitors Bureau; Alaska Alpine Adventures, LLC; Alaska State Parks; Alaska Trails; Alice Austen House; Alice Ferguson Foundation; All Good; Allegheny-Blue Ridge Alliance; Alliance for the Shenandoah Valley; Amazing Earthfest; American Anthropological Association; American Society of Landscape Architects; American Society of Landscape Architects—Prairie Gateway Chapter; American Society of Landscape Architects—Alabama Chapter; American Society of Landscape Architects—Kentucky Chapter; Anacostia Watershed Society; Andy Laub Films.

Angler Action Foundation; Animaashi Sailing Company; Anza-Borrego Foundation; Aquanauts Adaptive Aquatics, Inc.; Aquashicola/Pohopoco Watershed Conservancy; Arboretum Foundation; Archaeological Society of New Jersey; Archaeology Southwest; Arizona Heritage Alliance; Arizona Land and Water Trust; Arizona Trail Association; Arkansas Hospitality Association; Arkansas Wildlife Federation; Arroyos and Foothills Conservancy; Asheville Area Chamber of Commerce; Ashford Conservation Commission; Aspen Valley Land Trust; Atlantic Salmon Federation; Audubon Everglades; Audubon Society of Rhode Island; Audubon South Carolina; Back Country Horsemen of Colorado; Back Country Horsemen of Uwharrie, NC; Backcountry Horsemen of California; Baltimore Tree Trust; Bar Harbor Chamber of Commerce; Bass Anglers Sportsman Society (B.A.S.S.); Bay Area Ridge Trail Council; Bay County Conservancy, Inc.; Bayou Land Conservancy; Bear Warriors United; Bicycle Coalition of Maine.

Big Hole River Foundation; Big Sur Land Trust; Big Thicket Natural Heritage Trust; Bighorn River Alliance; Bird Conservation Fund; Blowing Rock Chamber of Commerce; Blue Bike Burrito; Blue Goose Alliance; Blue Ridge Conservancy; Blue Scholars Initiative; Blue Water Baltimore; Bold Archery Design; Boone Area Chamber of Commerce; Boston Harbor Now; Boulder County; Boulder County Parks & Open Space; Bowling Green Area Convention and Visitor Bureau; Brandywine

Conservancy; Bryson City Outdoors Inc.; Bucks County Audubon Society; Building Bridges Across the River; Burney Chamber of Commerce.

Business for Montana's Outdoors; California Habitat Conservation Planning Coalition; California League of Conservation Voters; California Mountain Biking Alliance; California Native Plant Society; California Waterfowl Association; California Wilderness Coalition; Californians for Western Wilderness; Camp Denali; Cape Coral Friends of Wildlife; Capital Region Land Conservancy; Carefree of Colorado; Catawba Lands Conservancy; Catawba Lands Conservancy and Carolina Thread Trail; Catskill Center for Conservation and Development, Inc.; Central Arizona Land Trust; Charleston Audubon; Charlevoix Main Street DDA; Chattahoochee Parks Conservancy; Chelan-Douglas Land Trust; Cherry Republic; Chesapeake Legal Alliance; Chesapeake Wildlife Heritage; Chesterfield Chamber of Commerce; Chicago Neighborhood Initiatives; Chickasaw Nation.

Chispa Arizona; Chuck Robbins Chapter 656 of Trout Unlimited; Citizens for Pennsylvania's Future (PennFuture); Citizens For Water; Citizens United to Protect the Maurice River; City of Michigan City Indiana Department of Parks and Recreation; City of Roseburg; Clean Ocean Access; Coalition of Oregon Land Trusts; College Republicans at Belmont University; Collette Travel; Colorado Mountain Club; Colorado Youth Corps Association; Columbia Land Trust; Community Training Works Inc.; Concerned Off-Road Bicyclists Association; Concrete Safaris Inc.; Congaree Land Trust; Connecticut Audubon Society; Connecticut Forest & Park Association; Connecticut Land Conservation Council; Connecticut Ornithology Association; Conservancy for Cuyahoga Valley National Park; Conservation Alabama; Conservation Council For Hawaii; Conservation Legacy; Conservation Minnesota; Conservation Northwest; Conservation Trust for NC; Conservation Voters of South Carolina; Conserving Carolina; Contour Design Studio LLC.

Cornerstone Studios; Cowboy Trail Rides; Cradle of Texas Conservancy, Inc.; Cycle for One Planet; Cypress Chapter, Izaak Walton League; Dade Heritage Trust, Inc.; Dana Bronfman LLC; Darby Communications; Davidson Lands Conservancy; Delaware Center for the Inland Bays; Delaware Electric Vehicle Association (DEEVA); Delaware Greenways; Delaware Nature Society; Delaware Wild Lands, Inc.; Delta Waterfowl; Denali Citizens Council; Denali Mountain Works; Deschutes Land Trust; Dishman Hills Conservancy; Dolores River Boating Advocates; Door County Kayak Tours, llc.; Downeast Salmon Federation; Dry Creek Trail Riders; E Mau Na Ala Hele; Eagle Valley Land Trust; EarthCorps.

East Bay Regional Park District; East Bay Regional Parks Association; East Coast Greenway Alliance; East Cooper Land Trust; Eastern RI Conservation District; Eastern Sierra Land Trust; Eastham Chamber of Commerce; Ecological Connections; Edward Hopper House; Elks Run Watershed Group; Empire Chamber of Commerce; Enchanted Circle Trails Association; Endangered Habitats League; Eno River Association; Environment California; Environment Colorado; Environment Connecticut; Environment Florida; Environment for the Americas; Environment Georgia; Environment Maine; Environment Maryland; Environment Massachusetts; Environment Michigan; Environment Minnesota; Environment Missouri; Environment Montana; Environment NC; Environment Nevada; Environment New Jersey; Environment New Mexico; Environment Oregon; Environment Texas; Environment Virginia; Environmental Justice Center at Chestnut Hill.

United Church; Estes Park ATV rentals; Evergreen Mountain Bike Alliance; Excelsior Sewing LLC.; Experience Learning; Explore Asheville; Flathead Lakers; Flathead Land Trust; Florida Bay Forever; Florida Chapter of the American Society of Landscape Architects; Florida Keys Environmental Fund, Inc.; Florida Trail Association; Florida Trust for Historic Preservation; Florida Wildlife Federation; Foothills Conservancy of North Carolina; Footloose Montana; Forest issues Group; Forests Forever; ForeverGreen Trails; Forterra; Four Corners Back Country Horsemen; Frankfort-Elberta Area Chamber of Commerce; Friends of Acadia; Friends of Apostle Islands National Lakeshore; Friends of Arthur R. Marshall Loxahatchee; National Wildlife Refuge.

Friends of Blackwater, Inc.; Friends of Friendship of Salem; Friends of Hawai'i Volcanoes National Park; Friends of Ironwood Forest; Friends of Johnston, Inc.; Friends of Katahdin Woods and Waters; Friends of Kenilworth Aquatic Gardens; Friends of Lafitte Greenway; Friends of Lower Haw River State Natural Area; Friends of Malheur National Wildlife Refuge; Friends of Metro Parks; Friends of Nevada Wilderness; Friends of Nulhegan Basin Fish and Wildlife Refuge, Inc.; Friends of Quincy Run Watershed; Friends of Shiloh National Park; Friends of the A.R.M. Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge; Friends of the Big Sioux River; Friends of the Boston Harbor Islands Inc.; Friends of the Cheat; Friends of the Chickasaw National Recreation Area; Friends of the Desert Mountains; Friends of the Heinz Refuge; Friends of the Inyo; Friends of the Mariana Trench; Friends of the Mississippi River; Friends of the Moshassuck; Friends of the Mountains-to-Sea Trail; Friends of the Oregon Caves and Chateau; Friends of the Rappahannock; Friends of the San Pedro River, Inc.; Friends of the Sonoran Desert.

Friends of the Upper Delaware River; Friends of Valle de Oro National Wildlife Refuge; Friends of Women's Rights National Historical Park, Inc.; Gaia Graphics Associates; Gallatin Valley Land Trust; Gathering Waters; Wisconsin's Alliance for Land Trusts; Genesee Valley Audubon Society; George Grant Chapter Trout Unlimited; Georges River Land Trust; Georgia Chapter—American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA); Georgia Conservation Voters; Georgia River Network; GERRY Outdoors; Gilroy Growing Smarter, Gilroy Historical Society; Golden Properties; Goulding's Lodge; Grand Canyon Conservancy; Great Basin Institute; Great Egg Harbor Watershed Association; Great Outdoor Store; Great Pond Mountain Conservation Trust; Greater Hells Canyon Council; Greater Lovell Land Trust.

Greater Munising Bay Partnership/Alger County Chamber; Greater New Jersey Motorcoach Association; Greater Philadelphia Cultural Alliance; Greater Yellowstone Coalition; Green Horizon Land Trust, Inc.; Green Valleys Watershed Association; Greens N Grains; Greensboro Land Trust; Greenwood SC Chamber of Commerce; Groundwork Lawrence; Guadalupe-Blanco River Trust; Guam Preservation Trust; Guardians of the Brandywine; Harriet Tubman Boosters, Inc.; Hawaii Audubon Society; Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources; Henderson County Tourism Development Authority; Hendry-Glades Audubon Society; Henrys Fork Wildlife Alliance; Hill Country Conservancy; Hill Country Land Trust; Historic Atlanta; Historic Boston Inc.; Historic Madison, Inc.; Historic Pullman Foundation; History Nebraska; Hoosier Environmental Council; HospitalityMaine; Hudson Highlands Land Trust.

Idaho—Montana Chapter of American Society of Landscape Architects; Idaho Coali-

tion of Land Trusts; Illinois Division of the Izaak Walton League; Illinois Environmental Council; Indiana Chapter ASLA; Indiana Dunes Tourism; Indiana Forest Alliance; Indiana Parks Alliance; Indigo Bluffs RV Park & Resort; Institute for Ecological Health; Interfaith Partners for the Chesapeake; International Inbound Travel Association; Izaak Walton League—Cypress Chapter; Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance; James River Association; Jefferson County Convention & Visitors Bureau; Jefferson County Democratic Party; Jefferson County Open Space; John Burroughs Association; Joshua's Tract Conservation & Historic Trust, Inc.; Kalmiopsis Audubon Society; Kansas Land Trust; Katmai Conservancy; Kennebec Land Trust; Kentucky Association of Convention and Visitors Bureaus; Kentucky Travel Industry Association; Kern Audubon Society; Kestrel Land Trust; Kingsport Chamber; Kingston Greenways Association; LA Conservation Corps.

Lafayette Flats Boutique Vacation Rentals; Lafayette Inn; Lake Charles/SWLA CVB; Lake Hopatcong Foundation; Land Trust of Napa County; Landmarks Illinois; LANL Foundation; League of Women Voters Iowa; Lemhi Regional Land Trust; Leominster Trail Stewards; Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation, Inc.; Lewis and Clark Trust, Inc.; Linn County Conservation Board; Littleton Conservation Trust; Loon Echo Land Trust; Los Angeles Neighborhood Land Trust; Los Angeles River State Park Partners; Los Padres ForestWatch; Loudoun Wildlife Conservancy; Louisiana Hypoxia Working Group; Louisville Tourism; Lowcountry Land Trust; Lowlives Respectable Citizens Club; Lowell Parks & Conservation Trust; Lower Nehalem Community Trust; Lummi Island Heritage Trust.

LuvTrails Inc; LWV Mid-Hudson Region; MA Association of Conservation Commissions; Magic City Fly Fishers Trout Unlimited 582; Mahoosuc Land Trust; Mahoosuc Pathways, Inc.; Maine Appalachian Trail Land Trust; Maine Audubon; Maine Conservation Voters; Maine Outdoor Brands; Maine Outdoor Coalition; Maine Outdoors; Maine Recreation and Parks Association; Maine Tourism Association; Mainspring Conservation Trust, Inc.; Manassas Battlefield Trust; Maple Street Bed and Breakfast; Maryland League of Conservation Voters; Maryland Native Plant Society; Massachusetts Historical Society; Massachusetts Land Trust Coalition; Mayfly Outdoors; Mayo Civic Association, Inc.; McKenzie River Trust; MCM Company, Inc.; Mendocino Land Trust; Miami Waterkeeper; Michigan Bed & Breakfast Assoc; Michigan League of Conservation Voters; Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District; Mile High Youth Corps; Miles Partnership; Mill Basin Civic Association; Millennium Development; Milwaukee Preservation Alliance; Milwaukee Riverkeeper; Minnechaug Land Trust; Minnesota Chapter of The Wildlife Society; Minnesota Office of School Trust Lands.

Minnesota School Trust Lands Commission; Miriam's Inspired Skin Care; Missouri Life magazine; Missouri Parks Association; Missouri Prairie Foundation; MN House District 10B; Mojave Desert Land Trust; Molokai Land Trust; Monmouth Conservation Foundation; Monocacy National Battlefield Foundation; Monson Conservation Commission; Montachusett Regional Trails Coalition; Montana Association of Land Trusts; Montana Outdoors Foundation; Montana Trout Unlimited; Montana Wilderness Association; Montana Wildlife Federation; Mormon Pioneer National Heritage Area; Mormon Trails Association; Morris County Tourism Bureau; Mountain Mamas; Mountains to Sound Greenway Trust; MS Tourism Association; Musconetcong Watershed Associa-

tion; Mystery Ranch; Natchitoches Convention and Visitors Bureau; National Aquarium; National Aviation Heritage Alliance; National Pony Express Assoc.; Native Fish Society; Native Prairies Association of Texas; Natural Lands; Natural Resources Council of Maine.

Nature for All; Naturesource Communications; NEMO Equipment, Inc.; Nevada Outdoor School; New Hampshire Audubon; New Hampshire Rivers Council; New Jersey Audubon; New Jersey Campground Owners and Outdoor Lodging Association; New Jersey Conservation Foundation; New Jersey Highlands Coalition; New Jersey Recreation & Park Association; New Jersey Sustainable Business Council; New Mexico Archaeological Council; New Mexico Horse Council; New Mexico Wild; New River Conservancy; New York League of Conservation Voters; New York-New Jersey Trail Conference; Nisqually Land Trust; No Barriers USA; Norcross Wildlife Foundation; North American Grouse Partnership; North Carolina Coastal Land Trust; North Carolina Friends of State Parks; North Carolina Outdoor Recreation Coalition; North Carolina Wildlife Federation; North Cascades Institute.

North Country Trail Association; North Florida Land Trust; North Shore Community Land Trust; North Shore Land Alliance; Northern Forest Canoe Trail; Northern Prairies Land Trust; Northern Rockies Conservation Cooperative; Northern Virginia Conservation Trust; Northstar Canoes; Northwest Rafting Company; Northwest Watershed Institute; Norwell Conservation Commission; NW WI Equestrian Friends Network; NY/NJ Baykeeper; NYH2o; Ocmulgee Mounds Association; Ocmulgee National Park & Preserve Initiative; Ocmulgee Outdoor Expeditions, LLC; Ohio Mayors Alliance; Ohio Veterans Outdoors, Inc.; Opossum Creek Retreat LLC; Oregon Chapter of American Society of Landscape Architects; Oregon Desert Land Trust; Oregon Equestrian Trails; Oregon Outdoors Coalition; Otsego County Conservation Association; Our Montana, Inc.; Outdoor Afro; Outdoor Alliance California; Outdoor Gear Builders of WNC; Outer Banks Visitors Bureau; Over Mountain Victory Trail Association; Pacific Forest Trust; Pacific Northwest Trail Association; Pajarito Environmental Education Center; Park Rx America; Park Watershed; Parks & Trails New York; Parks California; Paula Lane Action Network (PLAN); Pawtuxet River Authority; Peace River Audubon Society.

Pee Dee Land Trust; Peninsula Open Space Trust; PennEnvironment; Pennsylvania Council of Churches; Pennsylvania Parks and Forests Foundation; Pennsylvania Recreation and Park Society; Peoria Audubon Society; Petersburg Battlefields Foundation; Pheasants Forever and Quail Forever; Pie Ranch; Piedmont Land Conservancy; Pikes Peak Outdoor Recreation Alliance; Pinelands Preservation Alliance; Platte Land Trust; Pocono Heritage Land Trust; Prairie Rivers of Iowa; Preservation New Jersey; Preserve Arkansas; Presumpscot Regional Land Trust; Public Land Solutions; Quimby Family Foundation; R&R Fly Fishing Guide Service; Rangeley Area Chamber of Commerce; Rappahannock League for Environmental Protection; Rappahannock Tribe; Red Rooster Coffee House; Revolution House Media; Rhode Island Bicycle Coalition; Rio Grande Valley Broadband of the Great Old Broads for Wilderness.

River Through Atlanta Guide Service; RiverLink; Rocky Mountain Conservancy; Rocky Mountain Field Institute; Rocky Mountain Youth Corps; Ruffwear; Rutabaga Paddlesports; Sagebrush Steppe Land Trust; San Bernardino Mountains Land Trust; San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society; San

Diego Audubon Society; San Diego Mountain Biking Association; San Juan Back Country Horsemen; San Luis Valley Great Outdoors; Sanibel-Captiva Conservation Foundation; Santa Clara Valley Open Space Authority; Santosha on the Ridge; Save Historic Antietam Foundation, Inc.; Save Our Heritage Organization (SOHO); Save The Lakes Rhode Island; Save the Redwoods League; Scenic Galveston, Inc.; Scenic Rivers Land Trust; Scenic Virginia; Schuylkill Headwaters Association; Scottsbluff/Gering United Chamber; Sea and Sage Audubon Society; See Plymouth; Sequoia Riverlands Trust; Sereia Films; Sevier County.

Shenandoah Valley Bicycle Coalition; Sheridan Community Land Trust; Shine Beer Sanctuary & Bottleshop; Shirley Heinze Land Trust; Sierra Foothills Audubon Society; Siskiyou Outdoor Recreation Alliance; Skagit Audubon Society; Sleepy Creek Watershed Association; Smith River Alliance; Snake River Fund; Snowy Mountain Chapter Trout Unlimited #610; Soap Creek Outfitters LLC; Society for Historical Archaeology; Society for the Protection of NH Forests; Sonoma Land Trust; Soul River Inc.; South Carolina Wildlife Federation; South Coast Tours; South Dakota Hotel & Lodging Association; South Florida Wildlands Association; Southern Maine Conservation Collaborative; Southern Nevada Conservancy; Southern Off-Road Bicycle Association; Speak Up Wekiva, Inc.; Spice Acres in the CVNP; St. Croix River Association; St. Mary's River Watershed Association; Studio ray; Superior Hiking Trail Association; Susquehanna National Heritage Area; Tangled Up In Hue; Teens to Trails; Tennessee Citizens for Wilderness Planning; Tennessee College Democrats; Tennessee College Republican Committee; Tennessee Conservation Voters; Texas Land Conservancy; Texas Land Trust Council; The Carpenters' Company; The Cultural Landscape Foundation; The Custer Beacon.

The Friends of Rachel Carson National Wildlife Refuge; The Good Talk, LLC; The Jersey Shore Partnership; The Land Conservancy for Southern Chester County (TLC); The Land Conservancy of New Jersey; The Land Trust for Santa Barbara County; The Mountaineers; The Oblong Land Conservancy; The Ohio Environmental Council Action Fund; The Open Space Council for the St. Louis Region; The Otos Group, LLC; The Piedmont Environmental Council; The Star-Spangled Banner Flag House; The Trustees; The UNPavement; The Vital Ground Foundation; The Wetlands Conservancy; The Wetlands Initiative; The Wilderness Society—Wyoming; The Wildlands Conservancy; The ZaneRay Group; Three Rivers Land Trust; Tishomingo County Tourism Council; TOGETHER Bay Area; Tookany/Tacony-Frankford Watershed; Partnership; Town of Athol, Massachusetts; Open Space And Recreation Committee; Town of Littleton Parks and Rec; Town of Lyme Open Space Commission; Town of Palmer Conservation Commission; Trail Angels; Trails Inspire, LLC; Trails Utah.

Transylvania County Tourism Development Authority; Travelers' Rest Connection; Traverse City Tourism; Treeline Coffee Roasters; TreePeople; Triangle Greenways Council; Triangle Land Conservancy; TripHero; Tropical Audubon Society; Trout Unlimited; Pat Barnes Chapter, Helena, MT; Troyer Group; Upstate Forever; Urbana Park District; Utah Restaurant Association; Valley Creek Restoration Partnership; Valley Forge Park Alliance; Valley Forge Trout Unlimited; Vancouver Audubon Society; Vast Horizons Music, Inc.; Ventana Wilderness Alliance; Vermillionville Living History Museum; Vermont Conservation Voters; Vermont River Conservancy; Vinalhaven

Land Trust; Virginia Conservation Network; Virginia Eastern Shore Land Trust; Virginia League of Conservation Voters; Visit Moffat County / Moffat County Tourism Association; Visit Southern WV; VisitLEX; Volunteers for Outdoor Colorado; Voyageurs National Park Association; Walker Basin Conservancy; Wallowa Land Trust.

Ward 8 Woods Conservancy; Ward Walker 7 Oaks Ranch; Warm Springs Watershed Association; Washington Association of Land Trusts; Washington Conservation Voters; Washington Environmental Council; Washington Trails Association; Washington Wildlife and Recreation Coalition; Washington Wildlife Federation; Washington's National Park Fund; Water Stone Outdoors; West Sound Cycling Club; West Virginia Environmental Council; West Virginia Highlands Conservancy; West Virginia Land Trust; West Virginia Rivers Coalition; West Virginia Wilderness Coalition; Western Foothills Land Trust; Western Pocono Trout Unlimited; WestSlope Chapter Trout Unlimited; Wetland Strategies and Solutions, LLC; Whatcom Land Trust; Whitted Bowers Farm; Wilbarger Creek Conservation Alliance; Wildlife Management Institute; Willington Conservation Commission; Willistown Conservation Trust; Wilmington Rowing Center; Wimberley Valley Watershed Association; Windham Regional Commission; Wisconsin Environment; Wissahickon Trails; Wolf Trap Foundation for the Performing Arts; Wood River Land Trust; Wood-Pawcatuck Watershed Association; Woonasquatucket River Watershed Council; WV Citizen Action Group; Wyoming Outdoor Council; Wyoming Pathways; Wyoming Untrapped; Wyoming Wilderness Association; Wyoming Wildlife Advocates; Yellowstone River Parks Association Inc; Yellowstone Safari Company; YMCA of the Rockies; York Land Trust.

Mr. GARDNER. There is another historic feature I am particularly grateful for, and that is, the previous Secretaries of the Interior have signed a letter to Congress urging the passage of the Great American Outdoors Act. This letter includes two Secretaries of Interior from Colorado—Senator Ken Salazar, who was Secretary of the Interior under Barack Obama from 2009 to 2017, and Secretary Gale Norton, who was the Interior Secretary under President George W. Bush from 2001 to 2006. This letter was sent to us on June 3, 2020. It is a historic letter with six previous Secretaries of the Interior signing on to it, including Secretaries Zinke, Jewell, Kempthorne, Norton, and Babbitt.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter from the Secretaries of the Interior be printed in the RECORD.

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

JUNE 3, 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 uncertainty—and, also, to create jobs.

Together, we write to strongly urge swift passage and enactment of the Great Amer-

ican 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 will help address priority 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 contributes roughly \$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 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 Americans need your continued leadership 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.*

DIRK KEMPTHORNE,  
*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 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 who protected our lands and had the idea and forethought to create national parks, to create national forests, to say that there are places in our great land

that can and should be enjoyed for generations to come.

It is also about ballparks and swimming pools because not all of these dollars go to purchase land. In fact, here is a photo of a ballpark in Pueblo, CO. Runyon Park was funded through the Land and Water Conservation Fund. We have swimming pools across Utah and Alaska that were funded through it as well. States determine a great portion of it.

Listed here is Paradise Sports Park in Paradise, UT. It sounds like a great place. In 2015, \$80,000 was used for that park in Paradise.

In Alaska, the Kenai Peninsula, there is the Kenai soccer park in the city of Kenai, which received \$321,000 from the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Let's lead. Let's inspire. Let's show the American people that, indeed, from sea to shining sea, across America, the beautiful, the Great American Outdoors Act can stand as a testament to a Congress that realizes generations ahead of us need for us to work for them as well.

I will end this with a quote from the Father of Rocky Mountain National Park, who said: "Within National Parks is room—glorious room—room in which to find ourselves, in which to think and hope, to dream and plan, to rest and resolve."

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting the motion to proceed, the rollcall vote we are about to take. I would encourage my colleagues to vote yes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROMNEY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 18, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 116 Leg.]

YEAS—79

Alexander	Cantwell	Cramer
Baldwin	Capito	Daines
Bennet	Cardin	Duckworth
Blackburn	Carper	Durbin
Blumenthal	Casey	Ernst
Blunt	Collins	Feinstein
Booker	Coons	Fischer
Boozman	Cornyn	Gardner
Braun	Cortez Masto	Gillibrand
Brown	Cotton	Graham

Grassley	Merkley	Sinema
Harris	Murkowski	Smith
Hassan	Murphy	Stabenow
Hawley	Murray	Sullivan
Heinrich	Perdue	Tester
Hirono	Peters	Thune
Hoeven	Portman	Tillis
Jones	Reed	Udall
Kaine	Roberts	Van Hollen
King	Rosen	Warner
Klobuchar	Rubio	Warren
Leahy	Sanders	Whitehouse
Loeffler	Schatz	Wicker
Manchin	Schumer	Wyden
McConnell	Scott (FL)	Young
McSally	Scott (SC)	
Menendez	Shaheen	

NAYS—18

Barrasso	Johnson	Risch
Cassidy	Kennedy	Romney
Crapo	Lankford	Rounds
Cruz	Lee	Sasse
Enzi	Moran	Shelby
Inhofe	Paul	Toomey

NOT VOTING—3

Burr	Hyde-Smith	Markey
------	------------	--------

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 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.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for the substitute amendment.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on amendment No. 1617 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.

Mitch McConnell, John Hoeven, John Thune, Cory Gardner, Pat Roberts, Lindsey Graham, Susan M. Collins, John Boozman, Kevin Cramer, Thom Tillis, Rob Portman, Roy Blunt, Lamar Alexander, Todd Young, Steve Daines, Shelley Moore Capito, David Perdue.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1626 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1617

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, and I ask the clerk to report.

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 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:

At the end add the following:

"This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment."

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:

Strike "1 day" and insert "2 days"

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1628 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1617

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the text of the underlying bill.

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 1628 to the language proposed to be stricken by 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:

At the end add the following.

"This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment."

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. 1628

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. 1628.

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 a 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 move to bring to a close debate on 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.

Mitch McConnell, John Hoeven, John Thune, Cory Gardner, Pat Roberts, Lindsey Graham, Susan M. Collins, John Boozman, Kevin Cramer, Thom Tillis, Rob Portman, Roy Blunt, Lamar Alexander, Todd Young, Steve Daines, Shelley Moore Capito, David Perdue.

MOTION TO COMMIT WITH AMENDMENT NO. 1630

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move 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 clerk 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. 1631 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1630

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 “5 days” and insert “6 days”

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. 1632 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1631

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 1632 to amendment No. 1631.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the names be waived.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike “6 days” and insert “7 days”

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 question 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 of the Senate, 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 Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, Tom Cotton, John Boozman, Joni Ernst, Todd Young, Steve Daines, Cory Gardner, Jerry Moran, James E. Risch, Shelley Moore Capito, David Perdue, Ben Sasse, Kevin Cramer, Tim Scott, Lamar Alexander, Mike Rounds, Pat Roberts.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call 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 where 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 a willingness to help 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 shows 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 major 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 by changing 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 police 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 for 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 police 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 demilitarize 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 offending officers and enables individuals to recover damages in civil courts when law enforcement officers 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 and empower 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 very vividly, after the Freddie Gray episode in Baltimore, I met with a group of community leaders in Sandtown, where the tragedy oc-

curred, 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.

So let me share with you two 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.

Officers 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, 36. "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 commands the Silver Spring police district for the Montgomery County department. It culminated Sunday afternoon when Turner, Francke and three other Montgomery County police officers took a knee in front of more than 200 protesters facing them and stretching half a block down Georgia Avenue.

Everyone sat still for 2 minutes 53 seconds, the estimated time George Floyd lay unconscious with his neck pinned below the knee of a Minneapolis police officer.

... 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 county.

"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 some things that a few officers did 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 event safe from those that would want to turn your message into something else. We want your message to be heard."

By 1 p.m. Sunday, more than 200 people had gathered at Veterans Plaza in downtown Silver Spring. They marched 3 blocks to the corner of Colesville Road and Georgia Avenue, halted, 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 kneel. The crowd erupted with applause at the 2 minute 53 seconds mark as the group marched back to Veterans Plaza.

A series of speakers addressed 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 18 years earlier. 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 was 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, Davian, 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.

"Do you know why all these people are here?" the mother asked her younger son. He stared at the crowd, munching on his granola bar that had crumbled to pieces in his hands. The mother said, "They're out here for you."

Davian 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 our 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 guarantee equal 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 Under Law," 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 (Mrs. LOEFFLER). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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 racial injustice, which has sadly 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 about prejudice 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 appropriate people are held 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 across the country have 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 used a battering ram to enter her apartment shortly after midnight. She was asleep in her apartment, and shortly after midnight—no knock—just a battering ram, and her door is knocked open. Thinking somebody had broken into her home, which was a reasonable reaction, Breonna's boyfriend, a licensed gun owner, fired at them. He thought they were under assault. The officers returned at least 20 shots, killing the 26-year-old emergency room technician.

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 a majority of 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 extraordinarily reckless and dangerous path to 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, disbanding 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 a whole new host of 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. Obviously, you can handle 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. I have no doubt more 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. We did it 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 legislation 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 and passed 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 in America 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 right now, and 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 like these, 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 march since America was founded when we 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 chaotic times, which led to legislative work 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 that bad police officers are removed from the force, and that is where the near-term responsibility needs to lie because we don't have that capability here.

But we do believe—I do 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. PERDUE). 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 packages 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 trying to do the things that 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—had a view that 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—that has all been combined into the 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 specifically one 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 maintenance issues are decades 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, the 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 almost as old as the parks themselves. There are buildings we have in all those locations where the access is no longer appropriate and hasn'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.

We 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. But if you are going to have a private-public partnership, the public needs to do its part, and we are talking today about how the public would do its part in maintaining the parks, expanding the parks, building a new facility, repairing a facility, changing access to a facility.

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 African American, a 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.

When you think 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 know that we 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 signifi-

cant. 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 5 million American jobs are created and around \$800 billion of 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 and 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 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 has to have on the important resources that we need to make the right kind of investment in. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

#### ISSUES FACING AMERICA

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 weeks, hundreds of thousands 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 looking around them. They see the struggle for racial justice. They see a pandemic. They see an economic meltdown. And many of them are asking what the Republican leadership here in the Senate is doing. There is crisis after crisis after crisis, and 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 quickly wrap up debate over 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, Alton Sterling, 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 full force of law. That includes officers who stand by while these brutal acts take place. Every single killing of a person by police or while in police custody 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 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 grant funding 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 are not treated like criminals and 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 at the start of the pandemic, and they had 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—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 unnecessary deaths and illness 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 a way to effectively 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 today, 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 all want that.

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, that is great. Thank them, 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 calling their workers “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 kids. Anyone who thinks 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 homes, 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 and Senator McCONNELL taking 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 boldly.

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 every working-class

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 make sure that nobody in America goes hungry, and that means substantially expanding the Meals on Wheels program, the school meals programs, and SNAP benefits.

Here we are. All over this country people are demanding an end to 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 to stand up 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 and hearing 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. Let'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.

#### CORONAVIRUS

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 went all-in to respond to and 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 Pro-

tection 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.

All across the country, this jobs-saving effort is working, because last month the U.S. economy 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. Unemployment was down in 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 producing 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 prioritize review of 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 would certainly be 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). The Senator from Louisiana.

#### CONCERNS OVER NATIONS FUNDING UNIVERSITY CAMPUS INSTITUTES IN THE UNITED STATES ACT

Mr. KENNEDY. 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—the 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 a number of times, and I know 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 so much. Not nearly so 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 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 there by the Communist Party of China; 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 extending China's culture 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 which is chaired by a member of the Politburo and the vice-premier of the People's Republic of China. Most agreements establishing Confucius Institutes feature nondisclosure clauses and unacceptable concessions to the political aims and practices of the government of China. Specifically, North American universities permit Confucius Institutes to advance 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 U.S. 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 have 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 in the United States Act, the CONFUCIUS 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 fol-

lowing: 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 rather than granting full managerial control to the Chinese Party of China, it would grant full managerial authority of the Confucius Institute to the campus on which the Confucius Institute is situated. That would include full control over what is being taught, the activities carried out, the research grants that are made, and who was employed at the Confucius Institute.

If the Confucius Institutes are going to be part of our universities, they should be part of our universities. 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 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 funds 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.

The legislative clerk proceeded to 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, to Detroit, 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 our 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 to take 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 cosponsor 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 better and 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, limiting the 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 defunding 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 I 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-

ment, we should expect high standards and accountability for meeting those standards. We have a right to expect the best from our police officers.

Firing dozens of bullets into a Louisville apartment under a no-knock warrant, killing a 26-year-old emergency medical technician and aspiring nurse who grew up in Michigan, did not meet the high standards we have a right to expect. Breonna Taylor deserved the best from our police. She did not get it.

Shoving a 75-year-old man at a protest in Buffalo hard enough that his head cracked open while hitting the ground, creating a pool of blood, and then watching officer after officer walking past him without offering any help does not reflect the high standards we have a right to expect. Martin Gugino deserved the best from our police, and he did not get it.

Kneeling on the neck of a man who is lying on the ground for 8 minutes 46 seconds, as he cries out for his mother and the life leaves his body, is not meeting the high standards he had the right to expect. George Floyd deserved the best from our police. He did not receive it.

The U.S. Senate needs to pass the Justice in Policing Act now. I would love it if there was strong bipartisan support. Wouldn’t that send a wonderful message across our country if we could do that?

However, holding law enforcement to high professional standards is only the first step in becoming the Nation we all want to be. Racism has been with us since slaves were brought on ships to this country. It is an immoral thread that is woven deep in the fabric of our Nation’s history.

It is simply not enough to end racial inequalities in policing because the inequalities in our society don’t end there. The pandemic has shone a brutal light on this truth.

Our Democratic caucus released a report on April 30 that showed that Black Americans are more than twice as likely as White Americans to die from COVID-19, and in some communities, this disparity is even greater. In Michigan, 14 percent of our citizens are African Americans. Yet African Americans make up 41 percent—41 percent—of the deaths from COVID-19. It is not hard to see why, if you look. Because of generations of structural racism, Black Americans are less likely to have health insurance, more likely to have preexisting health conditions and higher risks for Black moms during labor and delivery, more likely to be exposed to air pollution because of where they live, and less likely to live in housing where social distancing is even possible.

Black families also face challenges in accessing healthy food. While around 12 percent of American families overall are food secure, we know that more than 22 percent of African-American families are food insecure—more than one out of every five families.

At the same time, in this health crisis Black Americans are more likely to

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 they are the ones still working. 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.

While 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. It has been weeks now 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 for their childcare 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 House bill extends 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 we are 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 ahead of profits 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 their last day of 11th grade, George 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 for his family and his friends who are missing him so much.

It is time for us—all of us—to set high standards for law enforcement and the quality of life we want for all of our families. It is time to hold each other accountable to live up to our highest and best ideals as Americans. George's last breath cannot be the last word.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

H.R. 1957

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 property in the United States is owned by the Federal taxpayers. When you can break that down, people immediately think it is all the National Park Service. Actually, the National Park Service is a small amount of that.

The Bureau of Land Management holds about 244 million acres, followed by the U.S. Forest Service with 192 million acres, Fish and Wildlife Service with 89 million acres, and then the National Park Service right at 80 million acres. The Department of Defense and some other agencies hold another 34 million acres. All together, there are 640 million acres and growing.

This doesn't even account for all of the land that is controlled by the Fed-

eral Government. That is the amount just owned by the Federal Government. That 28 percent of all the property in the United States that is owned by the Federal Government doesn't take into account the 27 million-plus acres that are also controlled by the Federal Government. Those are areas where they do conservation mitigation. Those are areas where they have land in trust for other aspects.

All told, around 30 percent of the United States is owned or controlled by the Federal taxpayer, by the Federal Government. That would all be fine and good if we were managing it well, but we are not. On those properties right now, we have almost \$20 billion in deferred maintenance backlog. That is almost \$20 billion just in things that haven't been done and where the Federal Government has proved to be a bad land manager.

There is a bill that is coming this week. It is on the floor now being debated. The conversation is about this: How do we get better at maintaining the land that we have and how can we actually purchase additional property?

There is something that has been around a long time called the Land and Water Conservation Fund. The Land and Water Conservation Fund has dollars set aside from offshore oil revenue to be able to purchase areas of property. That has happened for decades now. The problem is we haven't maintained that. Even with the property that we buy that has maintenance issues, we don't fix the maintenance issues when we purchase the property.

The proposal on the table this week is to double the amount of land acquisitions that we have and to be able to solve the maintenance issue that we have had for a long time. This conversation about the backlog and maintenance has been an ongoing issue. There is finally a resolution to it.

Here is the resolution. After years and years of debating a resolution about how to reduce spending in one area so we can make sure we can do the maintenance we need to do, the final decision was made to be able to put a bill together that just says: Forget it; let's just all add it to debt. Let's just completely do debt purchasing of all of our maintenance stuff. We will figure out some decades in the future how to be able to pay for that, rather than discerning how to pay for it now because there is not an offset on how to be able to pay for the maintenance.

The maintenance needs to be done. 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, use half of those dollars to purchase new properties and half of it just to be able to work on maintenance?

That was denied. They said: No, that is an irrational approach. We want to buy more land and figure out later how to maintain it.

We are at that point where we have to figure out how to maintain it because an almost \$20 billion backlog in

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 of it. We are not going to do this 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 in the sixth year how to be 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 make. At your home, you can't just say: Everything needs to be fixed, but I can't afford it; so I will 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 with this.

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 buy as many 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 into the budget scheming of everything 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 dollars you only vote on once and 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 mandatory.

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 idea 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 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 tail on it on the maintenance, at about \$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, so that we sunset 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 is broken on 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 even more. Put a requirement in that says 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 also is not getting a hearing right now. I think that is a problem. There are commonsense things that don't drive us further into debt, that aren't going to cause years and years of problems in our budget, that maintain the properties 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.

Why would we say we really need 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 issues.

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 law. 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.

But in the cases when they do not, the consequences can be devastating. What happened last week to George Floyd in Minnesota was horrific. He was killed by police officers—dying at the hands of men who pledged to 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 purposes, we must 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 scapegoat and demonize all police for the actions of a few, and we must reject 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 undertrained, 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 repair trust in this country, but defunding the police is not the answer. We need the rule of law and equal just 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 opposing calls to defund the police. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHUMER. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

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, we have seen with 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 my colleague offers is rhetoric, not action, and the great worry so many Americans have is that so many on the other side will feel rhetoric 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 House passes it.

Very few of us believe that Leader MCCONNELL will put it on the floor, but we want him to. We demand he does.

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

And so in a minute, I will be asking unanimous consent that upon receipt of H.R. 7120, the Justice in Policing Act of 2020, the pending business here in the Senate, after it passes the House, be that bill, so that we are forced and required to debate it.

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.

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 what part of that resolution he opposes and why he is objecting, 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 or 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.

So I will only conclude that the minority leader is here to speak on behalf of the Democratic Party and defend this radical idea to defund the police, since he is unwilling to cite what part of that resolution he opposes.

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

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 to bring 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 pass it. Some may choose to modify 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.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

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 upon receipt from the House. I further ask that the resolution be agreed to and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am a bit mystified about what has happened here. We had a resolution on the floor, a couple of pages, calling for justice for George Floyd and victims of excessive use of force, as well as condemning the radical idea of defunding the police.

Now, the minority leader wants to offer a resolution that would immediately make the pending business of the Senate—at some distant, speculative time in the future—a piece of legislation which, if I am not mistaken, hasn't even been written and filed yet in the House of Representatives. Now, maybe it has been written in the last day or two and I am not aware that they filed that bill, but it certainly hasn't been debated and voted on in the House of Representatives.

There is all the time in the world to decide what is going to be the pending business in the U.S. Senate when the Senate acts, but we have a resolution

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 his party, 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 versus action. 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 idea 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.

H.R. 1957

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, it is an honor to stand here today in support of one of the most historic pieces of conservation legislation in decades—some are saying 50 years.

The Great American Outdoors Act will have a lasting impact on generations to come. That is why, as Montana's voice in the Senate, I am standing here today to make the Great American Outdoors Act a reality.

Over the last few days, we have seen very strong bipartisan support both here in the Senate and around the Nation. Senators from both sides of the aisle, representing States all across our great Nation, have been coming down to the floor to share stories and photos and to show support for the bill. It is a very personal piece of legislation because we all love the outdoors.

At this point, plenty of us have spoken in support of this bill, but today I want to share some quotes from Montanans who are also in support of the Great American Outdoors Act.

David Brooks from Montana Trout Unlimited says:

As the Senate takes up the legislation this week, we are also excited to see progress on addressing decades of maintenance backlogs on our public lands that benefit our wild and native fish and their habitat.

Speaking of trout, this picture was taken at the Yellowstone River. The main channel is over here. There is a little side channel as well. That is Emigrant Peak. That is in a valley called Paradise Valley. It is appropriately named. It is south of Livingston—between Livingston and Gardiner. If you were to come visit Yellowstone National Park, one of the entrances is in Gardiner, and that would be on the way to Yellowstone Park.

As I mentioned before, that is, in fact, where in 1979 we had our high school homecoming dinner, and I proudly took a date in a Griswold station wagon with some couples, and we drove down to Chico's. It is right by where this picture was taken. There are a lot of memories when I see a picture like that. There was a lot of fish caught as I fished that river many, many times. I do it several times a summer.

Ben Horan with Mountain Bike Mis-soula says:

There is a good reason the Land and Water Conservation Fund has enjoyed bipartisan support since the 1960s. It is just good policy. For more than 55 years, LWCF has supported and funded open spaces and public lands that we in Montana rely on for our work, for our play, and for our way of life.

Kyle Weaver from the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation had this to say:

This important conservation program allowed the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation to complete more than 80 land protection and access projects that conserved more than 152,000 acres of habitat for elk and other wildlife. RMEF strongly urges Members of the Senate and House to rally alongside Senator DAINES, pass this measure, and forward it to President Trump's desk so it can be signed into law.

Land Tawny with the Backcountry Hunters and Anglers said this:

Sportsmen and women have been the leading voices in this effort to fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund as well as providing maintenance funding for the agencies that manage places critical for public access and fish and wildlife. Our public lands and our waters have traditionally been places of refuge, of solace, and of adventure.

Never has this been truer than right now when we need to recenter and get our minds right. Now is the most strategic time for investing in these places of refuge by funding shovel-ready projects that sustain important habitat, increase public access opportunities, and get people back to work.

Mayor Bill Cole of Billings said:

Over the years, Billings has received almost \$2 million to fund construction repairs on our parks. The Great American Outdoors Act will be a great help as we plan future projects that address the backlog of maintenance needs. Parks and trails are critical to our Western quality of life, they attract visitors, and they support our economy.

The city manager of Great Falls, Greg Doyle, said this:

For many years, the city has utilized the LWCF appropriations to complete a wide variety of projects. These projects help support and develop park land and recreational facilities for Great Falls residents and visitors.

Alex Kitchens with the Mystery Ranch. The Mystery Ranch—that sounds kind of mysterious, doesn't it? They actually make some of the best backpacks in America. In fact, when my wife and I and children get out in the wilderness area every summer, we all are carrying Mystery Ranch backpacks. They are some of the very best. In fact, in the early days of this company, back in the seventies when I was going to high school in Bozeman, I had a Kletterworks pack. Kletterworks was the precursor to Mystery Ranch. In fact, the book bag that I then took to Montana State University and carried my books in throughout my college experience in Bozeman—I took that same pack to the top of Granite Peak, our highest point in Montana, and the summit of the Grand Teton, just south of Montana there—beautiful country outside of Jackson, WY. It was a small pack. We went very ultralight with bivy bags, kind of a sense of a quick up and down because of weather. We wanted to get up there quickly on both peaks, and we made it. That was the precursor to the Mystery Ranch, which are the packs we have today. They are larger packs. You can carry more weight into the backcountry.

Alex said this: The Great American Outdoors Act is landmark conservation to protect our public lands. The full funding of the LWCF is a benefit to our parks and our forests at the local and State level.

We have Glenn Marx with the Montana Association of Land Trusts. I will quote Glenn:

Passage of the Great American Outdoors Act means LWCF funding and tremendous rural community, national park, and outdoor recreation economic benefits for Montana and the nation. More legislative steps to go. Let's finish the journey.

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 Boozman High in 1979. Little did 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 on to 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 their public lands. 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, wastewater treatment systems that are in desperate need of repair and upgrades. That maintenance backlog needs to be addressed, and 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 public lands to enjoy, 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. I rise today to highlight some recent 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 save some money when filing their Federal income tax returns this year and in future years.

As the ranking member of the subcommittee called the Permanent Subcommittee 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 Presiding Officer and I working together on recycling issues, with his team and mine.

Senator PORTMAN and I, 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 Presiding Officer probably has too. People in Delaware and I am sure in the Presiding Officer's State asked this question: Why can't you all work together in Washington and get something done? That is what we do on our Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. We work together, and I think we 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 Presiding Officer, 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 as Governor and even now.

When I was a Congressman, every year we used to—we only have three counties in my State. The Presiding

Officer has a lot more in his. Once every year, a month or so before the tax-filing deadline, usually March, I would host townhall meetings in each of our counties, and we would invite the IRS to come, along with the State Division of Revenue, to participate. We would offer to the people of Delaware the opportunity to ask questions not just of me and my staff but of the IRS and the State Division of Revenue about tax returns that were being filed. It was something I loved. I love helping people, and I know the Presiding Officer 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 1998—I was Governor then, and I think our 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 this program 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, for free, you say: Well, I am not sure I would want to do that. This is 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. The website—I am looking to see where that website is listed. I don't see it here. Maybe it is on the back. I don't think it is back there either, but I will just say it. Here it is. All they have to do is visit this website to get started: [IRS.gov/FreeFile](https://www.irs.gov/FreeFile). That is it. That is a mouthful, isn't it? That is [IRS.gov/FreeFile](https://www.irs.gov/FreeFile).

As much as I do it—it is this close. There it is: [IRS.gov/FreeFile](https://www.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](https://www.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—apparently took steps to actually prevent their Free File websites 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, and Intuit has one called Turbo Tax Free Edition. These 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 products and continuing 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 make sure not to confuse taxpayers any 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 Federal tax 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 product and want a free 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 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 2009. 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 heard. They said: “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. Here 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 in the Senate, in 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 them lament the fact that, for years 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. My guess 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, after accounting for inflation, while the number of individual taxpayers who need to be served, who have questions to ask and tax returns to submit—that number has gone up by 13 million people.

These IRS budget cuts have impaired both tax enforcement and taxpayer service operations. For example, reduced funding has led to a reduction in



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 budget for their 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 over 100 million taxpayers, 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 guidance 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 that means. 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 want to encourage all 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.

I would also ask everyone 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; say: 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 likes movies. One of my alltime favorite movies and our colleague who has joined us, from Alaska, one of his alltime favorite movies—he has talked about it many times—is “Back to the Future.” This is, in a way, back to the future.

Back when I first got to the House, we used to do this—as I said before Senator SULLIVAN and Senator CRUZ came to the floor—I talked about how every year, in every county in Delaware, we would do—there are only three counties—we would actually do townhall meetings, and we would have folks in from the IRS and from the State Division of Revenue to actually help people prepare and file their taxes. We don't do that anymore. Actually, we have something that is even better, a whole lot better, and it is this Free File Program that the IRS has. It is available, if people just knew about it.

I will close with these words. I wish I could claim this as well. I wonder who said this. Maybe one of our smart pages—if our pages were here, I would ask one of the pages to figure it out. Have you ever heard the saying: If a tree falls in the forest and there is nobody there to hear it, is there really a noise?

Think about that. If a tree falls in the forest and there is nobody there to hear it, is there really a noise? Well, if we have a great program through the IRS to help millions and millions of people file their taxes for free and they don't know about it, is there really a benefit? I think, arguably, not. We can do something about that. Let's do it.

I yield the floor to my friend from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The Senator from Alaska.

#### RACISM

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, among our families, our children, our friends.

The killing of George Floyd has shocked us all. The video of a police of-

ficer 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.

By 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 have rocked the Nation. They are three simple words that mean so much and have so much resonance throughout our history; words that, at their very heart, have helped to define the moral issue of our country, and that is slavery and the struggle—the long struggle for civil rights.

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 countries and brought, in slavery, into 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 Guardsmen 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 honorable and risk their lives daily for their fellow citizens, 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 just 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 which don't have any law enforcement officers at all. So this is a huge problem in Alaska that can create horrible situations, particularly when it comes

to violent crimes like sexual assault and domestic violence.

So I am not a proponent of defunding the police, but something else that is happening in America right now at this moment are discussions—not just in the halls of government but around dinner tables, among families and parents and their kids and their friend groups—on what can or should be done at the individual level, the individual American level. This is certainly happening, for example, in my family.

That was the main point of a powerful and wisdom-filled op-ed by my former boss, friend, and mentor, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice last week, in the *Washington Post*.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this op-ed be printed in the *RECORD* following my remarks.

It is entitled “This Moment Cries Out for Us to Confront Race in America.” Condoleezza Rice was the daughter of the segregated South, raised in Birmingham, AL, during the height of the struggle for civil rights, with sit-ins, riots, and even bombings happening in her city.

When she was 8 years old, the Ku Klux Klan bombed a local church in Birmingham, killing four school-aged girls. One of those girls, Denise McNair, was a friend of Condi’s. They used to play dolls together.

Over five decades later, through hard work, grace, dignity, and supreme intelligence, she rose to become one of the most powerful people in the world as Secretary of State of the United States, and I had the honor of a lifetime to work for her for 5 years.

She recounts some of her journey in this op-ed, which I encourage all of my colleagues and all Americans to read. She reminds us:

Our country has a birth defect: Africans and Europeans came to this country together—but one group was in chains. In time, the very Constitution that counted slaves as three-fifths of a man became a powerful tool in affording the descendants of slaves their basic rights. That work has been long and difficult, but it has made a difference. We are better than we were.

She notes one harsh indicator of progress. In Jim Crow Alabama, in her youth, she says:

[N]o one batted an eye if the police killed a black man. There wouldn’t have been even a footnote in the local press.

Yet now we are seeing hundreds of thousands across America take to the streets peacefully to protest such injustice.

In her piece from last week, she emphasizes that finger-pointing at this moment will not help the cause:

And if we are to make progress, let us vow to check the language of recrimination at the door.

Very wise words. We all need to focus on emphasizing unity and empathy at this moment—all of us. Senators, Governors, the President, the media—all of us have this responsibility, and it is what the vast majority of our fellow Americans want. It is what they want

and what they want us to do and to see and hear from us.

Perhaps most importantly, Condoleezza Rice, in her op-ed, emphasizes something seemingly so obvious but not spoken much: individual action and responsibility. She ends her piece with this challenge that I put up here on the posterboard. It is a really important challenge for every American:

So I ask my fellow Americans: What will each of you do? My personal passion is educational opportunity, because it is a partial shield against prejudice. It is not a perfect shield, I know, but it gives people a fighting chance. In my conversations, I want to discuss why the learning gap for black kids is so stubborn and what can be done about it. What is your question about the impact of race on the lives of Americans? And what will you do to find answers?

Those words in her op-ed—the challenge—really struck me, and I have thought long and hard all week about them since reading those words in the *Washington Post*.

Of course, as a Senator, I, with many of you, my colleagues, am taking part in discussions which I hope will lead to collective action by our Federal Government to address some of the challenges our Nation certainly continues to have regarding race. But Condoleezza Rice’s question and challenge is about personal passion and action, and it is a question for every American to consider.

I have an amazing Alaska Native wife from whom I have learned much about the serious issue of racism in my State against indigenous Alaskans and among the first peoples in our great Nation, but I have never experienced the kind of racism that many across our country have.

I am a colonel in the Marines, an institution I am very proud to be a part of, an institution that—like the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard—at its very heart, it isn’t supposed to matter what the color of your skin is, what religion you practice, or what part of the socioeconomic ladder you come from. The fundamental ethos of the Marine Corps and our military is supposed to be this: It doesn’t matter what race you are. You are just a U.S. marine.

Now, of course, the Marines and the rest of the military don’t always meet this ideal, but they strive for it, even in ways that might seem puzzling to those who haven’t served.

There is the story of the tough Marine Corps drill instructor shouting at his raw recruits on day one of boot camp:

There is no racial bigotry here. In my eyes, every one of you are equally worthless. My orders are to weed out all non-hackers who cannot serve my beloved Marine Corps. Do you maggots understand that?

That is the drill instructor. Again, it is the ideal—equality in the U.S. military—but it is not always met.

I remember how the first rifle platoon I commanded as a young second lieutenant was literally about one-third White, one-third Black, and one-

third Hispanic. My platoon sergeant was an African-American marine named Willis Towns. He was outstanding in every way, Sergeant Towns. I learned so much from him about leadership.

His dream in life was to be the first African-American sergeant major of the entire Marine Corps. He never reached that goal. A few weeks after I attended a Martin Luther King, Jr., ceremony with him in which he received an award for his leadership in the community, he was killed in a training accident. That was the worst day of my life. Just a few years later, the Marine Corps named another outstanding African American to be Sergeant Major of the entire Marine Corps. I remember thinking when the announcement came out: Congratulations, Willis. You did it. You did it.

I believe that the military—desegregated in 1948, nearly 20 years before the passage of civil rights legislation by this body—is one of the most important civil rights organizations in America. I am passionate about our U.S. military, but it can improve in terms of race. There are questions that need to be asked about the record of our military on these important issues.

Yesterday was an important day in the Senate with the unanimous vote to confirm Gen. Charles Q. Brown, Jr., to be Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force. For a whole host of reasons, I was probably more involved in his confirmation than any other Senator. I had the opportunity to come to the floor yesterday to speak strongly in support of his Senate confirmation.

I have had many discussions with General Brown over the past year, but what surprised me was that I learned recently that yesterday’s vote was actually a historic vote for America. His confirmation, 98 to 0, was so historic because General C. Q. Brown was just confirmed yesterday by this body as our first African-American service chief in the history of the United States of America.

Let me explain a little bit more about that. The Joint Chiefs of Staff consists of the service chiefs, the top four-star generals of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine, and Coast Guard, as well as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, with the notable exception of GEN Colin Powell, who was Chairman of the Joint Chiefs in the early 1990s. General C. Q. Brown, whom we confirmed yesterday, will be the first African-American service chief ever for any military service. Of course, this is good news in terms of racial progress for America, but it also begs an important question: Why did it take so long for this to happen, especially in one of America’s institutions with probably one of the best, longest records on positive civil rights in our Nation?

Some of the answers are surely hinted at in General Brown’s very moving video address that he gave last week when he talked about what was on his mind in the wake of the horrible

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 room. 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 prods 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 patriotism.

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 Austin, and Marine Corps Lt. Gen. Ron Bailey—will have insightful views on these important matters.

Our military is something I am very passionate about, not only because it protects and defends our Nation, but because for decades, 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 have a promising future after their service is completed.

If there is some kind of obstacle for minority advancement that stifles op-

portunities 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, which 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 take up Condoleezza 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 cannot dull 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 spouse dreads. While his 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 "peace that passes understanding."

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 girls from my neighborhood 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 go up in smoke. 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 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 reactions to the 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 these responses even 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.

Still, we simply must acknowledge that society is not color-blind and probably never will be. Progress comes when people treat one another with respect, as if we were color-blind. Unless and until we are honest that race is still an anchor around our country's neck, that shadow will never be lifted. Our country has a birth defect: Africans and Europeans came to this country together—but one group was in chains. In time, the very Constitution that counted slaves as three-fifths of a man became a powerful tool in affording the descendants of slaves their basic rights. That work has been long and difficult, but it has made a difference. We are better than we were.

I grew up in segregated Jim Crow Alabama, where no one batted an eye if the police killed a black man. There wouldn't have been even a footnote in the local press. So it is a source of pride for me that so many have taken to the streets—peacefully—to say that they care: that they, too, are sick and tired of being sick and tired. Yet protests will take our country only so far. The road to healing must begin with respectful but honest and deep conversations, not judgments, about who we were, who we are and who we want to become. Let us talk with, not at, each other—in our homes, schools, workplaces and places of worship. And if we are to make progress, let us vow to check the language of recrimination at the door. As united Americans, we can then turn our fears into faith, hope, compassion and action. And then we can accept and carry out our shared responsibility to build "a more perfect union."

Yet, any call to action will be empty if it does not move us to individual responsibility. We all have a role to play in moving our country forward, in ensuring that our democracy delivers not just for those who have but also for those who seek and for those in need.

So I ask my fellow Americans: What will each of you do? My personal passion is educational opportunity, because it is a partial shield against prejudice. It is not a perfect shield, I know, but it gives people a fighting chance. In my conversations, I want to discuss why the learning gap for black kids is so stubborn and what can be done about it. What is your question about the impact of race on the lives of Americans? And what will you do to find answers?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I have been thinking about the last time I was in an airplane. It was mid-March. One of the many great things about my State is I can drive back and forth in the car for 6 hours. The last time I was in an airplane was mid-March. That day in mid-March, South Korea had 90 diagnosed cases of coronavirus. On the other side of the world, in the United States of America, we had 90 cases of coronavirus.

Since then, fewer than 300 South Koreans have died. Their unemployment rate is under 4 percent. More than 110,000 Americans have been killed by this virus, and our unemployment rate is the worst since the Great Depression. This isn't because South Korea has smarter scientists or because

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. He is going to point fingers. 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 protesting for change. What was 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 them 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 step in to fill that leadership void. 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. We have 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—labor, 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 also 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.

Here is what I wish more 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.

H.R. 1957

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, right now we are debating the Great American Outdoors Act, which would be great if only it were balanced. 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 county or parish adjacent to a coastline—42 percent. 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, the panhandle, 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 way. 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.

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 floodgate 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 Conversation 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 Fund. These blue States in the interior—some of them populated, some of them not—on average get \$17.66 per capita. We are sending money to where people don't live to fix vacation spots, which are important, but it is not where we live, and we are not spending money where people do live, where their homes are, where their cities are, and where, if we don't enhance resiliency, we are going to spend billions when the hurricane hits. This is foolish public policy.

By the way, some of my fiscal conservative colleagues—and I consider myself a fiscal conservative—have weighed in against the Great American Outdoors Act, saying that we are not paying for it; we are pretending to pay for it. We are taking dollars that would otherwise go to the Treasury—otherwise go to the Treasury—and pretending like they are new dollars. That is actually true. But what we can also say is that if we add the amendment, the Coastal Act, which I worked on with Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE—he has been a great partner to work with—we actually would be paying for it. We would be paying for it by putting in the coastal resiliency that will prevent the future billions from having to be paid to pick up the pieces after a hurricane hits a populated area.

I will speak again on the floor tomorrow, but I just want to make the point that the Great American Outdoors Act spends billions where we vacation, fixing things that we don't wish to get worse. The Coastal Act does not take away from these billions—these billions that are spent on places where we vacation; these billions spent where people do not live—it just spends millions, a paltry few million trying to add resiliency to where we do live, to where we do work, to where we do create livelihoods not just for ourselves but for others, and that is a fiscally sound, fiscally conservative way to spend dollars. That would save Treasury money, and it would save lives and maybe give people a little extra money to spend in these parks we are spending billions to fix up.

Mr. President, I thank you, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged and the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of PN1704, with the exception of Aziz Younes; that the nominations be confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate resume legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

PN1704

*Ordered*, That the following nominations be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

The following-named Career Members of the Senior Foreign Service of the Depart-

ment of State for promotion within the Senior Foreign Service of the United States of America, Class of Minister-Counselor:

Michael J. Adler, of Maryland  
Aruna S. G. Amirthanayagam, of New York  
Assiya Ashraf-Miller, of Virginia  
Amber Michele Baskette, of the District of Columbia  
Mark J. Biedlingmaier, of Virginia  
Joseph Bookbinder, of Virginia  
Scott Douglas Boswell, of the District of Columbia  
Matthew Gordon Boyse, of the District of Columbia  
Natalie E. Brown, of Virginia  
Mark Joseph Cassayre, of Virginia  
Carol-Anne Chang, of Virginia  
Karen K. W. Choe-Fichte, of Washington  
Eric Scott Cohan, of Florida  
Robin Lisa Dunnigan, of Virginia  
Jewell Elizabeth Evans, of Mississippi  
Steven H. Fagin, of the District of Columbia  
Eric A. Fichte, of Washington  
Karen A. Finer, of the District of Columbia  
Jonathan Fritz, of Virginia  
Joshua D. Glazerooff, of Virginia  
Richard Harris Glenn, of Virginia  
John T. Godfrey, of Virginia  
Jennifer Hall Godfrey, of Virginia  
Ralph A. Hamilton, of Texas  
Michael P. Hankey, of the District of Columbia  
Michael G. Heath, of Virginia  
Robert B. Hilton, of Michigan  
Colleen Anne Hoey, of Virginia  
Paul D. Horowitz, of Virginia  
Edgard Daniel Kagan, of Virginia  
Kristin M. Kane, of California  
Lisa S. Kenna, of Maryland  
George P. Kent, of Virginia  
Yuri Kim, of the District of Columbia  
Adam Duane Lamoreaux, of Virginia  
Kathleen G. Lively, of Virginia  
Theodore J. Lyng, of Virginia  
Meredith Clare McEvoy, of Virginia  
Alan D. Meltzer, of Virginia  
Manuel P. Micaller, of California  
Mitchell R. Moss, of Texas  
Virginia E. Murray, of Maryland  
Courtney Robin Nemroff, of New York  
Robert W. Ogburn, of Maryland  
Kevin M. O'Reilly, of Virginia  
Sandra Springer Oudkirk, of Virginia  
Matthew A. Palmer, of Virginia  
Woodward C. Price, of Virginia  
David Jeremy Ranz, of Maryland  
Joel Richard Reifman, of Florida  
David Dale Reimer, of Virginia  
Hugo F. Rodriguez, of Virginia  
Dominic A. Sabruno, of Virginia  
Micaela A. Schweitzer-Bluhm, of California  
Behzad Shahbazian, of Maryland  
Greg Alan Sherman, of Virginia  
Jefferson D. Smith, of Virginia  
James Broward Story, of Florida  
Ronald W. Stuart, of Virginia  
Gavin A. Sundwall, of the District of Columbia  
Tracy Jo Thomas, of Virginia  
Gregory Dean Thome, of Virginia  
Jennifer S. Tseng, of Colorado  
Heather Catherine Variava, of Virginia  
Steven Craig Walker, of Virginia  
Robert Patrick Waller, of Maryland  
Jan Liam Wasley, of the District of Columbia  
Matthew Alan Weiller, of Virginia  
Scott Weinhold, of Virginia  
Eric Paul Whitaker, of the District of Columbia  
Edward Anthony White, of Virginia  
Thomas Kavon Yazdgerdi, of Virginia  
Hugo Yue Yon, of Maryland  
Joseph Michael Young, of California

The following-named Career Members of the Foreign Service for promotion into the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor:

Eliza F. Al-Laham, of Virginia  
 Jeffrey J. Anderson, of the District of Columbia  
 Sumera Ashruf, of Maryland  
 Natalie A. Baker, of Texas  
 Stephen B. Banks, of the District of Columbia  
 Sarah M. Beran, of the District of Columbia  
 David M. Birdsey, of Maryland  
 Daniel R. Bischof, of Maryland  
 Stephanie L. Bowers, of Virginia  
 John Daniel Boyll, of Texas  
 Clinton S. Brown, of New York  
 Ravi S. Candadai, of Texas  
 Angela M. Cervetti, of Virginia  
 Jeremy A. Cornforth, of Connecticut  
 Kevin T. Covert, of Maryland  
 Sara M. Craig, of Virginia  
 Mark W. Cullinane, of Virginia  
 Richard R. Custin, of the District of Columbia  
 Martin A. Dale, of Virginia  
 Timmy T. Davis, of the District of Columbia  
 Nathaniel P. Dean, of the District of Columbia  
 Isabella Detwiler, of Maryland  
 Matthew Steven Dolbow, of the District of Columbia  
 Karen L. Enstrom, of the District of Columbia  
 Susan K. Falatko, of Virginia  
 Cheryl L. Fernandes, of Virginia  
 Vernelle T. Fitzpatrick, of Virginia  
 Kathryn L. Flachsbart, of Virginia  
 Aaron P. Forsberg, of Maryland  
 Natasha S. Franceschi, of the District of Columbia  
 David J. Gainer, of Virginia  
 Susan P. Garro, of the District of Columbia  
 Jeffrey G. Giauque, of Virginia  
 Nikolas E. Granger, of Washington  
 Robert J. Greenan, of the District of Columbia  
 Ragini Gupta, of Maryland  
 Timothy Michael Hanway, of Maryland  
 Joshua M. Harris, of Virginia  
 Leslie M. Hayden, of Florida  
 James Denver Herren, of Virginia  
 Irvin Hicks, of Maryland  
 John J. Hill, of Virginia  
 Patricia L. Hoffman, of Virginia  
 Neil W. Hop, of Washington  
 Jayne A. Howell, of the District of Columbia  
 Matthew C. Hurley, of Virginia  
 Belinda Jackson Farrier, of Virginia  
 Rahima Kandahari, of Virginia  
 Jon C. Karber, of Virginia  
 Matthew E. Keene, of Virginia  
 Thomas A. Kelsey, of Maryland  
 Daniel B. King, of Delaware  
 Robert T. Koepcke, of Virginia  
 Rachna S. Korhonen, of New Jersey  
 Judy H. Kuo, of Maryland  
 Deborah Y. Larson, of Virginia  
 Joann M. Lockard, of Virginia  
 Peter W. Lord, of Florida  
 Margaret R. MacCallum, of Virginia  
 Denise M. Marsh, of Virginia  
 Charles Kent May, of California  
 Graham D. Mayer, of Virginia  
 Erin Cathleen McConaha, of New York  
 Kara C. McDonald, of Virginia  
 Joseph B. Mellott, of Florida  
 David Jose Mico, of Virginia  
 Jenifer Heather Moore, of the District of Columbia  
 David Muniz, of Virginia  
 Matthew Murray, of Maryland  
 Shane I. Myers, of Virginia  
 Margaret H. Nardi, of Virginia  
 Rebecca Hoisington Neff, of Virginia

Jeremey M. Neitzke, of Virginia  
 Rohit S. Nepal, of Maryland  
 George A. Noll, of Maryland  
 John D. Nylin, of Virginia  
 Erika A. Olson, of Washington  
 Paul Evans Poletes, of Virginia  
 Mustafa M. Popal, of the District of Columbia  
 Elizabeth Caruso Power, of Virginia  
 Gautam A. Rana, of the District of Columbia  
 Judith Ravin, of Virginia  
 Jason P. Rebholz, of the District of Columbia  
 Anneliese L. Reinemeyer, of Virginia  
 Wendy Crook Ryde, of Virginia  
 Mark A. Schapiro, of New York  
 John Paul Schutte, of Virginia  
 Alice Fugate Seddon, of Texas  
 Marc L. Shaw, of Florida  
 Andrew K. Sherr, of Colorado  
 Alison Shorter-Lawrence, of Virginia  
 Brian A. Shott, of Virginia  
 Lonnie Reece Smyth, of Texas  
 Vincent D. Spera, of Virginia  
 Terry Steers-Gonzalez, of Alabama  
 Mark E. Stroh, of Pennsylvania  
 Michael A. Sullivan, of Tennessee  
 Sherry Z. Sykes, of Florida  
 Sarah Olivia Takats, of Virginia  
 Victoria J. Taylor, of the District of Columbia  
 Elia E. Tello, of North Dakota  
 Nicole Dawn Theriot, of the District of Columbia  
 Robert W. Thomas, of the District of Columbia  
 Elizabeth K. Trudeau, of New Hampshire  
 Scott C. Walker, of Virginia  
 Paul S. Watzlavick, of Virginia  
 Richard Tsutomu Yoneoka, of Virginia  
 Earl J. Zimmerman, of Virginia

The following-named Career Members of the Foreign Service for promotion into the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, and a Consular Officer and a Secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Mark R. Brandt, of Virginia  
 Steven Robert Brda, of Florida  
 Kelly S. Briden, of Florida  
 Bart L. Brown, of Virginia  
 Mark J. Davis, of Virginia  
 Otto Frederick Dickman, of Utah  
 William B. Gannon, of Massachusetts  
 Ralph A. Gaspard, of Virginia  
 Christopher J. Gillis, of Florida  
 Misty S. Knotts, of Virginia  
 Charles J. Lilly, of the District of Columbia  
 Michael R. Lombardo, of Virginia  
 James G. Martin, of Florida  
 Shane C. Pierce, of Virginia  
 Michael J. Regal, of Virginia  
 Thomas E. Richardson, of Virginia  
 Michael Stuart Ross, of Maryland  
 Tanya S. Sears, of North Carolina  
 Sean A. Sirker, of Virginia  
 Elaine S. Tiang-Chu, of Virginia  
 Mark Vanelli, of Massachusetts  
 Kevin L. Waggoner, of Missouri  
 Ivan M. Watson, of Virginia  
 Ivan A. Wray, of the District of Columbia

#### 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.

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

#### TRIBUTE TO DR. BRIAN MONAHAN

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 led 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 Health Services and has 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 but especially 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.



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

[From the New York Times, May 16, 2020]

DOCTOR TO CONGRESS AND SUPREME COURT  
TOILS TO SIDESTEP POLITICS AMID PANDEMIC

DR. BRIAN P. MONAHAN HAS FOUND HIMSELF IN THE MIDDLE OF POLITICIZED DEBATES OVER HOW QUICKLY TO REOPEN THE COUNTRY AND WHO SHOULD BE TESTING FOR COVID-19

(By Emily Cochrane)

WASHINGTON.—When Senator John Barrasso, Republican of Wyoming, sought guidance on how to protect his family, including his 94-year-old father-in-law, when he returned home from the nation's capital amid the coronavirus pandemic, a doctor offered him some blunt advice.

Don't go home just yet, Dr. Brian P. Monahan, the attending physician of Congress, told Mr. Barrasso, directing him to quarantine for 14 days before rejoining his family. "You're a visitor," Dr. Monahan said.

But when House Democratic leaders wanted counsel on whether they could safely reconvene in the Capitol with Covid-19 still spreading—a debate with political dimensions as a partisan divide was emerging across the country over how quickly to reopen—Dr. Monahan was less absolute. Returning to Washington carried health risks he would not recommend taking, he told 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 remote voting in the future.

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 completely 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 at marquee hearings—Dr. Monahan has maintained an uncommonly low profile.

He never issued a public statement offering his opinion on whether Congress should reconvene, 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 coronavirus 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 Mitch McConnell, Republican of Kentucky and the 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, has been a calm and professional voice of reason during the pandemic, according to interviews with more than two dozen lawmakers, Capitol officials and medical professionals who know him. They say he has taken a personal interest in his influential clientele, which also includes the nine

Supreme Court justices, even as he fields politically charged questions about reopening, testing and precautionary measures.

Operating out of a nondescript clinic tucked away in the heart 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 a series of videos released 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 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 in any way," Ms. Pelosi said. "He treats us all with respect, and we respect his judgment in return."

Dr. Monahan 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 officer to work out of the Democratic cloakroom 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 doctor's jurisdiction to include its own members, leading to the establishment of the Office of the Attending Physician.

The office provides care to 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 nine "Commandments of Health," including "Accept Inevitables (don't worry)" and "Relax Completely."

Dr. Monahan was born in Connecticut, the son of Irish immigrants who came to the United States in the 1950s. His mother grew up in Kilkee, while his father grew up in a house with a thatched roof without running water or electricity in Lissycasey. 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, enticed in part by the offer of free tuition and a living allowance in exchange for a commitment to three years of service.

"Brian was always the smartest kid in the class," said Dr. William Dahut, a medical oncologist who spent time with him in both medical school and the Navy. "If there was a publication or data, Brian knew that data and knew that well."

In 1989, as a resident in the cardiology ward in what was then the National Naval Medical Center in Bethesda, Md., he treated a 39-year-old woman for potentially fatal cardiac arrhythmias. The patient had taken the popular antihistamine Seldane, and his contribution to research on that medicine—and its connection to the arrhythmias—later helped lead to its removal from the market.

Dr. Monahan rose through the ranks of the Navy, becoming a professor of medicine and pathology at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences in Maryland, as well as participating in a number of national organizations related to cancer, oncology and hematology.

While serving as the Chairman of the Department of Medicine at the university, he received a call for a meeting in which officials with congressional leadership asked him to become the attending physician on Capitol Hill when his predecessor retired.

He has since become a fixture on Capitol Hill, participating in congressional trips and functions and releasing health assessments for presidential and vice-presidential contenders, including Senators Bernie Sanders, the Vermont independent, and Tim Kaine, Democrat of Virginia. (Mr. Kaine also asked him for "a tuneup" before hiking the Virginia section of the Appalachian Trail.)

In 2016, it was Dr. Monahan's assessment of Justice Antonin Scalia's health at the time of his death—including sleep apnea, coronary artery disease, obesity and diabetes—that influenced the decision to decline an autopsy of the justice. The Associated Press reported at the time.

"He was 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 vista 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 AWARDS

● Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I want to recognize four talented 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. Hosted 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; Ashlynn



Hartsell, Artwork Title: "Heart Sunset," 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 will visit my State offices 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:

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

Our country's federal prison system is stuck in an ethical rut. We seem to focus on securing institutions and confining offenders like savage dogs in a pound to "protect the public," and disregard the fact that 44,000 prisoners return to society each year. 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 press pause on their potential harm to society until their release. Currently, we have one of the highest prison populations in the world. Unless we plan to incarcerate all convicts for life, our approach to detainment should shift from 'prison' to 'rehabilitation', focusing on equipping prisoners with the skills to be mentally stable and financially and lawfully successful.

To do so, all prisoners should not only have access to academic resources, but be re-

quired to attend a set number of courses each year. Just a few decades ago, Finland had one of the highest imprisonment rates in Europe. Because of this, researchers started investigating its cause. They concluded that punishment does not help reduce crime. As a result, Finland began 'decarceration,' which was better for the prisoners and crime rates didn't increase. Without teaching prisoners skills or continuing their education, we merely take them out of their lives and throw them back with no change, and no basis to be stable in any realm.

In the United States, prisoners have a higher likelihood of returning to illegal markets and returning to prison. As of October 2017, the BOP found that only 32 percent 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 time. However, even for this requirement alone, there is a stoppage to access the program due to overflow of over 16,000 inmates—that's a lot of potential students. Plus, although mock job and resume builder courses are offered, inmates do not take advantage of them—even with the knowledge that 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 courses. Consequently the recidivism rate will reduce, decreasing our total prison population, and lower the overall government spending on imprisonment as a whole. By treating inmates like humans in their time of rehabilitation, with a lower recidivism rate, we more confidently ensure public safety when 44,000 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 mental health 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 a 2017 study by the American Foundation for Suicide Prevention (AFSP), suicide is the 10th leading cause of death in the U.S.

Paula Clayton, medical director of AFSP, states that 90% of youth that kill themselves have a treatable psychiatric disorder. She explains that even in suicide clusters, there's almost always an underlying disorder, whether it's due to at-home issues or anything else that may be going on, suicide is the last straw. From this information we can gather that mental health is a big part of losing students to suicide. There are several steps that can be taken to ensure that our youth are getting the help they need.

First of all, mental health professionals on campus is a priority. If funds are an issue, as they usually are, fundraisers are always an option. Schools tend to raise funds for their athletic and music departments, as well as others, but typically not for mental health. Money can be raised in fundraisers not unlike the ones that are used to raise money for extracurricular activities. This way mental health professionals can be on campus for students to speak with at any time, and hav-

ing the money for this wouldn't be such an issue. Fundraising aside, mental health services are important enough to be state/government-funded.

Another step that can be taken is the steady normalization of mental health discussions. In society today as a whole mental health is a touchy topic. But with proper approach, these conversations can be normalized so that people are comfortable asking for help without being faced with stereotypes or fear of judgment. This can start with general annual assemblies about the topic and good coverage of the topic in classes. Even a unit in health classes or professionals coming in to speak with students on the subject for a few days can be beneficial.

In a lot of cases, a student will end their life and it will result in suicide clusters, or what is more commonly known as 'copycat suicides'. It's like a trigger that sets off a line of students attempting suicide after another student succeeds. If there is ever a situation in a community where someone ends their life, schoolwide mental health screenings are crucial. There are many non-profit organizations that offer screening kits that ultimately lower suicide rates. These kits usually include short, non-diagnostic screens for signs of depression and suicide that could even be beneficial as an annual subject. These are usually completely anonymous and encourage students to seek help.

Mental health issues are undoubtedly crucial in our youth today. There are several ways we as a country can improve the quality of mental health services in our schools for a brighter future for our generation.

THIRD PLACE, MAYA MARCY, LONG TRAIL SCHOOL, JUNIOR

For many, college is a liberating opportunity to further one's academic career and pursue a lifelong passion, as well as create a substantial base to obtain an income and begin life in adulthood. As well, with the increasingly competitive workforce, a college degree is almost mandatory to make a living wage. However, accessibility to attend a post-high school institution continues to prove difficult for not only marginalized groups, but also students coming from the middle class. This difficulty arises from the injustice embedded within the education system, a lack of government responsibility, and the senseless and excessive cost attributed to college in the present day.

According to the National Center for Education Statistics, undergraduate enrollment in any post-secondary educational institution has increased from 53% to 94% in just 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 reason, 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 an astonishing \$750 billion. To put facts along with numbers, with a little over 10% of the entirety of the military spending budget—approximately \$80 billion—the United States could cover the cost of public 4-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. We are fortunate enough in the United States to have 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, regardless of their upbringing. 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-Aminocyclopropane-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 14Ab-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; North Dakota; Revisions to Permitting Rules" (FRL No. 10010-33-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 2010 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; Columbia Falls, Kalispell and Libby PM10 Nonattainment Area Limited Maintenance 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-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 Maintenance Plans for 1997 Ozone NAAQS; Door County, Kewaunee County, Manitowoc County, and Milwaukee-Racine Area" (FRL No. 10009-87-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 Rule" (FRL No. 10009-80-OW) 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 Regulations and Policy Management

Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Tobacco Products; Required Warnings for Cigarette Packages and Advertisements; Delayed Effective Date" (RIN0910-AI39) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 4, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4786. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Food Additives Permitted in Feed and Drinking Water of Animals; Silicon Dioxide" (Docket No. FDA-2019-F-3911) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 4, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4787. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits" (29 CFR Part 4022) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4788. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits" (29 CFR Part 4022) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4789. A communication from the Agency Representative, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Patent Term Adjustment Reductions in View of the Federal Circuit Decision in *Supernus Pharm., Inc. v. Iancu*" (RIN0651-AD38) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2020; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4790. A communication from the Chairman of the Office of Proceedings, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Demurrage Billing Requirements" (RIN2140-AB47) (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-4791. A communication from the Chairman of the Office of Proceedings, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Policy Statement on Demurrage and Accessorial Rules and Charges" (Docket No. EP 757) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 20, 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, Revision of the Public Notice Requirements of Section 73.3580, Second Report and Order" (FCC 20-65) (MB Docket Nos. 17-264, 17-105, 05-6) 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 Chief of Staff, Media 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 Radio Auxiliary Special Broadcast and Other Program” ((FCC 20-53) (MB Docket Nos. 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, International Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “In the Matter of Mitigation of Orbital Debris in the New Space Age” ((FCC 20-54) (IB 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-4795. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, 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 of the Senate on May 19, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4796. A communication from the Program Analyst, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Review of the Commission’s Rules Governing the 896-901/935-940 MHz Bands” ((FCC 20-67) (WT Docket No. 17-200)) 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 Deputy Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Improving Public Safety Communications in the 800 MHz Band” ((FCC 20-61) (WT Docket No. 02-55)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4798. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Creation of Interstitial 12.5 KiloHertz Channels in the 800 MHz Band Between 809-817/854-862 MHz” ((FCC 20-62) (WT Docket No. 15-32)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4799. A communication from the Program Analyst, International Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “In the Matter of Amendment of Parts 2 and 25 of the Commission’s Rules to Facilitate the Use of Earth Stations in Motion Communicating with Geostationary Orbit Space Stations in Frequency Bands Allocated to the Fixed Satellite Service and Facilitating the Communications of Earth Stations in Motion with Non-Geostationary Orbit Space Stations” ((FCC 20-66) (IB Docket No. 17-95)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4800. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees for Fiscal Year 2020; Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees for Fiscal Year 2019” ((FCC 20-64) (MD Docket Nos. 20-105, and 19-105)) 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-4801. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Enforcement Bureau, 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 Pallone-Thune Telephone Robocall Abuse Criminal Enforcement and Deterrence Act (TRACED Act)” ((DA-460) 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-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 “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. 18-295)) 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 Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Great Lakes Pilotage Rates-2020 Annual Review and Revisions to Methodology” ((RIN1625-AC56) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0736)) 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-4804. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Security Zone; Potomac River, Montgomery County, Maryland” ((RIN1625-AA87) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0448)) 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-4805. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “TWIC-Reader Requirements; Delay of Effective Date” ((RIN1625-AC47) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0711)) 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-4806. A communication from the Associate Administrator for Policy, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Hours of Service of Drivers” ((RIN2126-AC19) 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.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-202. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Louisiana recognizing Tuesday, April 7, 2020, as the first annual “World Trade Day” at the state capitol; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

#### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 18

Whereas, Louisiana is home to the world’s first World Trade Center, which originated

as the “International House” in New Orleans more than seventy-five years ago in 1943, and has since inspired a global network of over three hundred world trade centers in more than one hundred countries; and

Whereas, the World Trade Center of New Orleans, a nonprofit organization, is committed to fostering economic development throughout the state of Louisiana by advocating for international trade objectives that bolster efficiencies, opportunities, and innovations for commerce; and

Whereas, having increased exports by sixty-one percent from 2008 to 2018, Louisiana is the fifth largest state exporter of goods in the United States, and Louisiana exports currently account for more than one quarter of the state’s total economic output; and

Whereas, the latest available data from the United States Trade Representative shows that Louisiana exports support an estimated 129,000 jobs and that such jobs pay up to 18 percent above the national average; and

Whereas, Louisiana produces the majority of U.S. LNG exported globally, and according to LSU’s Center for Energy Studies, Louisiana LNG projects could total nearly \$100 billion in capital investment and add 20,000 new construction jobs and 1,500 new full-time jobs at Louisiana terminals once completed; and

Whereas, key economic-driving and job-creating industries in the state, including aerospace, agribusiness, automotive, energy, manufacturing, and process industries, rely on international commerce; and

Whereas, Louisiana’s geographical positioning allows the state to take unique advantage of the Mississippi River to enhance competitiveness in global trade, making current and future investment in the infrastructure of the Mississippi essential to continued commercial success; and

Whereas, Louisiana ports are among the highest-performing in the country, with the following ports designated as national “power ports”: Port of South Louisiana (No. 1), Port of New Orleans (No. 4), Port of Baton Rouge (No. 8), Plaquemines Port (No. 11), and Port of Lake Charles (No. 12); and

Whereas, Louisiana has the tactical advantage of being the only state with a deepwater port (Port of New Orleans) served by six of the seven Class I railroads, which comprise a 132,000 plus mile network of track and tie the port community and local industries directly to every major North American market; and

Whereas, the world recognizes Louisiana as a key trade and investment destination for international companies, with the state attracting more foreign direct investment per capita than any other since 2008; and

Whereas, the state of Louisiana formally acknowledged the essential role of trade in 2012 by establishing the Louisiana Board of International Commerce to advance the state’s competitive position in the global marketplace through continued attraction of foreign and domestic investment and enhancement of the state’s trade-based economy; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby recognize Tuesday, April 7, 2020, as “World Trade Day” at the state capitol, celebrates the longstanding, indispensable influence of international commerce on Louisiana’s economic health, vitality, and growth, and expresses support for the mission of the World Trade Center of New Orleans and for trade policies that benefit American consumers and businesses and ensure the United States remains competitive in global commerce; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the secretary of the United States Senate, the clerk of the United States House of Representatives, each member of

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 8, 2022.

\*Catherine Bird, of Texas, to be General Counsel of the Federal Labor Relations Authority for a term of five years.

\*Craig Edward Leen, 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 8, 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. 3928. 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. SCHATZ, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

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. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. RISCH, 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. BOOKER, Mr. MARKEY, 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 Vice 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 amend 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. 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):

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 Federal antitrust 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 Maine (Ms. 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 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. 2916

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2916, 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.

S. 3296

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.

S. 3350

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.

S. 3393

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.

S. 3637

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3637, 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.

S. 3747

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3747, a bill to help charitable nonprofit 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.

S. 3799

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 Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3799, a bill to expand access to health care services, including sexual, repro-

ductive, and maternal health services, for immigrants by removing legal and policy barriers to health insurance coverage, and for other purposes.

S. 3898

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.

S. 3902

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3902, 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.

S. 3903

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.

S. RES. 502

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 landing on the Japanese island of Iwo Jima during World War II and the raisings of the flag of the United States on Mount Suribachi.

S. RES. 509

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.

S. RES. 567

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.

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.

## 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:

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 lynch 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 uphold the law;

Whereas law enforcement officers who abuse their positions, engage in corruption, employ excessive force, or exhibit bias betray 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 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 understaffed police departments and undertrained police officers increase the risk of encounters that result in the use of force, including unjustifiable or excessive 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

*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. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINÉ, 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. 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.

SA 1624. Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, and Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1625. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. REED, Mr. COONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. KAINÉ, 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. 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. BENNETT, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINÉ, 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. MARKEY, 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 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. 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. BENNETT, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINÉ, 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. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, 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, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINÉ, 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. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, supra.

SA 1628. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1957, supra.

SA 1629. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1628 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 1957, supra.

SA 1630. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1957, supra.

SA 1631. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1630 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 1957, supra.

SA 1632. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1631 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 1630 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 1957, 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, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINÉ, 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. MARKEY, 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 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, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINÉ, 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.

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, 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. 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. 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. KAINÉ, 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. MARKEY, 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 1636. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1637. 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 by him to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

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. 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. KAINÉ, 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. MARKEY, 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 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. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINÉ, 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.



SA 1650. 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. 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, 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, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

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. 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. 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, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

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. 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. 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, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1653. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1654. Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. INHOFE, 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. 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, 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. MARKEY, 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 1655. Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARD-

NER (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, 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. MARKEY, 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 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. 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, 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. MARKEY, 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 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. 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. 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, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

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. 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. 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, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1659. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her 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. 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, 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. 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:

At the end, add the following:

### SEC. 4. OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES.

(a) GULF OF MEXICO OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES.—

(1) DEFINITION OF QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES.—Section 102(9)(A) of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109-432) is amended—

(A) in clause (i)(II), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(B) in clause (ii)—

(i) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking “fiscal year 2017 and each fiscal year thereafter” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2017 through 2020”; and

(ii) in subclause (III), by striking the period and inserting “; and”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) in the case of fiscal year 2021 and each fiscal year thereafter, all rentals, royalties, bonus bids, and other sums due and payable to the United States received on or after October 1, 2020, from leases entered into on or after October 1, 2000, for—

“(I) the 181 Area;

“(II) the 181 South Area; and

“(III) the 2002-2007 planning area.”.

(2) ELIMINATION OF LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF DISTRIBUTED QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES.—Section 105 of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109-432) is amended by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following:

“(f) LIMITATIONS ON AMOUNT OF DISTRIBUTED QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES.—

“(1) LIMITATIONS.—

“(A) FISCAL YEARS 2016 THROUGH 2020.—Subject to paragraph (2), the total amount of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues made available under subsection (a)(2) shall not exceed—

“(i) \$500,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2019; and

“(ii) \$650,000,000 for fiscal year 2020.

“(B) FISCAL YEARS 2021 THROUGH 2055.—Subject to paragraph (2), the total amount of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues made available under subsection (a)(2)(B) shall not exceed \$125,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2055.

“(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 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 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 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(a) of the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act (16 U.S.C. 7503(a)).”

(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—

(I) all or part of which lies within the coastal zone (as defined in section 304 of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1453)) of the State; and

(II) 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

(ii) a municipal subdivision of the State that is determined by the State to be a significant staging area for oil and gas servicing, supply vessels, operations, suppliers, or workers.

(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 all revenues derived from all rentals, royalties, bonus bids, and other sums due and payable to the United States

from energy development in the Alaska outer Continental Shelf region.

(ii) EXCLUSIONS.—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, civil penalties, 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 deposit—

(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 under paragraph (2) for the applicable fiscal year shall be made available in accordance with that paragraph during the fiscal year immediately following the applicable fiscal year.

(5) AUTHORIZED USES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the State shall use all amounts received under paragraph (2)(B) 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 build healthy and resilient communities.

(v) Installation and operation of energy systems to reduce energy costs and greenhouse gas emissions compared to systems in use as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(vi) Programs at institutions of higher education in the State.

(vii) Other purposes, as determined by the Governor of the State, with approval from the State legislature.

(viii) Planning assistance and the administrative costs of complying with this subsection.

(B) LIMITATION.—Not more than 3 percent of amounts received by the State under paragraph (2)(B) may be used for the purposes described in subparagraph (A)(viii).

(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.

## SEC. 5. 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. 7501) 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 (7), by striking “has the meaning given that term pursuant to” and inserting “means a ‘tidal shoreline’ or a ‘Great Lake shoreline’, as those terms are used in”.

(b) NATIONAL OCEANS AND COASTAL SECURITY FUND.—Section 904 of the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act (16 U.S.C. 7503) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “and jointly manage” after “establish”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Fund shall consist of such amounts as—

“(A) are deposited in the Fund under section 105(f)(3)(B) of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109-432);

“(B) are deposited in the Fund under subparagraph (C)(ii)(I)(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.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the amounts deposited into, and amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for, the Fund for each fiscal year—

“(A) not more than 75 percent may be used for the award of grants under section 906(b);

“(B) not more than 20 percent may be used for the award of grants under section 906(c); and

“(C) not more than 5 percent may be used by the Administrator and the Foundation for administrative expenses to carry out this title.

“(2) LIMITATION.—If less than \$50,000,000 is deposited into, or appropriated or otherwise made available for, the Fund for a fiscal year, in that fiscal year—

“(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 between the Administrator and the Foundation pursuant to an agreement reached and documented by both the Administrator and the Foundation.”; and

(4) in subsection (e)(2), by striking “section 906(a)(1)” and inserting “section 906(a)”.

(C) ELIGIBLE USES OF AMOUNTS IN THE NATIONAL OCEANS AND COASTAL SECURITY FUND.—Section 905 of the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act (16 U.S.C. 7504) is amended to read as follows:

**“SEC. 905. ELIGIBLE USES.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Amounts in the Fund may be allocated by the Administrator and the Foundation to support programs and activities carried out by States, local governments, Indian tribes, regional and interstate collaboratives such as regional ocean partnerships, nongovernmental organizations, public-private 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 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) 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 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 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 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);

(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 90 days after funds are deposited into the Fund and made available to the Administrator and the Foundation for adminis-

trative purposes, the Administrator and the Foundation shall establish the following:”;

(C) in subparagraph (A), by striking “such subsections” and inserting “this section”;

(D) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) Selection 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) under subsection (c) to entities including States, local governments, Indian tribes, regional and interstate collaboratives such as regional ocean partnerships, nongovernmental organizations, public-private partnerships, and academic institutions.”;

(F) in subparagraph (D), by striking “Performance accountability and monitoring” and inserting “Performance, accountability, and monitoring”; and

(G) 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 on the basis of the ratio of tidal shoreline miles in a coastal State to the tidal shoreline miles of all coastal States.

“(C) 25 percent of available amounts shall be allocated on the basis of the ratio of 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 will use in allocating amounts received under this subsection, which shall include—

“(I) a description of the relative roles in the State process of—

“(aa) the State coastal 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 (33 U.S.C. 1122)), 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 all applicable competitive bidding and audit requirements.

“(iv) Procedures to make publicly available on the internet a list of all projects and programs receiving amounts under this subsection that includes, at a minimum—

“(I) an identification of each entity receiving amounts under this subsection;

“(II) the amount of funds received by each such entity;

“(III) a description of each such project and program; and

“(IV) 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 date of the enactment of the Great American Outdoors Act in which the Administrator awards grants under this subsection—

“(i) a plan approved under this paragraph shall not be required; and

“(ii) a coastal State may use amounts received under this subsection to develop a plan under this paragraph to receive funding in future years.

“(4) 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.

“(5) 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

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(B)—

(i) in clause (ii), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(ii) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (iv); and

(iii) by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

“(iii) nongovernmental organizations; and”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) 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 from non-Federal sources to match the amount of the grant.

“(4) EXCLUSION OF FUNDS FROM LIMITATION.—The amount of a grant awarded under this subsection shall not count toward the limitation under subsection (b)(2) on funding to coastal States through grants awarded under subsection (b).”.

(e) 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 by striking “Subject to” and all that follows through “the Foundation” and inserting the following: “Not later than 60 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Administrator and the Foundation”.

(f) REPEAL OF AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2017, 2018, AND 2019.—Section 908 of the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act (16 U.S.C. 7507) is repealed.

(g) EXTENSION OF CONSTITUTION, LAWS, AND JURISDICTION OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENERGY FACILITIES AND DEVICES ON THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF.—Section 4(a)(1) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1333(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “or producing or supporting the production of energy from sources other than oil and gas” before “, or any such installation”;

(2) by inserting “or transmitting energy” after “transporting such resources”; and

(3) in the proviso, by inserting “and other energy” after “That mineral”.

(h) **PARITY 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—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “(A) The Secretary” and inserting the following: “(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C), the Secretary”;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking “(B) The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(B) **DISPOSITION OF REVENUES FOR PROJECTS LOCATED WITHIN 3 NAUTICAL MILES SEAWARD OF STATE SUBMERGED LAND.**—The Secretary”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) **DISPOSITION OF REVENUES FOR 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-powered electric 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 established under section 904(a) of the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act (16 U.S.C. 7503(a)); and

“(cc) 37.5 percent shall be deposited in a special account in the Treasury, from which the Secretary, subject to subclause (II), 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 inversely proportional to the respective distances between—

“(AA) the point on the coastline of each eligible State that is closest to the geographic center of the applicable 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 in accordance 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).

“(v) **ADMINISTRATION.**—Subject to clause (vi)(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.

“(vi) **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)(cc) for the succeeding fiscal year shall be deposited in the National Oceans and Coastal Security Fund established under section 904(a) of the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act (16 U.S.C. 7503(a)).”

(i) **EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS FROM SEQUESTRATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 255(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 (28–0404–0–1–651),” the following:

“Payments to States pursuant to subparagraph (C)(ii)(I)(cc) of section 8(p)(2) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(p)(2)).”

(2) **APPLICABILITY.**—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. 900 et seq.) on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

**SA 1624.** Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, and Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her 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. . DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL HERITAGE AREAS.**

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **LOCAL COORDINATING ENTITY.**—The term “local coordinating entity” means the entity designated by Congress—

(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 a component of the National Heritage Area System described in subsection (b)(2).

(3) **NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA SYSTEM.**—The term “National Heritage Area System” means the system established by subsection (b)(1).

(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 included on the most recent list published by the Secretary pursuant to section 104 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 5131).

(b) **NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA SYSTEM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—To recognize certain areas of the United States that tell nationally significant stories and to conserve, enhance, and interpret those nationally significant stories and the natural, historic, scenic, and cultural resources of areas that illustrate significant aspects of the heritage of the United States, there is established a National Heritage Area System through the administration of which the Secretary may provide technical and financial assistance to local coordinating entities to support the establishment, development, and continuity of the National Heritage Areas.

(2) **NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA SYSTEM.**—The National Heritage Area System shall be composed of—

(A) each National Heritage Area, National Historic District, National Heritage Corridor, National Heritage Canalway, Cultural Heritage Corridor, and National Heritage Partnership designated by Congress before or on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) each National Heritage Area designated by Congress after the date of enactment of this Act, unless the law designating the area exempts that area from the National Heritage Area System by specific reference to this section.

(3) **RELATIONSHIP TO THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM.**—

(A) **RELATIONSHIP TO NATIONAL PARK UNITS.**—The Secretary shall—

(i) ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, participation and assistance by any administrator of a unit of the National Park System that is located near or encompassed by a National Heritage Area in local initiatives for the National Heritage Area to conserve and interpret resources consistent with the applicable management plan for the National Heritage Area; and

(ii) work with local coordinating entities to promote public enjoyment of units of the National Park System and National Park-related resources.

(B) **TREATMENT.**—A National Heritage Area shall not be—

(i) considered to be a unit of the National Park System; or

(ii) subject to the authorities applicable to units of the National Park System.

(4) **DUTIES.**—Under the National Heritage Area System, the Secretary shall—

(A) review and approve or disapprove the management plan for a National Heritage Area in accordance with subsection (c)(3); and

(B) submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the

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 (f) 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; and

(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 coordinating entities; and

(F) provide national oversight, analysis, coordination, technical and financial assistance, and support to ensure consistency and accountability of the National Heritage Area System.

(C) **DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL HERITAGE AREAS.**—

(1) **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—

(I) by the Secretary, in consultation with State and local historic preservation officers, State and local historical societies, State and local tourism offices, and other appropriate organizations and governmental agencies; or

(II) 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)(II), 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—

(I) represent distinctive aspects of the heritage of the United States;

(II) are worthy of recognition, conservation, interpretation, and continuing use; and

(III) would be best managed—

(aa) through partnerships among public and private entities; and

(bb) by linking diverse and sometimes noncontiguous resources and active communities;

(ii) reflects traditions, customs, beliefs, and folklore that are a valuable part of the story of the United States;

(iii) provides outstanding opportunities—

(I) to conserve natural, historic, cultural, or scenic features; and

(II) for recreation and education;

(iv) contains resources that—

(I) are important to any identified themes of the proposed National Heritage Area; and

(II) retain a degree of integrity capable of supporting interpretation;

(v) includes residents, business interests, nonprofit organizations, and State and local governments that—

(I) are involved in the planning of the proposed National Heritage Area;

(II) have developed a conceptual financial plan that outlines the roles of all participants in the proposed National Heritage Area, including the Federal Government; and

(III) have demonstrated support for the designation of the proposed National Heritage Area;

(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) has a conceptual boundary map that is supported by the public.

(D) **REPORT.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—For each study carried out under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall 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 describes—

(I) the findings of the study; and

(II) any conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary.

(ii) **TIMING.**—

(I) **STUDIES CARRIED OUT BY THE SECRETARY.**—With respect to a study carried out by the Secretary in accordance with subparagraph (B)(i)(I), the Secretary shall submit a report under clause (i) not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are first made available to carry out the study.

(II) **STUDIES CARRIED OUT BY OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES.**—With respect to a study carried out by interested individuals or entities in accordance with subparagraph (B)(i)(II), the Secretary shall submit a report under clause (i) not later than 180 days after the date on which the Secretary certifies under subparagraph (B)(ii) that the study meets the requirements of subparagraph (C).

(2) **DESIGNATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—An area may be designated as a National Heritage Area only by an Act of Congress.

(B) **DESIGNATION.**—On receipt of a report under paragraph (1)(D) recommending the designation of a proposed National Heritage Area as a National Heritage Area, Congress may designate—

(i) as a National Heritage Area the proposed National Heritage Area that is the subject of the relevant feasibility study; and

(ii) a local coordinating entity to operate the National Heritage Area.

(C) **TREATMENT AS COMPONENT OF NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA SYSTEM.**—A National Heritage Area designated under subparagraph (B)(i) shall be a component of the National Heritage Area System, unless the law designating the National Heritage Area exempts the National Heritage Area from the National Heritage Area System through a specific reference to this section.

(3) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The applicable local coordinating entity shall develop a management plan for a National Heritage Area in accordance with subparagraph (B).

(B) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The management plan for a National Heritage Area shall—

(i) be developed using a comprehensive planning approach that includes—

(I) opportunities for stakeholders (such as community members, local and regional governments, Tribal governments, businesses, nonprofit organizations, and others)—

(aa) to be involved in the planning process; and

(bb) to 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;

(bb) the stakeholders involved in the process; and

(cc) the timing and method of stakeholder involvement;

(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;

(iii) identify comprehensive goals, strategies, policies, and recommendations for—

(I) demonstrating the heritage represented by the National Heritage Area; and

(II) encouraging long-term resource protection, enhancement, interpretation, and development;

(iv) include recommendations for ways in which Federal, State, Tribal government, and local entities may best be coordinated, including the role of the National Park Service and other Federal agencies associated with the National Heritage Area, to advance the purposes of this section;

(v) describe a strategy by which the local coordinating entity will achieve financial sustainability;

(vi) include an implementation program that identifies, with respect to the National Heritage Area—

(I) prioritized actions and criteria for selecting future projects;

(II) existing and potential sources of funding;

(III) performance goals;

(IV) the means by which stakeholders will be involved; and

(V) the manner in which the management plan will be evaluated and updated;

(vii) include a business plan for the local coordinating entity that, at a minimum, addresses management and operation, products or services offered, the target market for those products and services, and revenue streams; and

(viii) be submitted to the Secretary for approval by not later than 3 years after the date on which the National Heritage Area is designated by Congress under paragraph (2).

(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.**—

(1) **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 each 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) accomplishing the purposes of the applicable National Heritage Area; and

(ii) achieving the goals and objectives of the management plan;

(B) analyze Federal, State, local, Tribal government, and private investments in the National Heritage Area to determine the leverage and impact of the investments; and

(C) review the management structure, partnership relationships, and funding of the National Heritage Area for purposes of identifying the critical components for sustainability of the National Heritage Area.

(3) **RECOMMENDATIONS.**—Each report under paragraph (1)(B) shall include—

(A) if the report contains a recommendation of the Secretary that Federal funding for the applicable National Heritage Area should be continued, an analysis of—

(i) any means by which that Federal funding may be reduced or eliminated over time; and

(ii) the appropriate time period necessary to achieve the recommended reduction or elimination of Federal funding; or

(B) if the report contains a recommendation of the Secretary that Federal funding for the applicable National Heritage Area should be eliminated, a description of potential impacts on conservation, interpretation, and sustainability in the applicable National Heritage Area.

(4) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 3052(a) of Public Law 113-291 (54 U.S.C. 320101 note) is amended by striking paragraph (2).

(e) **PROPERTY OWNERS AND REGULATORY PROTECTIONS.**—Nothing in this section—

(1) abridges any right of a public or private property owner, including the right to refrain from participating in any plan, project, program, or activity conducted within a National Heritage Area;

(2) requires any property owner to permit public access (including Federal, State, Tribal government, or local government access) to a property;

(3) modifies any provision of Federal, State, Tribal, or local law with respect to public access or use of private land;

(4)(A) alters any applicable land use regulation, land use plan, or other regulatory authority of any Federal, State, or local agency or Tribal government; or

(B) conveys to any local coordinating entity any land use or other regulatory authority;

(5) authorizes or implies the reservation or appropriation of water or water rights;

(6) diminishes the authority of a State to manage fish and wildlife, including through the regulation of fishing and hunting within a National Heritage Area in the State; or

(7) creates or affects any liability—

(A) under any other provision of law; or

(B) of any private property owner with respect to any person injured on private property.

(f) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for each fiscal year not more than \$1,000,000 for each National Heritage Area.

(2) **COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.**—

(A) **FEDERAL SHARE.**—Except as otherwise provided in applicable law, including any law designating a National Heritage Area, the Federal share of the total cost of any activity funded with appropriations authorized by paragraph (1) shall be not more than 50 percent.

(B) **FORM OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE.**—The non-Federal share of the total cost of any activity funded with appropriations authorized by paragraph (1) may be in the form of in-kind contributions of goods or services fairly valued.

(3) **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. 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. 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:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. . 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. 7501) 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 (7), by striking “has the meaning given that term pursuant to” and inserting “means a ‘tidal shoreline’ or a ‘Great Lake shoreline’, as those terms are used in”.

(b) **NATIONAL OCEANS AND COASTAL SECURITY FUND.**—Section 904 of the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act (16 U.S.C. 7503) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “and jointly manage” after “establish”; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Fund shall consist of such amounts as—

“(A) are deposited in the Fund under subparagraph (C)(ii)(I)(bb) of section 8(p)(2) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(p)(2)); or

“(B) are appropriated or otherwise made available for the Fund.”;

(3) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

“(d) **EXPENDITURE.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Of the amounts deposited into, and amounts appropriated or oth-

erwise made available for, the Fund for each fiscal year—

“(A) not more than 75 percent may be used for the award of grants under section 906(b);

“(B) not more than 20 percent may be used for the award of grants under section 906(c); and

“(C) not more than 5 percent may be used by the Administrator and the Foundation for administrative expenses to carry out this title.

“(2) **LIMITATION.**—If less than \$50,000,000 is deposited into, or appropriated or otherwise made available for, the Fund for a fiscal year, in that fiscal year—

“(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 between the Administrator and the Foundation pursuant to an agreement reached and documented by both the Administrator and the Foundation.”; and

(4) in subsection (e)(2), by striking “section 906(a)(1)” and inserting “section 906(a)”.

(c) **ELIGIBLE USES OF AMOUNTS IN THE NATIONAL OCEANS AND COASTAL SECURITY FUND.**—Section 905 of the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act (16 U.S.C. 7504) is amended to read as follows:

**“SEC. 905. ELIGIBLE USES.**

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Amounts in the Fund may be allocated by the Administrator and the Foundation to support programs and activities carried out by States, local governments, Indian tribes, regional and interstate collaboratives such as regional ocean partnerships, nongovernmental organizations, public-private 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 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) 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 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 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 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);

(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 90 days after funds are deposited into the Fund and made available to the Administrator and the Foundation for administrative purposes, the Administrator and the Foundation shall establish the following:”;

(C) in subparagraph (A), by striking “such subsections” and inserting “this section”;

(D) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) Selection 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) under subsection (c) to entities including States, local governments, Indian tribes, regional and interstate collaboratives such as regional ocean partnerships, non-governmental organizations, public-private partnerships, and academic institutions.”;

(F) in subparagraph (D), by striking “Performance accountability and monitoring” and inserting “Performance, accountability, and monitoring”; and

(G) 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 on the basis of the ratio of tidal shoreline miles in a coastal State to the tidal shoreline miles of all coastal States.

“(C) 25 percent of available amounts shall be allocated on the basis of the ratio of 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 will use in allocating amounts received under this subsection, which shall include—

“(I) a description of the relative roles in the State process of—

“(aa) the State coastal 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 (33 U.S.C. 1122)), 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 all applicable competitive bidding and audit requirements.

“(iv) Procedures to make publicly available on the internet a list of all projects and programs receiving amounts under this subsection that includes, at a minimum—

“(I) an identification of each entity receiving amounts under this subsection;

“(II) the amount of funds received by each such entity;

“(III) a description of each such project and program; and

“(IV) 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 date of the enactment of the Great American Outdoors Act in which the Administrator awards grants under this subsection—

“(i) a plan approved under this paragraph shall not be required; and

“(ii) a coastal State may use amounts received under this subsection to develop a plan under this paragraph to receive funding in future years.

“(4) 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.

“(5) 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

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(B)—

(i) in clause (ii), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(ii) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (iv); and

(iii) by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

“(iii) nongovernmental organizations; and”;

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) 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 from non-Federal sources to match the amount of the grant.

“(4) EXCLUSION OF FUNDS FROM LIMITATION.—The amount of a grant awarded under this subsection shall not count toward the limitation under subsection (b)(2) on funding to coastal States through grants awarded under subsection (b).”.

(e) 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 by striking “Subject to” and all that follows through “the Foundation” and inserting the following: “Not later than 60 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Administrator and the Foundation”.

(f) REPEAL OF AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2017, 2018, AND 2019.—Section 908 of the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act (16 U.S.C. 7507) is repealed.

(g) EXTENSION OF CONSTITUTION, LAWS, AND JURISDICTION OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENERGY FACILITIES AND DEVICES ON THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF.—Section 4(a)(1) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1333(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “or producing or supporting the production of energy from sources other than oil and gas” before “, or any such installation”;

(2) by inserting “or transmitting energy” after “transporting such resources”; and

(3) in the proviso, by inserting “and other energy” after “That mineral”.

(h) PARITY 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—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “(A) The Secretary” and inserting the following: “(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C), the Secretary”;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking “(B) The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(B) DISPOSITION OF REVENUES FOR PROJECTS LOCATED WITHIN 3 NAUTICAL MILES SEAWARD OF STATE SUBMERGED LAND.—The Secretary”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) DISPOSITION OF REVENUES FOR 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-powered electric 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 established under section 904(a) of the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act (16 U.S.C. 7503(a)); and

“(cc) 37.5 percent shall be deposited in a special account in the Treasury, from which the Secretary, subject to subclause (II), 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 inversely proportional to the respective distances between—

“(AA) the point on the coastline of each eligible State that is closest to the geographic center of the applicable 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 in accordance 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).

“(v) ADMINISTRATION.—Subject to clause (vi)(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.

“(vi) 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)(cc) for the succeeding fiscal year shall be deposited in the National Oceans and Coastal Security Fund established under section 904(a) of the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act (16 U.S.C. 7503(a)).”

(i) EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS FROM SEQUESTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 255(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 (28–0404–0–1–651).” the following:

“Payments to States pursuant to subparagraph (C)(ii)(I)(cc) of section 8(p)(2) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(p)(2)).”

(2) APPLICABILITY.—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. 900 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. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. 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. 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; as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.”

**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, 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. 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; as follows:

Strike “1 day” and insert “2 days”

**SA 1628.** Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment 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:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment.”

**SA 1629.** Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1628 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL 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”

**SA 1630.** Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment 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:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 5 days after the date of enactment.”

**SA 1631.** Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1630 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL 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 “5 days” and insert “6 days”

**SA 1632.** Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1631 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the amendment SA 1630 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL 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 “6 days” and insert “7 days”

**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, 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. 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:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . MORATORIUM ON OIL AND GAS LEASING IN CERTAIN AREAS OF GULF OF MEXICO.**

Section 104(a) of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109-432) is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “June 30, 2022” and inserting “June 30, 2032”.

**SA 1634.** Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. 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, 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. 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:

At the end, add 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 reinstated on March 3, 2017, by the decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia (No. 14-5300) and further republished on May 1, 2017 (82 Fed. Reg. 20284-85) that reinstates 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. 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. 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:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . CONFORMING ADJUSTMENT OF DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.**

Section 251(c)(8)(B) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(c)(8)(B)) is amended by striking “\$626,500,000,000” and inserting “\$626,050,000,000”.

**SA 1636.** Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him 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. \_\_\_\_ . AUTHORIZATION TO ESTABLISH COMMEMORATIVE WORK.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Fallen Journalists Memorial Foundation may establish a commemorative work on Federal land in the District of Columbia and its environs to commemorate America's commitment to a free press as represented by journalists who 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 (commonly known as the “Commemorative Works Act”).

(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.

(2) RESPONSIBILITY OF THE FALLEN JOURNALISTS MEMORIAL FOUNDATION.—The Fallen Journalists Memorial Foundation shall be solely responsible for acceptance of contributions for, and payment of the expenses of, the establishment of the commemorative work under this section.

(d) DEPOSIT OF EXCESS FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If upon payment of all expenses for the establishment of the commemorative work (including the maintenance and preservation amount required by section 8906(b)(1) of title 40, United States Code), there remains a balance of funds received for the establishment of the com-

memorative work, the Fallen Journalists Memorial Foundation shall transmit the amount of the balance to the Secretary of the Interior for deposit in the account provided for in section 8906(b)(3) of title 40, United States Code.

(2) ON EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—If upon expiration of the authority for the commemorative work under section 8903(e) of title 40, United States Code, there remains a balance of funds received for the establishment of the commemorative work, the Fallen Journalists Memorial Foundation shall transmit the amount of the balance to a separate account with the National Park Foundation for memorials, to be available to the Secretary of the Interior or the Administrator of General Services (as appropriate) following the process provided in section 8906(b)(4) of title 40, United States Code, for accounts established under section 8906(b)(2) or (3) of title 40, United States Code.

**SA 1637.** 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 by him 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. \_\_\_\_ . CONFORMING ADJUSTMENT OF DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.**

Section 251(c)(8)(B) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(c)(8)(B)) is amended by striking “\$626,500,000,000” and inserting “\$626,050,000,000”.

**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. 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. 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:

At the end, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . PROHIBITION OF USE OF FUNDS TO IMPLEMENT THE PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATION MODIFYING THE NORTHEAST CANYONS AND SEAMOUNTS 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 9496, 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 9496, as issued on September 15, 2016 (54 U.S.C. 320301 note).

(b) **FUNDING 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 by any Act for any fiscal year may be used to implement or enforce the Presidential Proclamation issued on June 5, 2020, which modifies 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. 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. 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 8, strike line 19 and all that follows through page 9, line 2, and insert the following:

“(h) **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; 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.

On page 14, after the matter following line 18, 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. 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. 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:

At the end, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . RESTRICTIONS ON ACQUISITIONS USING AMOUNTS FROM LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.**

Section 200306(b) of title 54, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “Appropriations” and inserting the following:

“(1) **ACQUISITION.**—Appropriations”;

(2) in paragraph (1) (as so designated), in the second sentence, by striking “Appropriations” and inserting the following:

“(2) **OTHER PURPOSES.**—Appropriations”;

(3) in paragraph (1) (as so designated), by inserting “valued and carried out in accordance with paragraph (3) and” before “otherwise authorized by law”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **VALUATION.**—

“(A) **DISPOSAL REQUIRED.**—Appropriations from the Fund pursuant to this section shall

not be used for the acquisition of land, water, or an interest in land or water unless, prior to the acquisition, the Secretary or the Secretary of Agriculture, as applicable, sells land, water, or an interest in land or water in the applicable State—

“(i) that is under the jurisdiction of the Secretary or the Secretary of Agriculture, as applicable; and

“(ii) the value of which is equal to or greater than the value of the land that is proposed for acquisition.

“(B) **DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS.**—The proceeds from a sale of land, water, or an interest in land or water under subparagraph (A) shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States.

“(C) **USE OF SURPLUS.**—

“(i) **DEFINITION OF SURPLUS.**—In this subparagraph, the term ‘surplus’ means the difference between—

“(I) the amount deposited in the Treasury of the United States from a sale of land, water, or an interest in land or water under subparagraph (B); and

“(II) any amounts used for the acquisition under this section of land, water, or an interest in land or water in the State that was proposed for acquisition under subparagraph (A).

“(ii) **USE.**—The Secretary or the Secretary of Agriculture, as applicable, may use any surplus for—

“(I) additional acquisitions of land, water, or interests in land or water pursuant to this section; or

“(II) any other authorized activity for use of the Fund in accordance with this chapter.”.

**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. 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. 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:

At the end, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . LIMITATION ON THE EXTENSION OR ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL MONUMENTS IN THE STATE OF UTAH.**

Section 320301(d) of title 54, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “WYOMING” and inserting “THE STATE OF WYOMING OR UTAH”; and

(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, 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. 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:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . 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.—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.—

“(1) 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. 4331 et seq.) before the covered agency undertakes the proposed action.

“(ii) PERIOD.—For purposes of clause (i), the NEPA process—

“(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;

“(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 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.

“(2) APPLICABLE TIMELINES.—

“(A) NEPA PROCESS.—

“(i) IN 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 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—

“(I) 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)(II), within the period described in clause (i) and not later than 1 year after the date on which the head of the covered agency publishes the notice of intent, the head of the covered agency shall complete the environmental impact statement and, if necessary, any supplemental environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

“(B) AUTHORIZATIONS AND PERMITS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date described in paragraph (1)(B)(ii)(II), the head of a covered agency shall issue—

“(I) any necessary permit or authorization to carry out the proposed action; or

“(II) a denial of the permit or authorization necessary to carry out the proposed action.

“(ii) 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 that subparagraph, the permit or authorization shall be considered to be approved.

“(iii) DENIAL OF PERMIT OR AUTHORIZATION.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—If a permit or authorization described in clause (i) is denied, the head of the covered agency shall describe to the project sponsor—

“(aa) the basis of the denial; and

“(bb) recommendations for the project sponsor with respect to how to address the reasons for the denial.

“(II) RECOMMENDED CHANGES.—If the project sponsor carries out the recommendations of the head of the covered agency under subclause (I)(bb) and notifies the head of the covered agency that the recommendations have been carried out, the head of the covered agency—

“(aa) shall decide whether to issue the permit or authorization described in clause (i) not later than 90 days after date on which the project sponsor submitted the notification; and

“(bb) shall not carry out the NEPA process with respect to the proposed action again.”.

**SA 1643.** 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, 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. 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 200402 of title 54, United States Code (as added by section 2(a)), strike subsection (h) and insert the following:

“(h) 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; 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, 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. 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:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . 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. 4331 et seq.) before the covered agency undertakes the proposed action.

“(ii) PERIOD.—For purposes of clause (i), the NEPA process—

“(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;

“(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 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.

“(2) 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) REQUIREMENT FOR 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)(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)(I) 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 has similar issues or decisions as 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, 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. 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:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . PROHIBITIONS OF CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES 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) PROHIBITIONS UNDER NEPA ANALYSIS.—

“(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. 4331 et seq.) before the covered agency undertakes the proposed action.

“(ii) PERIOD.—For purposes of clause (i), the NEPA process—

“(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;

“(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 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.

“(2) PROHIBITIONS UNDER NEPA.—In carrying out the NEPA process for a proposed action, the head of a covered agency may not—

“(A) consider an alternative to the proposed action if the proposed action is not technically or economically feasible to the project sponsor; or

“(B) consider an alternative to the proposed action that is not within the jurisdiction of the covered agency.”.

**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, 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. 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:

At the end, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . 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 1647.** 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, 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. 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:

At the end, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. STATE APPROVAL REQUIRED PRIOR TO ACQUISITION OF LAND, WATER, OR AN INTEREST IN LAND OR WATER.**

Section 200306 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) STATE APPROVAL REQUIRED PRIOR TO ACQUISITION.—Land, water, or 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 from the State in which the land, water, or interest in land or water is located written notice that the State has enacted legislation approving the proposed acquisition.”.

**SA 1648.** 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, 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. 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:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. 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) NEPA PROCESS TIMELINES.—

“(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. 4331 et seq.) before the covered agency undertakes the proposed action.

“(ii) PERIOD.—For purposes of clause (i), the NEPA process—

“(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;

“(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 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.

“(2) APPLICABLE TIMELINES.—

“(A) NEPA PROCESS.—

“(i) IN 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 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—

“(I) 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)(II), within the period described in clause (i) and not later than 1 year after the date on which the head of the covered agency publishes the notice of intent, the head of the covered agency shall complete the environmental impact statement and, if necessary, any supplemental environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

“(iv) PENALTIES.—

“(I) DEFINITIONS.—In this clause:

“(aa) DIRECTOR.—The term ‘Director’ means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

“(bb) FINAL NEPA COMPLIANCE DATE.—The term ‘final NEPA compliance date’, with respect to a proposed action, means the date by which the head of a covered agency is required to complete the NEPA process under clause (i).

“(cc) INITIAL EIS COMPLIANCE DATE.—The term ‘initial EIS compliance date’, with respect to a proposed action for which a covered agency published a notice of intent described in clause (ii)(II), means the date by which an environmental impact statement for that proposed action is required to be completed under clause (iii).

“(dd) INITIAL NEPA COMPLIANCE DATE.—The term ‘initial NEPA compliance date’, with respect to a proposed action, means the date by which the head of a covered agency is required to issue or publish a document described in clause (ii) for that proposed action under that clause.

“(ee) INITIAL NONCOMPLIANCE DETERMINATION.—The term ‘initial noncompliance determination’ means a determination under subitem (BB), (CC), or (DD) of subclause (II)(aa) that the head of a covered agency has not complied with the requirements of clause (i), (ii), or (iii).

“(II) INITIAL NONCOMPLIANCE.—

“(aa) DETERMINATION.—

“(AA) NOTIFICATION.—As soon as practicable after the date described in paragraph (1)(B)(ii)(I) for a proposed action of a covered

agency, the head of the covered agency shall notify the Director that the head of the covered agency is beginning the NEPA process for that proposed action.

“(BB) INITIAL DETERMINATION.—As soon as practicable after the initial NEPA compliance date for a proposed action, the Director shall determine whether, as of the initial NEPA compliance date, the head of the covered agency has complied with clause (ii) for that proposed action.

“(CC) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—With respect to a proposed action of a covered agency in which the head of the covered agency publishes a notice of intent described in clause (ii)(II), as soon as practicable after the initial EIS compliance date for a proposed action, the Director shall determine whether, as of the initial EIS compliance date, the head of the covered agency has complied with clause (iii) for that proposed action.

“(DD) COMPLETION OF NEPA PROCESS.—As soon as practicable after the final NEPA compliance date for a proposed action, the Director shall determine whether, as of the final NEPA compliance date, the head of the covered agency has complied with clause (i) for that proposed action.

“(bb) IDENTIFICATION; PENALTY; NOTIFICATION.—If the Director makes an initial noncompliance determination for a proposed action—

“(AA) the Director shall identify the account for the salaries and expenses of the office of the head of the covered agency, or an equivalent account;

“(BB) beginning on the day after the date on which the Director makes the initial noncompliance determination, the amount that the head of the covered agency may obligate from the account identified under subitem (AA) for the fiscal year during which the determination is made shall be reduced by 0.5 percent from the amount initially made available for the account for that fiscal year; and

“(CC) the Director shall notify the head of the covered agency of the initial noncompliance determination, the account identified under subitem (AA), and the reduction under subitem (BB).

“(III) CONTINUED NONCOMPLIANCE.—

“(aa) DETERMINATION.—Every 90 days after the date of an initial noncompliance determination, the Director shall determine whether the head of the covered agency has complied with the applicable requirements of clauses (i) through (iii) for the proposed action, until the date on which the Director determines that the head of the covered agency has completed the NEPA process for the proposed action.

“(bb) PENALTY; NOTIFICATION.—For each determination made by the Director under item (aa) that the head of a covered agency has not complied with a requirement of clause (i), (ii), or (iii) for a proposed action—

“(AA) the amount that the head of the covered agency may obligate from the account identified under subclause (II)(bb)(AA) for the fiscal year during which the most recent determination under item (aa) is made shall be reduced by 0.5 percent from the amount initially made available for the account for that fiscal year; and

“(BB) the Director shall notify the head of the covered agency of the determination under item (aa) and the reduction under subitem (AA).

“(IV) REQUIREMENTS.—

“(aa) AMOUNTS NOT RESTORED.—A reduction in the amount that the head of a covered agency may obligate under subclause (II)(bb)(BB) or (III)(bb)(AA) during a fiscal year shall not be restored for that fiscal year, without regard to whether the head of

a covered agency completes the NEPA process for the proposed action with respect to which the Director made an initial non-compliance determination or a determination under subclause (III)(aa).

“(bb) REQUIRED TIMELINES.—The violation of clause (ii) or (iii), and any action carried out to remediate or otherwise address the violation, shall not affect any other applicable compliance date under clause (i), (ii), or (iii).

“(B) AUTHORIZATIONS AND PERMITS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date described in paragraph (1)(B)(ii)(II), the head of a covered agency shall issue—

“(I) any necessary permit or authorization to carry out the proposed action; or

“(II) a denial of the permit or authorization necessary to carry out the proposed action.

“(ii) 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 that subparagraph, the permit or authorization shall be considered to be approved.

“(iii) DENIAL OF PERMIT OR AUTHORIZATION.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—If a permit or authorization described in clause (i) is denied, the head of the covered agency shall describe to the project sponsor—

“(aa) the basis of the denial; and

“(bb) recommendations for the project sponsor with respect to how to address the reasons for the denial.

“(II) RECOMMENDED CHANGES.—If the project sponsor carries out the recommendations of the head of the covered agency under subclause (I)(bb) and notifies the head of the covered agency that the recommendations have been carried out, the head of the covered agency—

“(aa) shall decide whether to issue the permit or authorization described in clause (i) not later than 90 days after date on which the project sponsor submitted the notification; and

“(bb) shall not carry out the NEPA process with respect to the proposed action again.”.

**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. 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. 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:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . 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) 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. 4332(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. 4331 et seq.) that has been approved by—

“(i)(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—

“(i) carefully reviews the description of the proposed action to ensure that it fits within the category of actions described in the categorical exclusion; and

“(ii) 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 1650.** 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, 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. 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:

Strike subsection (b) of section 3 and insert the following:

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 200302(c) of title 54, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (3).

**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. 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. 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:

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 201(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

“(iii) publish in the Federal Register a detailed list of each parcel of public land identified under clause (ii), together with—

“(I) an estimate of the fair market value of each such parcel; and

“(II) a 5-year schedule by which the Secretary proposes to sell, or cause a covered agency to sell, the parcels to the public, 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;

“(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 through 2025.

“(B) COOPERATION BY COVERED 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)(iii)(II).

“(C) DEPOSIT IN FUND.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The net proceeds from each sale of public land pursuant to this paragraph shall be deposited in the Fund, subject to paragraph (2).

“(ii) TREATMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

“(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 subclause (I) may be deposited in the Fund.

In section 200402(c) of title 54, United States Code (as added by section 2(a)), strike “subsection (e), without further appropriation or fiscal year limitation” and insert “subsection (d), only as provided in advance in an appropriations Act”.

In section 200402 of title 54, United States Code (as added by section 2(a)), strike subsection (d).

In section 200402(i)(1) of title 54, United States Code (as added by section 2(a)), strike “subsection (e)(1)” and insert “subsection (d)(1)”.

In section 200402(j)(3) of title 54, United States Code (as added by section 2(a)), strike “subsection (e)(1)” and insert “subsection (d)(1)”.

In section 200402 of title 54, United States Code (as added by section 2(a)), redesignate subsections (e) through (k) as subsections (d) through (j), respectively.

In section 200303(a) of title 54, United States Code (as added by section 3(a)), strike “without further appropriation or fiscal year limitation” and insert “only as provided in advance in an appropriations Act”.

**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. 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. 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:

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 201(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

“(iii) publish in the Federal Register a detailed list of each parcel of public land identified under clause (ii), together with—

“(I) an estimate of the fair market value of each such parcel; and

“(II) a 5-year schedule by which the Secretary proposes to sell, or cause a covered agency to sell, the parcels to the public, 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;

“(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 through 2025.

“(B) COOPERATION BY COVERED 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)(iii)(II).

“(C) DEPOSIT IN FUND.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The net proceeds from each sale of public land pursuant to this paragraph shall be deposited in the Fund, subject to paragraph (2).

“(ii) TREATMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

“(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 subclause (I) may be deposited in the Fund.

**SA 1653.** Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her 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(j)(1)(B) of title 54, United States Code (as added by section 2(a)), insert “, including partnerships with qualified youth or conservation corps (as that term is defined in section 203 of the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1722))” before the period.

**SA 1654.** Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. INHOFE, 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. 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, 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. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the In-

ternal 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. 4. CERTAIN LAND ACQUISITION REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.**

Section 200306 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) MAINTENANCE NEEDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Prior to acquiring land under this section, the Secretary or the Secretary of Agriculture, as applicable, shall take into account the deferred maintenance needs of the land proposed for acquisition.

“(2) FUNDING.—Funds appropriated for the acquisition of land under this section shall include any funds necessary to address deferred maintenance needs at the time of acquisition of the acquired land.”.

**SA 1655.** Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. RISCH, 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. 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, 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. 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 200304(b)(3).

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 18, add the following:

(d) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—Section 200304(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 in the National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund established by section 200402(a).”.

(e) ALLOCATION OF LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND AMOUNTS FOR FEDERAL PURPOSES.—Section 200306(a) of title 54, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) MAINTENANCE ON FEDERAL LAND.—Amounts made available from the Fund may be used to carry out deferred maintenance activities on Federal land.”.

**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. 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, 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. 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 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) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts in the Fund shall remain available until expended.

On page 11 of the amendment, between lines 16 and 17, 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 landholding agency has a deferred maintenance backlog in excess of \$2,000,000,000, if discretionary appropriations (as defined in section 250(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900(c))) were made available for the acquisition of land, water, or an interest in land or water under section 200306(a)(2) during the preceding fiscal year (referred to in this subsection as the ‘transfer amount’)—

“(1) the amount 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 200306(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.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 200302(b)(2) of title 54, United States Code, is amended by striking “200310” and inserting “200310(a)”.

On page 14 of the amendment, strike line 9 and insert the following:

“(d) AVAILABILITY OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCE.—Out of amounts deposited in the Fund under section 200302 for any fiscal year prior to fiscal year 2020, there is authorized to be appropriated for deposit in the National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund \$9,500,000,000.”.

**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. 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. 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:

At the end, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . 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 a permit under, 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. 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. 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:

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.** Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her 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. \_\_\_\_ . LIFETIME NATIONAL PARKS AND FEDERAL RECREATIONAL LANDS PASS FOR DISABLED VETERANS.**

Section 805(b) of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6804(b)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) DISABILITY DISCOUNT.—The Secretary shall make the National Parks and Federal Recreational Lands Pass available, without charge and for the lifetime of the passholder, to the following:

“(A) Any United States citizen or person domiciled in the United States who has been medically determined to be permanently disabled, within the meaning of the term ‘disability’ under section 3 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12102), if the citizen or person provides adequate proof of the disability and such citizenship or residency.

“(B) Any veteran who has been found to have a service-connected disability under title 38, United States Code.”.

## 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.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 10, 2020, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR,  
AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 10, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND  
GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 10, 2020, at 9 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND  
ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 10, 2020, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

## STOP SENIOR SCAMS ACT

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) Prepaid cards.

(6) A member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

(7) A prudential regulator, as defined in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481).

(8) The Director of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network.

(9) 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 senior scams;

(III) best practices for keeping employees up to date on current scams;

(IV) the most effective signage and placement in retail locations to warn seniors about scammers' use of gift cards, prepaid cards, and wire transfer services;

(V) suggestions on effective collaborative community education campaigns;

(VI) available technology to assist in identifying possible scams at the point of sale; and

(VII) other information that would be helpful to retailers, wire transfer companies, financial institutions, and their employees as they work to prevent fraud affecting seniors; and

(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.

(e) **REPORTS.**—Section 101(c)(2) of the Elder Abuse Prevention and Prosecution Act (34 U.S.C. 21711(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"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(E) for 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 recommendations on ways stakeholders can continue to work together to reduce scams affecting seniors.".

(f) **TERMINATION.**—This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, ceases 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 SERV-  
ICEMEMBERS UNDER STOP  
MOVEMENT ORDERS IN RE-  
SPONSE 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 RE-  
SPONSE TO LOCAL, NATIONAL, OR  
GLOBAL EMERGENCY.**

(a) **TERMINATION.**—Subsection (a)(1) of section 305 of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. 3955) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking "or" and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting "or"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(C) 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.".

(b) **COVERED LEASES.**—



(1) LEASES OF PREMISES.—Paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of such section is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) the servicemember, while in military service—

“(i) executes a lease upon receipt of military orders for a permanent change of station or to deploy with a military unit, or as an individual in support of a military operation, for a period of not less than 90 days; and

“(ii) thereafter receives a stop movement order issued by the Secretary of Defense in response to a local, national, or global emergency, effective for an indefinite period or for a period of not less than 30 days, which prevents the servicemember or servicemember’s dependents from occupying the lease for a residential, professional, business, agricultural, or similar purpose.”.

(2) LEASES OF MOTOR VEHICLES.—Paragraph (2) of such subsection is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) the servicemember, while in military service—

“(i) executes a lease upon receipt of military orders described in subparagraph (B); and

“(ii) thereafter receives a stop movement order issued by the Secretary of Defense in response to a local, national, or global emergency, effective for an indefinite period or for a period of not less than 30 days, which prevents the servicemember, or the servicemember’s dependents, from using the vehicle for personal or business transportation.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE OF TERMINATION.—Paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of such section is amended to read as follows:

“(1) LEASE OF PREMISES.—

“(A) ENTRANCE TO MILITARY SERVICE, PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION, OR DEPLOYMENT.—In the case of a lease described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b)(1) that provides for monthly payment of rent, termination of the lease under subsection (a) is effective 30 days after the first date on which the next rental payment is due and payable after the date on which the notice under subsection (c) is delivered. In the case of any other lease described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (b)(1) termination of the lease under subsection (a) is effective on the last day of the month following the month in which the notice is delivered.

“(B) STOP MOVEMENT ORDERS.—In the case of a lease described in subsection (b)(1)(C), termination of the lease under subsection (a) is effective on the date on which the requirements of subsection (c) are met for such termination.”.

(d) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Subsection (i) is amended, in the matter before paragraph (1), by inserting “In this section:” after “DEFINITIONS.—”.

(e) RETROACTIVE APPLICATION.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to stop movement orders issued on or after March 1, 2020.

#### 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

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL J. ADLER AND ENDING WITH IVAN A. WRAY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 16, 2020.

#### 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:

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL J. ADLER AND ENDING WITH IVAN A. WRAY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 16, 2020.