The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro temore (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.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER
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.
But 1 week ago, the Gray Lady finally met her match. Vladimir Putin? 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 their bosses or risk defeat in the next election. 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 view. Employees flooded social media to claim their bosses have risked reporters' physical safety with the Senator's view. Their safe space was safe till someone had to atone. So when the dust settled, the Senator 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, a dear staff member, 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 anger out on the 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 American if civil disagreement becomes a contradiction in terms.

The liberal tradition in this country used to pride itself on being broadminded, but we have spent years making slow progress in 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. McCONNEL, 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 landscapes are truly "the heritage of all 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."

This 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. And the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which this legislation will provide 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 home State of Kentucky, for example. For years, I have been proud to advocate for LWCF funding to conserve some of the Bluegrass' precious wilderness and historic sites. Back in 1996, Kentucky was the only State without a national wildlife refuge. And it was my legislation that helped secure the creation of one at Clarks River.

Last year, additional legislation I authored helped create another sanctuary for wildlife and recreation at the confluence of the Green and Ohio Rivers. Already, the Fish and Wildlife Service has marked the Green River Wildlife Refuge as the LWCF's top funding priority for the coming year. The dedicated resources in this legislation would be instrumental in the growth of Kentucky's newest national treasure, along with other areas like Clarks River. As the LWCF drives the preservation of more national wetlands, forests, and battlefield space in Kentucky, I suspect every dollar our Congresses 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
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TAXPAYER FIRST ACT OF 2019—MOTION TO PROCEED—Resumed

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 protest against police violence. Today, his brother Philonise Floyd will testify in front of the House Judiciary Committee.

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

Now, Democrats in the House and Senate have proposed legislation that would directly respond to the issues of racial bias and excessive force in our police departments. The Justice in Policing Act would ban the use of choke holds, limit the transfer of military equipment to local departments, make it easier to hold police 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 the amendments 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 some of 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 feel that reform is needed, 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 allows the other side to strum sunny chords because he is more interested in what Leader McConnell said that it is the majority in the Senate did exactly nothing?

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. races of color have less access to quality healthcare, greater food insecurity, greater percentages of poverty, and a disproportionate number of our frontline essential workers—41.2 percent—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. Markets in the early hours of today, 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—J. David histo, and Cory Wilson—both of whom have expressed deep-seated antipathy toward our healthcare law. And I am not aware of either of them embracing civil rights, voting rights so desperately needed in this country.

That is right—in the middle of a public health crisis, the Republican majority is planning to confirm rightwing judges who have spoken out against our healthcare law. Watch what they do, not what they say. And what they are doing is regressive—itis 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 interferes 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 they did, they would allow the witnesses that Senator DURBIN and the other members of the Judiciary Committee have proposed to come forward and tell their side of the story—quite contrary to the witnesses that the Republican majority and the Republican chairman are calling.

PROTESTS

That is one crazy conspiracy theory, but yesterday the country was treated to an even more bizarre scene. When I got to Trumpeland, 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 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 by now. But yesterday 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 want to demonize 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 petulant bully.

Apprently, 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 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. And you say something that will get 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 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 malfunc-tioned. 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 learned 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—one 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 HELP Committee should update us on 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 think about where you will find a doctor if you need one. If you need a cardiologist, for example, you don’t spend a lot of time worrying whether you will be able to find one within driving distance. But 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 may be able to see patients in rural families, but sometimes specialty care is needed. When there is no specialist close by, telehealth can help get these rural providers and their patients the medical care they need at a remote location through the use of technology.

The virus has highlighted the fact that telehealth is a valuable resource for every American. During the pandemic, we have seen our healthcare providers turned 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 2033. In areas without shortages, telehealth can make life easier for patients by reducing the number of times that they have to visit a doctor’s office for care.

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

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 smartphone.

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 CON-NECT for Health Act, which I co-sponsored with Senators SCHATZ, WICKER, CARDIN, WARNER, and HYDE-SMITH for the Senate.

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 or to on-demand support from providers equipped to treat seniors. This 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, more 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 significant 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 push for anything I can to make telehealth more available to underserved patients in rural communities and to the country as a whole.

The coronavirus pandemic has highlighted just how valuable a resource telehealth can be for literally every American, and we should ensure that all Americans can access its benefits.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority whip.

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 rural care 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, 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 State, this country, yes, but also 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? Sometimes even for 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?

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

Can you imagine having a problem with your teeth, some pain or discomfort or perhaps a disfigurement, and being unable to afford the care you need? For many of these people, this is their last chance, to wait in line all night to get in for free dental services from the Illinois Dental Society. We can see 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 going to be doctors and dentists, 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 here. They were little kids who grew up in Camden, NJ. It wasn’t an easy life. She grew up in a single-parent household, and her mother did not speak English. Here is what she told me about it:

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

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

“Before DACA, I had no future, purpose, or chance of a better life. DACA is the option that is 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 front lines 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 health at risk to save 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 other recipients of DACA. Too many 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 today—anyone listening believes we would be a better country if Mariana were deported. That is the option that the President has created. He has
We have time. We have the ability to make a change. The question is whether the President will ever realize that or whether Senator McConnell would make room in our schedule for us to debate this issue.

Let's get this right. Let's make sure that we don't have another generation of immigrants face the challenges that would be created if the Supreme Court abolishes 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. 6271

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 I am now a cosponsor of legislation that 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. And this program you focus on recreation that involves protecting our natural wonders and jobs. That is a big step forward.

I would appeal to Senator McConnell to use his power as the Republican leader to set aside 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 working 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.

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

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

I remember one year we got 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, we 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. The permanent endowment fund that provides money for the roads and the schools and the counties, and the principles are invested, and the interest will be used to make SRS payments to counties.

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

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

In my view, these are the basics of an economic toolkit for rural areas. If you focus on roads, if you focus on schools, if you focus on those counties, you 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 derive a safety net like everyone else. They ought to be entitled 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 can make available trillions of dollars to the biggest corporations in America. So the COVID pandemic is causing pain everywhere, but it seems to me, with so many resources going to big corporations and powerful interests in intensely populated areas, the U.S. Senate has an obligation to make sure rural economies and rural workers and rural businesses aren't just left behind. Upgrading Secure Rural Schools and extending PILT is a targeted way to advocate for rural communities.

We are going to be home for several weeks in July, and my hope is to be able to talk to folks in those areas. 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 roads and 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 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 considered 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, it sent to coastal States for every dollar that it sent to inland States. That 40 cents is not a mistake 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. 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 $8.8 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 and upland States while the leading attraction. Beach tourism supports 2.5 million jobs, $285 billion in direct revenue and . . . $45 billion in taxes annually."

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

I wish it were just the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Look at the inland-to-coastal disparity in the Army Corps of Engineers’ Coastal 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: In 2017, First Street data show that coastal dollars spent on 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 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 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 weather warms. 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 $220 million. Over 5,000 homes in coastal Texas are projected to be at risk of chronic flooding. These homes are worth $1.2 billion.

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

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

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

I would like to ask my colleagues, if you are a small community on the coast, where are you going to go to get sufficient adaptation and mitigation strategies for Moody’s? Where are we in helping those communities? Here is the 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 coasts are sources, 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 will turn into action for our coasts. A sense of decency and a sense of urgency would both seem to demand that.

Who is listening? The Land and Water Conservation Fund passes, they are gone—“zippo,” vanished.

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

And then you don’t.

My colleagues say: You are right, SHELTON. 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 anyone. Everyone is saying: Yes, you are right, SHELTON, 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 reauthorize a cent—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 hundreds of millions 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 reasons the Land and Water Conservation Fund performed in Colorado was in Rocky Mountain National Park, acquiring one of the land holdings within the national park, helping to complete the Great Rocky Mountain National Park, the third most visited national park in the country.

This legislation gives this Congress a chance to pass 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.

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:

(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. 422) as quickly as possible. This bill is necessary to support our communities and rely upon by achieving the twin goals of protecting America’s special places and repairing deteriorating infrastructure. We urge your vote in favor of this 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 surging bipartisan majority in the House, and the President has specifically asked for this bill by 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 millions of acres that sustain 80 million 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 outdoor recreation opportunities 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 $32.0 billion in direct spending at hotels, restaurants, outfitters, and other amenities in gateway communities, supporting over 299,000 jobs and generating over $80.1 billion in total economic output. Nationally, outdoor recreation contributes $878 billion in consumer spending and supports 5.2 million jobs.

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

[Signature]

[Organization Name]

ALLIANCE; Wildlands Network; Winter Association; UrbanPromise Ministries; US Water The Trust for Public Land; The Trust for the America, Inc.; The Lyme Timber Company; Environmental Network; The Garden Club of Foundation; The Archaeological Conservation, Professionals; Specialty Equipment Mar- Industry Association; Scenic America; Si- dance; Quality Deer Management Association; Partnership for the National Out- sation; Natural Gear Camouflage; Natural tional; National Wild- tional Trust for Historic Preservation; Na- of Conservation Voters; American Sportfishing Association; Amer- Council; American Littoral Society; Amer- 10,000 Friends of Pennsylvania; 15 Minute Field Trips; 1785 Inn; 350 Maine; 508 Main St; A Walk in the Woods; AdventureKEEN; Ad- ventures 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; A Place on The Hill 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.; AQushialina/Pochopeo Wilderness Con- servancy; Arboretum Foundation; The Archae- ological Society of New Jersey; Archaeology Southwest; Arizona Heritage Alliance; Ari- zona Land and Water Trust; Arizona Trail Association; Arkansas Conservation; Arkansas Wildlife Federation; Arroyos and Foothills Conservancy; Asheville Area Chamber of Commerce; Ashford Conserva- tion Commission; Aspen Valley Land Trust; Atlantic Salmon Federation; Audubon Ever- glades; Audubon Society of Rhode Island; Audubon South Carolina; Back Country Horsemen of America; Back Country Horsemen of Uwharrie, NC; Backcountry Horse- men of California; Baltimore Tree Trust; Bar Harbor Chamber of Commerce; Bass Anglers Sportman Society (B.A.S.S.); Bay Area Ridge Trail Council; Bay County Conserva- tion, Inc.; Bayou Land Conservancy; Bear Warriors United; Bicycle Coalition of Maine. The Big Hole River Foundation; Big Sur Land Trust; Big Thicket Natural Heritage Trust; Bighorn River Alliance; Bird Conservation Fund; Blowing Rock Chamber of Commerce; Boone County Open Space; Blue Ridge Conservancy; Blue Scholars Initiative; Blue Water Baltimore; Bold Archery Design; Boone Area Chamber of Commerce; Boston Parks & Recreation; Boundary County Parks & Open Space; Bouldering Green Area Convention and Visitor Bureau; Brandywine Conservancy; Bryson City Outdoors Inc.; Bucks County Audubon Society; Building Bridges Across the River; Burnley Chamber of Commerce; Colorado Business for Montana's Outdoors; Cal- ifornia Habitat Conservation Planning Coalition; California League of Conservation Vot- er Education; California Mountain Association; California Native Plant Society; California Waterfowl Association; California Wilderness Coalition; Californians for Western Wilder- ness; Capital Region Land Conservancy; Carefree of Colorado; Catawba Lands Con- servancy; Catawba Lands Conservancy and Conservation District; Central Arizona Land Trust; Charleston Audubon; Citizens for Main Street; Cheo- pesco Parks Conservancy; Chenal-Douglas Land Trust; Cherry Republic; Chesapeake Legal Alliance; Chesapeake Wildlife Heritage; Chicago Neighborhood Initiatives; Chickasaw Nation, Chepia Arizona; Chuck Robbins Chapter 656 of Trout Unlimited; Citizens for Pennsylvania’s Future (PennFuture); Citizens For Water; Citizens United to Protect the Mau- rice River; City of Michigan City Indiana De- partment of Parks and Recreation; Clean Roseburg; Clean Ocean Access; Coalition of Oregon Land Trusts; College Republicans at Belmont University; Collette Travel; Colo- rado Trail Association; Constitution Parks Association; Columbia Land Trust; Community Training Works Inc. Concerned Off-Road Bicyclists Association; Concrete Safa- riall Foundation; Congaree Land Trust; Connecticut Audubon Society; Connecticut Forest & Park Association; Connecticut Land Con- servation Council; Connecticut Ornithology Association; Conservation Land Trust; Con- servation Valley National Park; Conservation Alabama; Conservation Council for Hawaii; Conserva- tion Legacy; Conservation Minnesota; Con- servation Northwest; Conservation Trust for NC; Conservation Voters of South Carolina; Conservation Virginia; Contour Design Studio LLC.

Cornerstone Studios; Cowboy Trail Rides; Cradle of Texas Conservancy, Inc.; Cycle for One Planet; Cypress Chapter, Izaak Walton League, Izaak Walton League, Dade Heritage Trust Inc., Dade Bronfman LLC; Darby Communications; Da- vidson Lands Conservancy; Delaware Center for the Inland Bays; Delta Electric Vehi- cle Association (DEEVA); Delaware Beachways; Delaware Nature Society; Delaware Wild Lands, Inc.; Delta Waterfowl; Denali Mountain Works; Deschutes Land Trust; Dismal Hills Con- servancy; Dolores River Boating Advocates; Door County Kayak Tours, Inc.; Downeast Salmon Federation; Dry Creek Trail Riders; E Ma 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 Financial Support, Edward Hopper House; Elks Run Watershed Group; Empire Chamber of Commerce; Enchanted Circle Trails Association; Endangered Habi- tates League; Eno River Association; En- vironment California; Environment Colorado; Environment Connecticut; Environment Florida; Environment Georgia; Environment Georgia; Envi- ronment Maine; Environment Maryland; Environment Massachusetts; Environment Michigan; Environ- ment Missouri; Environment Montana; Environ- ment Montana; Environment NC; Envi- ronment Nevada; Environment New Jersey; Environment New Mexico; Environment Or- egon; Environmental Advocacy Group of Vir- ginia; Environmental Justice Center at Chestnut Hill.
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 our daily lives, as places to recreate, to recharge and to seek solace in the midst of our daily lives.

The outdoor economy has all experienced how public lands managed by the Department provide vital functions like wildlife habitat while preserving water quality and quantity, sustaining working landscapes and rural economies, increasing access for recreation opportunities, and stimulating the outdoor economy. Nationally, outdoor recreation businesses generate 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 waterways, and American leaders of both parties have the opportunity to provide the strong leadership to deliver this historic legislation into law.

Sincerely,

Ryan Zinke

Ken Salazar

Babbitt
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—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 rolcall 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
Balzin
Bennet
Blackburn
Blumenfeld
Blunt
Boozman
Braun
Brown

Gassley
Harris
Hassan
Hawley
Heimrich
Hirono
Hoeven
Jones
Kaine
King
Klobuchar
Leahy
Lee
Leesler
Manchin
McConnel
McSally
Menendez

Grassley
Harkin
Hawley
Heinrich
Hirono
Hoeven
Jones
Kaine
King
Klobuchar
Leahy
Lee
Leesler
Manchin
McConnel
McSally
Menendez

Markley
Mark
Mark
Mark
Mark
Mark
Mark
Mark
Mark
Mark
Mark
Mark
Mark
Mark
Mark
Mark
Mark
Mark
Mark
Mark

Sinetra
Smith
Stabenow
Sullivan
Tester
Thune
Trill
Udall
Van Hollen
Warner
Warren
Whitehouse
Wicker
Wyden
Young

The motion was agreed to.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask that the clerk read the motion.

The amendment is as follows:

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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1626 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1617

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 1626 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:

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. 1628 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1627

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 1628 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:

At the end add the following:

“Strike ‘11 days’ and insert ‘2 days’”

AMENDMENT NO. 1629 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 1629 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.
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The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1629 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1630

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike “6 days” and insert “7 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. 1857, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes.


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. 1857 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 “3 days” and insert “4 days”

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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.


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 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 willingness and integrity. But in too many communities around the country, the system in which they work has been failing. People are dying at the hands of police, predominantly people of color. Accountability has been tied to public videos rather than doing the right thing. Incremental reform is no longer an option when it comes to police reform. We have been patient, but we must do better to protect the civil rights, human rights, and lives of men, women, and children of this country.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This comprehensive legislation takes several important steps to hold police accountable in courts. It makes it consistent with standard practice to proscribe police misconduct and enable 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 reinvests 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 this floor here establishes public safety innovation grants for community-based organizations to create local commissions and task forces to help communities to reimagine and develop concrete, just, and equitable public safety approaches.

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

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

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

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

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

“Thank you for sharing your story,” Francke wrote. “I don’t blame you for having a chip on your shoulder. I am not proud of the things that happened to me 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 crowd safe from those that would try to turn your message into something else. We want your message to be heard.”

P.m. Sunday, more than 200 people had gathered at Veterans Plaza in downtown Silver Spring. They marched 3 blocks to the corner of 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 group of speakers came forward. . . . About 3:30 p.m., Turner handed the microphone back to Francke. The commander told the crowd about Turner’s encounter the previous week. 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 has also been 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, Darrius, 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 get criminal justice under the law and fulfill the promise of our Constitution in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, and ensure domestic tranquility.

Let this Nation finally guarantee “Equal Justice Under the 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

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

In many ways, the killing of George Floyd was the match in the powder barrel. It ignited long-overdue conversations about police violence 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 officers are 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 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 members of the Minneapolis City Council members. Over the weekend, nine of them said they would defund the Minneapolis Police Department. Well, I am amazed that we have to say it, but apparently we must. This is an extraordinary reaction to just a battering ram 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 host of new problems that would do far more damage. Our job here is to fix the leak and figure out how to move forward. The process in this case isn’t going to be quite so straightforward.

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

If you are in Mayberry with Andy Taylor, it may be a two-police-officer town. Traditionally, you 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, which have no clear legal follow-up. 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 this bill here 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, introduced last year to create a National Criminal Justice Commission.

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

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

We haven’t done this sort of top-to-bottom review of our criminal justice system since the 9/11 Commission was established in 1994, 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 and are facing a deficit of trust between many of their communities and the police departments. That is because to 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 this, 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 the 9/11 Commission was founded where 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, but I believe that 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 our police agencies are made more effective. It is a responsibility that we have made a part of this effort in the Senate. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Paducah). The clerk will 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.

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

We haven’t done this sort of top-to-bottom review of our criminal justice system since the 9/11 Commission was established in 1994, 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 and are facing 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 this, 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 the 9/11 Commission was founded where 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, but I believe that 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 our police agencies are made more effective. It is a responsibility that we have made a part of this effort in the Senate. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Paducah). The clerk will 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.

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 Act. I am co-sponsor 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 thought that 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.
This act will work to help improve the visitor experience at the park—certainly at the units in my State and, Mr. President, your State. I have been to a number of the facilities in Georgia that will be impacted by this.

In Missouri, there is the westward expansion that is celebrated at the arch, and we just made a significant investment in that facility. The Truman home in Independence will be a National Park Service facility. The first park in America dedicated to an American president, 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 history 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 doing safe to use for the millions of Americans who are going to use them this summer and next summer and the summer after that, and this winter and next winter and the winter after that.

In addition to the preservation and conservation efforts, the bill will help, frankly, bolster Missouri’s outdoor recreation industry, and it is significant. The Outdoor Recreation Industry Association says that we generate about $14 billion—almost $15 billion—in our State in consumer spending, and about 133,000 jobs are created in Missouri because of outdoor recreation. About 5 million American jobs are created, and about $80 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 or 50 years and see 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. I am also proud that this important 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 these important resources that we need to make the right kind of investment in.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, as everybody knows, our country today faces an extraordinary set of crises—unprecedented, in fact—in the modern history of this country. Over the last several decades, tens 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 counties in this country, is actually getting worse and which has, up to this point, killed over 110,000 people and infected over 2 million Americans.

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

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

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

Enough is enough. The U.S. Senate must respond to the pain and the suffering of the American people. Let us 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, Tamil Rice, Abdiqani, 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 county 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 do so in peace and stand up to real crime. 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. They had competent 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 illness and death 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 have to be economic levers to deal with the consequences of 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.

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 need 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.

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, they thank the workers, 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 our heroes while paying them starvation wages and treating them disrespectfully.

It is not just the racial justice crisis we face, nor just the pandemic we face, but we are in the midst of an unprecedented economic crisis as well, 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 children. Anybody that says that this is not a moment of urgency does not understand what the word urgency means. When people in America go hungry, we have to act. When people are being evicted from their apartment—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 employment 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.

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 ending 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 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 people are seeing the ending of 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today having just heard from 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 the coronavirus crisis.

One of the companies, called 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 the White House went all-in to respond to the coronavirus crisis and allowing paychecks to continue to be paid as our businesses reopen.

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 ran down to 13.3% 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 recovery that is greater 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—the money to open these Confucius Institutes located at one of our universities—the money to open these Confucius Institutes located at one of our universities. 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 11 times, and I believe, if 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, has come a long way since that time, and since that time, they have formed on an American campus in 2004, and indeed the imprisonment of Liu Xiaobo 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 China 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 mandated to ignore academic freedom. Their academic activities are under the supervision of Hanban, a Chinese state agency chaired by a member of the Politburo and the vice-president of the People’s Republic of China. Most agreements establishing Confucius Institutes feature nondisclosure and unaccountable concessions to the political aims and practices of the government of China. Specifically, North American universities permit Confucius Institutes to create 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—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, we 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 In-stitutes Act or 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 following: The Confucius Institute, by contract, would have to provide that it would protect academic freedom at the university; that it would prohibit the application of any foreign law on any campus of the institution; and that it would maintain 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.

The Confucius Institutes are going to be part of our universities, they should be part of our diversity. 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.

There being no objection, the clerk will read 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:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, in Senate and House of Representatives, in Congress assembled."

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Concerns Over Nations Funding University Campus Institutions 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
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 our souls. 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—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 collective journey to work 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 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, 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-
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 that are being impacted, who is impacted, is it fair, and does everybody have a fair shot?

When people say racial disparities are the main issue, that is something as basic as making sure that everybody fully has the right to vote in this country. One of George Floyd’s high school friends, Jonathan Veal, remembered that on the 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 all around the world. His horn on his mourning has inspired a worldwide movement against systemic racism and police brutality. I know that is cold comfort against systemic racism and police brutality. I know that is cold comfort 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 start thinking about something as basic as making sure that everybody fully has the right to vote in this country.

One of George Floyd’s high school friends, Jonathan Veal, remembered that on the 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 all around the world. His horn on his mourning 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 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.

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 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 Federal 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 is 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 39 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. 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.

This 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? It has been a long time since we have purchased new properties and half of it just to be able to pay for the maintenance. 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 backlot 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 is about it. It is on the floor now being debated.

Here is the resolution. After years and years of debating a resolution about how to reduce spending in one area, we can make some 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, to fund the maintenance itself, 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 this bill. We do not want to go on 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 year by year how we are able to take care of the rest. The fiscally responsible portion of this is to say we are not doing infinite amounts of debt. It will just be the next 5 years.

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

My challenge is figuring out what we can do with a bill that we need to fix. We need to be a better manager 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 put it off until tomorrow. We have to do 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 was wrong. 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 goes back up our backlog of maintenance issues. Even when the purchase is taken 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 we have to 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 the maintenance backlog. 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 doing 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.

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 indisputable 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 overachieve.

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 people who protect and serve their communities.

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

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 thrones. The communities that now seek to reveal national unity from the wreckage of broken trust and broken glass on our streets. To do this, we will need to be guided by our Nation’s noblest principles, while rejecting the anti-American suggestions of radicals who want a revolution.

Every American deserves to be treated equally by their government, as guaranteed by our Constitution and our country’s most fundamental principle that all men are created equal. There is no greater bulwark to tyranny and injustice than that old, simple proposition. But we must reject efforts to scapegoat and demonize all police for the actions of a few, and we must reject the 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 disadvantage. 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 trust in this country, but defunding the police is not the answer. We need the rule of law and equal justice under law. We need them both.

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

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of a resolution that is at the desk, calling for justice for George Floyd and opposing calls to defund the police. I further ask unanimous consent that the 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 Senate 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.

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 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 Justice in Policing Act does. We need it on the floor now, as soon as the House passes it.

Very deeply, we 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.

Mr. SCHUMER. 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 Senate 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.

If the Senate from New York would like to explain to the Senate that part of the 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 yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHUMER. Reserving the right to object.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Democratic leader.

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

I yield the floor.

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

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

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

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.
I couldn't agree more, Glenn. Finally, I want to highlight a letter. It is a letter signed by every former Secretary of the Interior, from Secretary Babbitt, who served in 1993, to Montana's very own Secretary Ryan Zinke, 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 our 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 impresssion. 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 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.
IRS, over 100 million taxpayers are eligible to use this program, Free File.

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

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

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

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

On Wednesday, we started looking into Free File about a year ago, after reading news reports alleging that some of the companies that participated in the program were making it harder, not easier, for taxpayers to find their Free File websites. This is important, colleagues. This is important because very few taxpayers go directly to the IRS.gov address that I mentioned right here—website. Instead, when most taxpayers are ready to file their taxes, they use search engines like Google, and they type in phrases like “free online tax filing” or “free tax return.” For search terms like these, Google might return thousands, maybe millions, of results. Those results could oftentimes be confusing. Imagine that you are trying to get some information, and you get thousands of ideas from searching on Google. That can often be very confusing 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 Federal tax return when they did not need to do so. Just think about that. Fourteen million taxpayers could have filed their Federal 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 free File 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 actually work on Free File and, I am told, has not conducted sufficient oversight over the program for years. For example, our Subcommittee on Investigations learned that the IRS has not completed a customer satisfaction survey for the Free File Program since 2004. That is 11 years. That is right. Since 2009, even though the Treasury Department’s Inspector General for Tax Administration recommended greater use of customer satisfaction surveys not last year or the year before that but as far back as 2007.

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

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

The Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration came to pretty much the same conclusion. This 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 members of the Finance Committee, Senator PORTMAN and I have listened to former IRS Commissioner John Koskinen, a great leader, and to the Government Accountability Office led by Gene Dodaro, a wonderful Comptroller General. We listened to lament the budget cuts by IRS Commissioner John Koskinen, a great leader, and to the Government Accountability Office led by Gene Dodaro, a wonderful Comptroller General. We listened to lament the budget cuts by IRS.
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 its Free File Program, it spent between $750,000 and $1.5 million marketing the program annually to, gosh, probably 200—over 100 million—we will say close to 200 million taxpayers. That sounds like a lot of money, but when you are talking about 100 million 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 personnel it needs to make Free File work the way we intended it to work almost two decades ago.

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

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

That is it. I will close with this. I like movies. I know the Presiding Officer here chois itselfe of all time 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 taxpayers 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 would ask one of the pages to figure it out. 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 a friend from Alaska.

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

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 homes, in our families, our children, our friends. The killing of George Floyd has shocked us all. The video of a police of-

icer so nonchalantly kneeling on George’s neck as he begged to be re-

leased and three other officers standing by as if nothing was happening, as if it weren’t a human being’s life being taken—this shocked us.

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

The freedom to breathe and your life as your own are what were taken from men and women and their children when they were ripped from their country and forced upon 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 hon-

oring their public duty and risking their lives daily for their fellow citizens, and we need to re-

member that.

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

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

Of course, we are a big country, and what might seem to be a good idea in one place wouldn’t be a good idea in some other place. For example, one of the enormous challenges in the great State of Alaska that I have been fo-

cused on for years is not enough law enforcement, particularly in our rural and Native communities, dozens of whom haven’t had sufficient officers at all. So this is a huge prob-

lem 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 and by families 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.

There is no 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 Crises Out for Us to Confront Race in America.” Condoleezza Rice was the daughter of the segregated South, raised in Birmingham. A 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. She was Secretary of State, 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:

[No] one 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 help the cause:

And if we want 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 important, Condoleezza Rice, in her op-ed, emphasizes something seemingly so obvious but not spoken much: individual action and responsibility. She ends her piece with the 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 what the black kids are 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.

I, 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 involvement of our 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 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 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 in the U.S.—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 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 this 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 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 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?

I believe that the answer is subtly 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 rooster. What is he thinking about during these challenging times? ’I’m thinking about wearing the same flight suit with the same wings on my chest as my peers and then being questioned by another military member, are you a pilot?’

What else is he thinking? ’I’m thinking about my mentors and how rarely I had a mentor who looked like me.’ ’I’m thinking about the pressure I felt to perform error-free, especially for supervisors I perceived had expected less of me as an African American.’

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

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

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

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

I suspect that a lot of our military leaders who have risen to the general officers ranks—like General Brown or other outstanding African-American generals whom I have gotten to know or have the privilege of serving with, like Army GEN Vincent Brooks, former CENTCOM Commander GEN Lloyd J. Austin III, 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 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 help ensure that the future of our country is securely protected.

If there is some kind of obstacle for minority advancement that stifles opportunities at the highest ranks of our military, then we need to know why and we need to work on addressing it together. As a matter of fact, I just came from a full day of marking up the NDAA with Democratic and Republican Senators, and we will be trying to look at this issue and 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 bring General 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 grandchild—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 destroyed our community, 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 livelihoods go up in smoke. There is no excuse for looting and criminality, and offenses must be stopped. But a call for calm is not enough, either. This time, we must recognize 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, 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.

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, 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 to people. 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 gunned down.” 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 him about it, when one journalist even printed out a copy of the President’s statement, some of my colleagues physically refused to look at it.

You might be able to escape to your office in this building, but you can’t ignore the people in cities and towns and neighborhoods in your State—in all of our States—who are demanding change. You can’t ignore the people whom we serve. I implore my colleagues to listen to the calls for change. The President may ignore them. When he is not dividing, he is ignoring what citizens want to do, but we can do better in the Senate. We can 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. A rental assistance bill to help people pay their bills and stay in their homes. 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 McCu...
Jersey and New York; Hurricanes Rita and Katrina on the coast of Louisiana; also Mississippi and Alabama.

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

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

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

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

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

It is my disappointment that the authors of this legislation will not allow this bipartisan amendment to be added. By the way, we have heard that Democrats are OK with the amendment, but for whatever reason, the authors will not allow it.

Let me show you one other thing, just to make the point. The Great American Outdoors Act actually has two pots of dollars, if you will. One is for deferred maintenance—again, 50 to 60 percent of that goes to seven States. But this shows where the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

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 live, where people live, and we are not spending money where people do live, where their homes are, where they work, and where they live 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 Whitmer—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 turning to be paid 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 journal of the Senate; 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 Department 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. Bledlingmaier, 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 Casyae, of Virginia
Carol-Anne Chag, 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. Pagin, of the District of Columbia
Eric A. Fichte, of Washington
Karen A. Finer, of the District of Columbia
Jonathan Fritz, of Virginia
Joshua D. Glazeroff, 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. Meitzer, of Virginia
Manuel P. Micaler, of California
Mitchell R. Moss, of Texas
Virginia E. Murray, of Maryland
Courtney Robin Nemroff, of New York
Robert W. Ogburn, of Virginia
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. Sabrano, of Virginia
Micaela A. Schweitzer-Bluhm, of California
Behzad Shabbazian, 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 Thomas, of Virginia
Jennifer S. Tseng, of Colorado
Heather Catherine Variava, of Virginia
Steven Craig Walker, of Virginia
Robert Patrick Walker, of Maryland
Jan Lian Misley, of the District of Columbia
Matthew Alan Weiller, of Virginia
Scott Weinhold, of Virginia
Eric Paul Whittaker, of the District of Columbia
Edward Anthony White, of Virginia
Thomas von Yacov, of Virginia
Hugo Yue Yon, of Maryland
Joseph Michael Young, of California

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

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

Dr. Monahan is an accomplished physician and rear admiral of the U.S. Navy. He began his career as a public servant after college, when he joined the Navy as a member of the Health Professions Scholarship Program. In 1989, while working as a resident at the National Naval Medical Center, Dr. Monahan discovered a connection between cardiac arrhythmias and the antihistamine, Seldane, a discovery that lead to the removal of the drug from the market. Dr. Monahan has spent years working in the attending physician’s office, as a staff physician and later as the assistant attending physician. Dr. Monahan has also served as the chairman of the Department of Medicine at the Uniformed Services University of the Defense. Dr. Monahan has been and is 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 is, 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 Tolls to Sidestep Politics amid Pandemic," be printed in the Record.
DR. BRIAN P. MONAHAN HAS FOUND HIMSELF IN RECORD, as follows:

He is both an executive with lots of research responsibilities—and also has the unique relationship with members that a small-town doctor would have with the patients he knows and sees,” said Senator Roy Blunt, Republican of Missouri and chairman of the Senate Rules Committee. “He’s in a unique role at a unique time.”

As government doctors have emerged as trusted public voices and political figures in the face of a fearsome pandemic—appearing in White House news conferences and as witnesses to hearings—Dr. Monahan has maintained an uncommonly low profile.

He never issued a public statement offering his opinion on whether Congress should reopen, even as he fields politically charged questions about reopening, testing and precautionary measures.

Operating out of a nondescript clinic tucked away in the basement of the Capitol, Dr. Monahan and a small staff have been exceedingly busy since the pandemic took hold, consulting with lawmakers who have un- contracted Covid–19 or exposed to someone infected with it, doling out health recommendations in detailed memos ahead of votes, and producing 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 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 pills (Conmedome by is of. Dr. Monahan uses a black shopping bag and a sewing machine).

“He has a big job—two houses of Congress, two parties to deal with—but he’s not political to the point that he treats us all with respect, and we respect his judgment in return.”

Dr. Monahan in 2009 became the seventh first physician, Dr. George W. Calver, who at the time.

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’s clear: I strongly recommend you go to the hospital—this is serious.”

The congressman has spoken with the doctor at least a dozen times since, he said in an interview on Thursday—but had yet to meet Dr. Monahan in person.

An avid photographer, Dr. Monahan’s photos are present in offices around the Capitol—and he has been known to offer advice on how to best capture a scenic landmark or view on trips across the country.

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 outstanding North Dakota students whose artwork will be on display in my State offices this year.

They are the winners of the State of the Arts Awards in this year’s North Dakota Juried Student Art Show. 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; Ashllyn...
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. She is a great young woman who has nurtured the emerging skills of these young North Dakota artists.

VERMONT STATE OF THE UNION ESSAY WINNERS

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. She is a great young woman who has nurtured the emerging skills of these young North Dakota artists.
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. However, 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 privilege peers. Wealth and the quality of schooling have collided for too long. Every young adult has the right to a deserving and fulfilling academic career. We must realize now that the only way to fix the education system is to approach it as an economic matter. From then on, we will achieve equity and prosperity through the American college system.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC–4772. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promotion 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–4773. 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–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 Promotion 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 Promotion of Air Quality State Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Revisions to the Utah Division of Administrative Rules; R207–101–3" (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 Promotion of Air Quality State Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Revisions to the Utah Division of Administrative Rules; R207–101–3" (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–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 Promotion of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2019 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard" (FRL No. 10009–54–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4782. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Quality State Implementation Plans; Approvals and Promulgations; Montana; Campbell and Lobby 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 Mainstream Waiver Application; 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 303 (d) 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 Cigarette Package and Advertisements; Delayed Effective Date" (RIN0919–A138) 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 "Pension Plan 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 4, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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 "Pension Plan 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 4, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4789. A communication from the Chairmen of the Office of Surface Transportation, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Patent Term Adjustment Reductions in View of the Federal Circuit Decision in Supennus Pharm., Inc. v. Iancu" (RIN0651–AD36) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2020; to the Committee on Judiciary.

EC–4790. A communication from the Chairmen of the Office of Surface Transportation, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Demurrage Billing Notice Requirements" (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 758) 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 Revenue Requirements for Paying Benefits” (29 CFR Part 4022) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 20, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.
The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

**POM-392.** 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.

Whereas, the World Trade Center of New Orleans, a nonprofit organization, is committed to fostering economic development and enhancing the state’s prospects for international trade.

Whereas, having increased exports by sixty-one percent from 2008 to 2018, Louisiana is the fifth largest state exporter of the United States; 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 bring in $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, transportation, and tourism, 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 Class I railroads, which traverse 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, being situated at the crossroads, in 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 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 business; and

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 business; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the President 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.

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 5, 2022.
*Catherine Bird, of Texas, to be General Counsel of the Federal Labor Relations Authority for a term of five years.
*Craig Edward Leon, of the District of Columbia, to be Inspector General, Office of Personnel Management.

Donald Lee Moak, of Florida, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service for a term expiring December 5, 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. 3930. 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. 3931. 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. 3932. 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, Mr. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. WARNEN, 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 Mr. DUCKWORTH:

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

By Mr. HAWLEY:

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

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Ms. SINEMA, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 3937. A bill to reauthorize 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 introduced, read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. MCGONNELL, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. TOOMY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. HJOVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LEE, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. TULLIS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. HARKASSO, 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. 330

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 330, a bill to restore the operation of the Federal trust laws to the business of health insurance to protect competition and consumers.

S. 598

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. EINSTEIN), the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. CORMANY), and the name of the Senator from Alabama (Ms. COLLINS) 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. TANNER, 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. 2963

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. 2963, 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. 3305

At the request of Mr. Tester, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. Hassan) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3305, 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. 3893

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. Bennett) were added as cosponsors of S. 3893, 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. 3957

At the request of Mr. Tester, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Reed) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3957, 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 Vermont (Mr. Sanders) were added as cosponsors of S. 3799, a bill to expand access to health care services, including sexual, reproductive, and maternal health services, for immigrants by removing legal and policy barriers to health insurance coverage, and for other purposes.

S. 3900

At the request of Mr. Sullivan, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. Murkowski) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3900, 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 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. Crapo, 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, Ms. 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 lynching mobs, segregation, and Jim Crow, and that history leaves the United States with important work to accomplish;

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

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

Whereas, in 2019, 89 law enforcement officers were killed in the line of duty;

Whereas law enforcement officers are entrusted by the public to protect, serve, and defend 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 underfunded police departments andundertrained 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

RESOLUTION NO. 5
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. AXELROD, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. Kaine, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. HIRONO, Mr. WARNER, 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. AXELROD, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. Kaine, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. HIRONO, Mr. WARNER, 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 1633. Mr. RAUL (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. AXELROD, Mr. KENNEDY, 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. WYDEN, Mr. Kaine, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. HIRONO, Mr. WARNER, 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 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. PORTMAN) 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. AXELROD, Mr. KENNEDY, 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. WYDEN, Mr. Kaine, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. HIRONO, Mr. WARNER, 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. AXELROD, Mr. KENNEDY, 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. WYDEN, Mr. Kaine, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. HIRONO, Mr. WARNER, Ms. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DUNBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BUCNOK, Ms. MASTO, 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.
WARNEN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 617, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1640. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1640 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURRE, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Ms. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HENRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. COTZET MASTO, Mr. MERCYKLY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KINN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARNEN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 617, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1644. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1644 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURRE, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Ms. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HENRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. COTZET MASTO, Mr. MERCYKLY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KINN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HISONO, Ms. WARNEN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 617, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1646. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1646 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURRE, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Ms. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HENRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. COTZET MASTO, Mr. MERCYKLY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KINN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HISONO, Ms. WARNEN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 617, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1649. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1649 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURRE, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Ms. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HENRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. COTZET MASTO, Mr. MERCYKLY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KINN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HISONO, Ms. WARNEN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 617, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1617. 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. Schum- mer, Mr. Blunt, Harris, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Peters, Mr. Tillis, Ms. Baldwin, Ms. McSally, Mr. Casey, Mr. Graham, Mr. Hein- rich, Mr. Bennet, Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Booker, Ms. Cortez Masto, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Wyden, Mr. Kaine, Ms. Sinema, Ms. Rosen, Ms. Coons, Ms. Smith, Ms. Hassan, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mrs. Murray, Mr. Durbin, Mrs. Shaheen, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Jones, Mr. Van Hollen, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Brown, Ms. Hirono, Ms. Warren, Mr. Murphy, Ms. Klobuchar, Ms. Duckworth, Ms. Stabenow, Ms. Leahy, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Marky, 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, Daines, Mr. Warner, Mr. Portman, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Alexander, Mr. King, Mr. Burr, Mr. Tester, Ms. Collins, Mr. Udall, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Schum- mer, Mr. Blunt, Harris, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Peters, Mr. Tillis, Ms. Baldwin, Ms. McSally, Mr. Casey, Mr. Graham, Mr. Hein- rich, Mr. Bennet, Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Booker, Ms. Cortez Masto, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Wyden, Mr. Kaine, Ms. Sinema, Ms. Rosen, Ms. Coons, Ms. Smith, Ms. Hassan, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mrs. Murray, Mr. Durbin, Mrs. Shaheen, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Jones, Ms. Van Hollen, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Brown, Ms. Hirono, Ms. Warren, Mr. Murphy, Ms. Klobuchar, Ms. Duckworth, Ms. Stabenow, Ms. Leahy, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Marky, 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. Inhoffe) 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. Schum- mer, Mr. Blunt, Harris, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Peters, Mr. Tillis, Ms. Baldwin, Ms. McSally, Mr. Casey, Mr. Graham, Mr. Hein- rich, Mr. Bennet, Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Booker, Ms. Cortez Masto, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Wyden, Mr. Kaine, Ms. Sinema, Ms. Rosen, Ms. Coons, Ms. Smith, Ms. Hassan, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mrs. Murray, Mr. Durbin, Mrs. Shaheen, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Jones, Mr. Van Hollen, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Brown, Ms. Hirono, Ms. Warren, Mr. Murphy, Ms. Klobuchar, Ms. Duckworth, Ms. Stabenow, Ms. Leahy, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Marky, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Cramer, and Mr. Schatz) to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SEC. 4. OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES. (a) GULF OF MEXICO OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES.—(1) PROVISIONAL 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), by striking “and” after thesemicolon;

(B) in clause (ii)—

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

(ii) in subclause (I), by inserting “and” before “in each fiscal year thereafter”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) each fiscal year 2017 through 2020.”.

SEC. 5. 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:

SEC. 5. ELIMINATION OF LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF DISTRIBUTED QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES.—

SEC. 6. OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES.
(f) LIMITATIONS ON AMOUNT OF DISTRIBUTED QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES.—

(1) LIMITATIONS.—

(A) YEARS 2016 THROUGH 2020.—Sub- ject to paragraph (2), the total amount of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues made available under subsection (a)(2)(B) 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) YEARS 2021 THROUGH 2055.—Sub- ject to paragraph (2), the total amount of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues made available under subsection (a)(2)(B) shall not exceed—

(i) $125,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2035.

(ii) $200,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2036 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)(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.

(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 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;

(ii) all or part of which lies within the coastal zone (as defined in section 301 of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1453)) of the State; and

(iii) the coastal point of which is not more than 200 nautical miles from the geographical center of any leased tract in the Alaska outer Continental Shelf region; and

(B) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term "institution of higher education" has the meaning given 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 revenues derived from 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 security securing obligations other than royalties, rentals, royalties, bonus bids, or other sums due and payable to the United States taken by the Secretary in-kind and not sold.

(D) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(E) STATE.—The term "State" means the State of Alaska.

(2) DISPOSITION OF QUALIFIED REVENUES IN ALASKA.—Notwithstanding section 9 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1338) and subject to the other provisions of this subsection, for fiscal year 2021 and each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury shall—

(A) 50 percent of qualified revenues in the general fund of the Treasury;

(B) 42.5 percent of qualified revenues in a special account in the Treasury to be distributed by the Secretary to the State; and

(C) 7.5 percent of qualified revenues in a special account in the Treasury, to be distributed by the Secretary to coastal political subdivisions.

(3) ALLOCATION AMONG COASTAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS.—Of the amount paid by the Secretary to coastal political subdivisions under paragraph (2)(C) the Secretary shall—

(A) 90 percent shall be allocated among coastal political subdivisions described in paragraph (1)(A)(i) in amounts (based on a formula established by the Secretary by regulation) that are inversely proportional to the respective distances between the point in each coastal political subdivision that is closest to the geographic center of the applicable leased tract and not more than 200 miles from the geographic center of the leased tract; and

(B) 10 percent shall be divided equally among each coastal political subdivision described in paragraph (1)(A)(ii).

(4) TIMING.—The amounts required to be deposited in the Fund under subsection (a)(2) may be used for the purposes described in subparagraph (A)(viii) in accordance with this subsection, for 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 (4)(A) in accordance with all applicable Federal and State laws, for 1 or more of the following purposes:

(I) Projects and activities for the purposes of coastal protection, conservation, and restoration, including onshore infrastructure and relocation of communities directly affected by coastal erosion, melting permafrost, or climate change-related losses.

(II) Mitigation of damage to fish, wildlife, or natural resources.

(III) Mitigation of the impact of outer Continental Shelf activities through the funding of onshore infrastructure projects and related rights-of-way.

(IV) Adaptation planning, vulnerability assessments, and emergency preparedness assistance to coastal, rural, and resilient communities.

(V) Installation and operation of energy systems to reduce energy costs and greenhouse gas emissions associated 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 uses, 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 the amounts received by the State under paragraph (2)(B) may be used for the purposes described in paragraph (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. 7503) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (5)(A) 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 in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304)" and inserting "means a 'tidal shoreline' or a 'Great Lake shoreline', as those terms are used in section 1002 of the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act (16 U.S.C. 7503)".

(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) by striking 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 103(b)(3)(B) of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109-402);

(B) are deposited in the Fund under subparagraph (C) of section 8(g) 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—

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

(ii) 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—

(A) amounts in the Fund shall be used for the award of grants only under section 906(b); 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 in proportion to an amount reached and documented by both the Administrator and the Foundation."; and
SEC. 905. ELIGIBLE USES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Amounts in the Fund may be awarded by the Administrator and the Foundation for administration, and 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.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed to require the Administrator to expend amounts in the Fund for any purpose that is not consistent with the standard competitive bidding and audit requirements.

(c) ELIGIBLE USES OF AMOUNTS IN THE NATIONAL OCEANS AND COASTAL SECURITY FUND.—The Administrator and the Foundation for 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 National Oceans and Coastal Security Fund (as defined in section 906 of the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act (16 U.S.C. 7504)) are available only for the purposes described in this subsection.

(b) PURPOSES DESCRIBED.—The purposes described in this subsection are the following:

(1) Ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes restoration and protection, including efforts to address potential impacts to natural resources, communities, and coastal economies of sea level change, sedimentation, erosion, changes in ocean chemistry, hurricanes and other extreme coastal storms, flooding, and changes in ocean temperature;

(2) conservation and management, or maintenance of ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources and marine habitats;

(3) research, monitoring, planning, or resiliency and readiness at a regional scale, such as through regional ocean partnerships or similar bodies, including sustainable coastal development;

(4) scientific research that contributes to the understanding and mitigation of ecological, economic, societal, and national security threats driven by sea level change, sedimentation, erosion, changes in ocean chemistry, hurricanes and other extreme weather 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) grants to coastal States in strengthening, stabilizing, elevating, modifying, repositioning, or otherwise enhancing the resiliency of onshore infrastructure, including structures, affected by coastal land loss or erosion, hurricanes or other extreme coastal storms, or flooding from sea level change.

(6) data compilation, and sharing of data that supports and includes regular stakeholder engagement to minimize actual or potential conflicts among ocean users.

(c) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR LITIGATION OR OTHER PURPOSES.—No funds made available under this title may be used—

(1) to fund litigation against the Federal Government; or
(2) to fund the creation of national marine monuments, marine protected areas, or marine spatial plans.

(d) GRANTS UNDER THE NATIONAL OCEANS AND COASTAL SECURITY ACT.—Section 906 of the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act (16 U.S.C. 7505) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking paragraph (2); and

(B) by striking “andCoastal Administration of Grants.—”. and all that follows through “the following:” and inserting the following:

(‘‘(A) ADMINISTRATION OF GRANTS.—Not later than the last day of each fiscal year, the Administrator shall make available to the Administrator and the Foundation for administration purposes, the Administrator and the Foundation shall establish the following:’’;

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

(C) in 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 Commerce.’’;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

‘‘(ii) A description of the process the coastal State or other coastal-related business will use in allocating amounts received under this subsection, which shall include—

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

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(B)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking ‘‘; and’’ and inserting a semicolon;

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

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

‘‘(iii) nongovernmental organizations; and’’;

(B) by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(C) 25 percent of available amounts shall be allocated on 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 roles in the State performed by 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) a description of each such project and program; and

(II) a statement of the status of each such project and program.

(4) OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In determining whether to amend 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.

(B) NONPARTICIPATION BY A STATE.—In any year, if a coastal State does not submit a plan as required by paragraph (3) or declines to participate in the plan, the amounts that would have been allocated to the coastal State shall be redistributed equally among the remaining coastal States.

(5) ELIGIBILITY OF RECIPIENTS.—As a condition of receiving a grant under this subsection, the entity seeking to receive the grant shall demonstrate that the project or program is based on available from non-Federal sources to match the amount of the grant.

(6) 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 “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 AND 2018.—Section 906 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 ENERGYSFACILITIES AND DEVICES ON THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF.—Section 401 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1333(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e), by striking “‘(1)’ and inserting the following: ‘‘(1)’’;

(2) by inserting at the end the following:

‘‘(2) To the extent permitted by适用于的 federal, state, or local law, a coastal entity may enter into agreements with the Administrator and the Foundation, or any of their contractors, to carry out projects or programs under this section that includes, at a minimum—

(I) an identification of each entity receiving amounts under this subsection;’’;
(b) Mitigation of damage to fish, wildlife, or natural resources.

(cc) Implementation of a federally approved marine, coastal, or comprehensive conservation plan within the prescribed boundaries.

(dd) Mitigation of the impact of outer Continental Shelf activities through the funding of onshore infrastructure projects.

(ee) Administrative costs of complying with this section.

(ii) LIMITATION.—Of the amounts received by a State under clause (ii)(cc), not more than 3 percent shall be used for the purposes described in subsection (1)(e).

(iv) ADMINISTRATION.—Subject to clause (v)(III), amounts made available under clause (ii)(dd) shall—

(1) be made available, without further appropriation, in accordance with this paragraph;

(2) remain available until expended; and

(3) be in addition to any amount appropriated under any other Act.

(v) IMPLEMENTING REQUIREMENTS.—(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)(cc) 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 ACCESS.—On receipt of a report under clause (I), the Secretary shall make the report available to the public on the website of the Department of the Interior.

(vi) SEC. 1373(p)(2).—(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(aa) Proposed National Heritage Area.—The term "proposed National Heritage Area" means an area that is proposed to be designated as a National Heritage Area.

(bb) National Heritage Area System.—The term "National Heritage Area System" means the system established by subsection (b)(1).

(c) DISPOSITION OF REVENUES FOR OFFSHORE WIND PROJECTS IN CERTAIN AREAS.—

(i) GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall—

(A) PROPOSED NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA.—

The term "proposed National Heritage Area" means an area that is proposed to be designated as a National Heritage Area.

BB) National Heritage Area System.—The term "National Heritage Area System" means the system established by subsection (b)(1).

(d) PROPOSED NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA.—

The term "proposed National Heritage Area" means an area that is proposed to be designated as a National Heritage Area.

(e) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(f) TRIBAL GOVERNMENT.—The term "tribal government" means the governing body of an Indian Tribe designated by Congress or on the date of enactment of this Act.

Amendments.—The Secretary shall—

(A) 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 encompasses areas designated by Congress as National Heritage Areas in land use activities or on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) work with local coordinating entities to promote public enjoyment of units of the National Park System in accordance with the applicable management plan for the National Park System.

Amendments.—The Secretary shall—

(A) 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 encompasses areas designated by Congress as National Heritage Areas in land use activities or on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) work with local coordinating entities to promote public enjoyment of units of the National Park System in accordance with the applicable management plan for the National Park System.

Amendments.—The Secretary shall—

(A) 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 encompasses areas designated by Congress as National Heritage Areas in land use activities or on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) work with local coordinating entities to promote public enjoyment of units of the National Park System in accordance with the applicable management plan for the National Park System.
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;

(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 communities, individuals, and organizations; 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, Tribal, or local authorities, the House of Representatives, the Senate, and other Federal agencies, States, Tribal governments, local governments, local coordinating entities, and other interested individuals and entities; and

(ii) by the Secretary, in consultation with State, Tribal, or local governments that—

(aa) is supported by the public.

(B) CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 1 year after receiving a study carried out by interested individuals or entities under clause (i), the Secretary shall—

(I) make a determination whether the study meets the requirements of subparagraph (C); and

(ii) conduct an analysis, documentation, and determinations on whether the proposed National Heritage Area—

(I) has an assemblage of natural, historic, and cultural resources that—

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

(bb) reflects traditions, customs, beliefs, and cultural resources that—

(aa) have a potential management entity to ensure the continued involvement of, and support by, the public.

(C) REQUIREMENTS.—A study under paragraph (B) shall—

(i) of the purposes of this section;

(ii) prioritize actions and criteria for selecting projects; and

(iii) include recommendations for the continued involvement of, and support by, the public.

(D) REPORT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—For each study carried out under subparagraph (A), 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) TIMING.—

(I) the findings of the study; and

(ii) any conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary.

(ii) STUDIES CARRIED OUT BY THE SECRETARY.—With respect to a study carried out by the Secretary under subparagraph (B), 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) 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 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); and

(bb) review and comment on the draft plan; and

(ii) documentation of the planning and public participation processes, including a description of—

(aa) the means by which the management plan was developed; and

(bb) the stakeholders involved in the process; and

(iii) the timing and method of stakeholder involvement.

(d) AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY FOR EVALUATION.—

(1) STUDIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—For each study carried out under paragraph (A), the Secretary shall submit a report 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.

(B) CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 1 year after receiving a study carried out by interested individuals or entities under clause (i), the Secretary shall—

(I) certify the proposed National Heritage Area; and

(ii) submit a report under clause (i) not later than 180 days after the date on which the Secretary certifies under clause (i) that the study meets the requirements of subparagraph (C).

(C) REQUIREMENTS.—A study under subparagraph (B) shall—

(i) conform to the procedures described in subparagraph (B) and the applicable individual counseling, products or services offered, the target market for those products and services, and revenue streams; and

(ii) 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).

(D) APPLICABILITY.—The requirements described in subparagraph (B) shall not apply to any management plan or 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).

(e) 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—

(i) assess the progress of the applicable local coordinating entity of a National Heritage Area with respect to—
(1) accomplishing the purposes of the applicable National Heritage Area; and
(2) achieving the goals and objectives of the management plan;
(3) management of Federal, State, local, Tribal government, and private investments in the National Heritage Area to determine the leverage and impact of the investments; and
(4) management of Federal, State, local, Tribal government, and private investments in the National Heritage Area for purposes of identifying the critical components for sustainability of National Heritage Areas.
(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 any means by which that Federal funding may be reduced or eliminated over time; and
(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) CONFIRMING AMENDMENT.—Section 302(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;
(A) alters any applicable land use regulation, land use plan, or other regulatory authority of any Federal, State, or local agency or other entity, 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.—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) shall 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. KAIN, 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, Ms. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOTTENBERG, Mrs. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. Kaine, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. Shaheen, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBuchar, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. McCONNELL, Mr. MARKET, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1967, 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. 9. 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) in subsection (a), by inserting ''and'' after ''the'';
(2) in subsection (b), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

(b) PURPOSES DESCRIBED.—The purposes described in this subsection are the following:

(1) Ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes restoration and protection, including efforts to mitigate and 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 scale, such as through regional ocean partnerships or similar bodies, including sustainable coastal development.

(4) Scientific research that contributes to the understanding and mitigation of ecological, economic, societal, and national security threats driven by sea level change, sedimentation, erosion, changes in ocean chemistry, hurricanes and other extreme weather 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, other coastal-related businesses.

(5) Efforts to assist coastal States in strengthening, stabilizing, elevating, modifying, repositioning, or otherwise enhancing the resiliency of onshore infrastructure, in-
other extreme coastal storms, or flooding from sea level change.

“(6) The collection, compilation, and sharing of data that supports and includes regular updates and reports to minimize actual or potential conflicts among ocean users.

“(c) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR LITIGATION OR OTHER PURPOSES.—No funds made available under this title may be used—

“(1) to fund litigation against the Federal Government; or

“(2) to fund the creation of national marine monuments, marine protected areas, or marine spatial plans.”.

(d) GRANTS UNDER THE NATIONAL OCEANS AND COASTAL SECURITY ACT.—Section 906 of the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act (16 U.S.C. 7505) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking paragraph (2); and

(B) by striking “(a) ADMINISTRATION OF GRANTS.” and all that follows through “the following;” and inserting the following:

“(a) ADMINISTRATION OF GRANTS.—Not later than 30 days after funds are deposited into the revolving fund established under this subsection, the Administrator and the Foundation for administrative purposes, the Administrator and the Foundation shall establish the following:

(C) in paragraphs (1), (B), by striking “such subsections” and inserting “this section”; and

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

“(B) procedures and criteria for the awarding of grants under this section that require consultation with the Administrator and the Foundation;”;

(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;

and

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) GRANTS TO COASTAL STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall award grants to coastal States as follows:

(A) 50 percent of available amounts shall be allocated equally among coastal States.

(B) 25 percent of available amounts shall be allocated based on the 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 based 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 must submit to the Administrator a 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 to apply for, receive, and expend funds awarded under this subsection, which shall include—

(I) a description of the roles in the State process for receiving the funds that would have been awarded under this subsection;

(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; and

(iv) Procedures to make publicly available in a timely manner lists of projects and programs receiving amounts under this subsection that includes, at a minimum—

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

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

(C) a description of each such project and program; and

(D) a statement of the status of each such project and program.

(B) UPDATES.—As a condition of receiving a grant under this subsection, a coastal State shall submit to the Administrator, not less frequently than once every 5 years, an update to the plan submitted by the coastal State under subparagraph (A) for the 5-year period immediately following the most recent submittal under this paragraph.

(C) INAUGURAL YEAR.—In the first year after the submittal of the plan under paragraph (b)(1)(A), the Administrator awards grants under this subsection—

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

(2) a coastal State may use amounts received under this subsection to develop a plan for the administration of the funds received 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

(6) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(B)—

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

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

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

(A) nongovernmental organizations; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—As a condition of receiving a grant under this subsection, the entity seeking to receive the grant shall demonstrate that funds are available to match the limitation under subsection (b)(2) on funding to coastal States through grants awarded under subsection (b).”

(b) ANNUAL REPORT ON OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL OCEANS AND COASTAL SECURITY ACT.—Section 907(a) of the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act (16 U.S.C. 7506(a)) is amended—

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

and

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

(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 ENCOMPASS AREAS BEYOND 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 striking paragraph (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 AREAS—

(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this subparagraph:

(I) COVERED OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT.—The term ‘covered offshore wind project’ means a project for electric generation 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.

(iii) REQUIREMENT.—

(1) 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. 7505(a)); and

(cc) 37.5 percent shall be deposited in a special account in the Treasury, from which the Secretary, subject to subparagraph (ii), shall disburse to each eligible State an amount
amended by inserting after "Payments to Social Security Trust Funds (28-0404-0-1-651).:"
the following: "Payments to States pursuant to subparagraph (d)(2)(B)(i)(R)(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, 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. KAIN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. DEMPSEY, Mrs. SHELLENBERGER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WARNEN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBuchar, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEHAY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; as follows:

"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, Mrs. BURKETT, Mr. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAIN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DEMPSEY, Mrs. SHELLENBERGER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WARNEN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBuchar, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEHAY, Mr. McCONNELL, Mr. MARKY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; as follows:

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

SA 1628. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1957, 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; as follows:

"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:

"This Act shall take effect 4 days after the date of enactment."

SA 1630. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1630 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the amendment SA 1630 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 1957, 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; as follows:

"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 amendment SA 1630 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 1957, 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; as follows:

"This Act shall take effect 6 days after the date of enactment."

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, 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; as follows:

"This Act shall take effect 7 days after the date of enactment."
purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 4. REISSUANCE OF FINAL RULE REGARDING GRAY WOLVES IN WESTERN GREAT LAKES.

(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 provision of statute or regulation that applies to issuance of such rule is amended by striking “June 30, 2022” and inserting “June 30, 2032”.

(b) Reissuance of Final Rule Regarding Gray Wolves in Wyoming.—The final rule published on September 10, 2012 (77 Fed. Reg. 55530) that was reissued on March 3, 2017, by 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. 20394-45) 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.

SEC. 5. MORATORIUM ON OIL AND GAS LEASING IN CERTAIN AREAS OF GULF OF MEXICO.

Section 104(a) of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Act of 2008 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note) is amended by striking “June 30, 2012” and inserting “June 30, 2017”.

SEC. 6. CONFORMING ADJUSTMENT OF DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) In General.—The Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(c)(8)(B)) is amended by striking “$626,050,000,000” and inserting “$626,500,000,000”.

(b) 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 “$626,050,000,000” and inserting “$626,500,000,000”.

SA 1634. Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CARTER, 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. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BURBANK, Mr. REED, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HINCHIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CORTÉZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. Kaine, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. ROSEN, Ms. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BURR, Mr. VANCE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DWUCKWORTH, Mr. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKET, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1159, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 7. 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 “$626,050,000,000” and inserting “$626,500,000,000”.

SA 1636. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1159, 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. 8. AUTHORIZATION TO ESTABLISH COMMEMORATIVE WORK.

(a) In General.—The Fallen Journalists Memorial Foundation shall have the authority to sell commemorativeorative work, to be available to the public to pay any expenses for the establishment, the maintenance, and the preservation 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 commemorative 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.

(b) On Expiration of Authority.—If upon expiration of the authority for the commemorative work under section 8906(b)(3) 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 and the Administrator of General Services (as appropriate) following the process provided in section 8906(b)(1) 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. 1159, 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. 9. CONFORMING ADJUSTMENT OF DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(b) 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 “$626,050,000,000” and inserting “$626,500,000,000”.

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. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BURBANK, Mr. REED, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HINCHIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CORTÉZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. Kaine, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. ROSEN, Ms. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BURR, Mr. VANCE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DWUCKWORTH, Mr. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKET, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1159, 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 the amendment, add the following:

SEC. 10. PROHIBITION OF USE OF FUNDS TO IMPLEMENT THE PRESIDENTIAL MEMORIAL FOUNDATION ACTION PROCLAMATION MODIFYING THE NORTHEAST CANYONS AND SATURDAY MARINE NATIONAL MONUMENT.

(a) Findings.—Congress finds that—
(1) the Presidential Proclamation of June 5, 2020, relating to “Modifying the Northeast Canyons and Seamounts Marine National Monument” is illegal and should not be carried out;

(2) the President does not have the legal authority under the Constitution of the United States or any Federal law to eliminate the protections necessary for the proper care and management” of the “objects of scientific and historic interest” at a national monument, as required under chapter 3203 of title 54, United States Code;

(3) only Congress may make a significant change in the protection of a national monument;

(4) in attempting to roll back the protections for the Northeast Canyons and Seamounts Marine National Monument under the Presidential Proclamation, as issued on September 15, 2016 (54 U.S.C. 329301 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 9466, as issued on September 15, 2016 (54 U.S.C. 329301 note).

(b) PROHIBITION.—No funds, resources, or fees made available to the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Interior, or any other official of a Federal agency for any fiscal year shall 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. AXELROD, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASSEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Ms. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERRICK, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAIN, 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, Mr. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DWUCKOW, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDU, 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 is 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:

“"(a) Submission of Annual List of Projects to Congress.—Until the date on which all of the amounts in the Fund are expended, the President shall annually submit to Congress, together with the annual budget of the United States—

“(1) a list of projects that are to be funded from the Fund for the applicable fiscal year that includes a detailed description of each project, including the estimated expenditures from the Fund for the project for the applicable fiscal year;

“(2) a list of projects that received funding during the preceding fiscal year from the Fund that includes a detailed description of each project, including—

“(A) the total amount of expenditures expected 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; and

“(c) 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. AXELROD, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASSEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Ms. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERRICK, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAIN, 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, Mr. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DWUCKOW, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDU, 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 is ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 6. LIMITATION ON THE EXTENSION OR ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL MONUMENTS IN THE STATE OF WYOMING.

Section 23001(d) of title 54, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “Wyoming” and inserting “the State of Wyoming or Utah”;

(2) by striking “Wyoming” and inserting “the State of Wyoming or Utah”.

"..."
SA 1642. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, 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. HENRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. ROSEN, Ms. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ANGUS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Mr. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill S. 1301, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer to the Internal Revenue Service the amounts in the Internal Revenue Service Trust Fund that includes a detailed description of each project, including—

"(1) 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) a list of projects that are to be funded from the Fund in the applicable fiscal year that includes a detailed description of each project, including—

"(i) a list of projects that are to be funded from the Fund in the applicable fiscal year that includes a detailed description of each project, including—

"(ii) a list of projects that are to be funded from the Fund in the applicable fiscal year that includes a detailed description of each project, including—

"(iii) a list of projects that are to be funded from the Fund in the applicable fiscal year that includes a detailed description of each project, including—

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. HENRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. ROSEN, Ms. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ANGUS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Mr. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, 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. 16. 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.—

"(A) NEPA PROCESS.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—If a permit or authorization necessary to carry out the proposed action is issued by a covered agency, the head of the covered agency shall publish a notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement in the Federal Register.

"(iii) DENIAL OF PERMIT OR AUTHORIZATION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—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.

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. HENRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. ROSEN, Ms. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ANGUS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Mr. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, 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:

"(1) REUSE OF WORK UNDER NEPA.—

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. HENRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. ROSEN, Ms. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ANGUS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Mr. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

With respect to a proposed action from a project sponsor; a notice of intent to prepare a project sponsor carries out the recommendations of the head of the covered agency under subparagraph (I) 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 not issued or denied within the period described in that subparagraph, the permit or authorization shall be considered to be approved.

"(B) AUTHORIZATIONS AND PERMITS.—

"(I) IN GENERAL.—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.

"(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.—

"(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 not issued or denied within the period described in that subparagraph, the permit or authorization shall be considered to be approved.
"(1) Definitions.—In this subsection:

"(A) Environmental impact statement.—The term ‘environmental impact statement’ means a detailed statement required under section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

"(B) NEPA process.—

"(i) In general.—The term ‘NEPA process’, with respect to a proposed action, means the entirety of every process, analysis, or other measure, including an environmental impact statement, required to be carried out by a covered agency under title I of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) before the covered agency undertakes the proposed action.

"(ii) Period.—For purposes of clause (i), the NEPA process begins on the date on which the head of a covered agency receives an application for a proposed action from a project sponsor; and

"(B) consider an alternative to the proposed action, the head of a covered agency may reuse the applicable findings and research was not 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 been materially changed; or

"(ii)(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 proposed action was 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, Mr. PORTER, Mr. BURR, Mr. LAWS, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. SHELBY, Mr. VERNON B. JONES, Mr. MAYEUX, Mr. 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. HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. Brown, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTHS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHUETZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 3. PROHIBITIONS OF CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES UNDER NEPA.

Section 200402 of title 54, United States Code (as added by section 2a.), is amended by adding at the end following:

"(i) Prohibitions Under NEPA Analysis.—

"(I) Definitions.—In this subsection:

"(A) Environmental impact statement.—The term ‘environmental impact statement’ means a detailed statement required under section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

"(B) NEPA process.—

"(i) In general.—The term ‘NEPA process’, with respect to a proposed action, means the entirety of every process, analysis, or other measure, including an environmental impact statement, required to be carried out by a covered agency under title I of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) before the covered agency undertakes the proposed action.

"(ii) Period.—For purposes of clause (i), the NEPA process begins on the date on which the head of a covered agency receives an application for a proposed action from a project sponsor; and

"(B) considers an alternative to the proposed action, the head of a covered agency may reuse the applicable findings and research was not 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 been materially changed; or

"(ii)(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 proposed action was similar issues or decisions as the project.

SA 1646. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. Kaine, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. Brown, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTHS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHUETZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 3. CERTAIN REPORTS REQUIRED PRIOR TO ACQUISITION OF LAND USING AMOUNTS FROM THE CONSERVATION SECURITY FUND.

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

"(a) Reports Required Prior to Acquisition.—Before acquiring any land under this title, the Secretary of Agriculture, as applicable, shall submit—

"(I) 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

"(II) 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. HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. Brown, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTHS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHUETZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 3. CERTAIN REPORTS REQUIRED PRIOR TO ACQUISITION OF LAND USING AMOUNTS FROM THE CONSERVATION SECURITY FUND.
purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, the addenda following:

SEC. 2. STATE APPROVAL REQUIRED PRIOR TO ACQUISITION OF LAND OR 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.—If 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 a written notice from the owner of such land or water, which is located in the State in which the 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. ALFORD, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESAVER, 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. HENRICH, Mr. BERNET, Ms. FRANKEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTES MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAIN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOOLANDT, 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. 527, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 4. CATEGORICAL EXclusions.

Section 54, United States Code (as added by section 2(a)), is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(i) NEPA PROCESS TIMELINES.—

"(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.).

"(2) 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.

"(3) 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. 4231 et seq.)) to carry out a project using amounts made available under the Fund.

"(4) 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)(I), not later than 2 years after the date described in paragraph (1)(B)(ii)(I).

"(ii) ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS.—Within the period described in clause (i), not later than 1 year after the date described in paragraph (1)(B)(ii)(I), the head of the covered agency shall, with respect to the proposed action—

"(I) issue—

"(aa) a finding that a categorical exclusion applies to the proposed action; or

"(bb) a finding of a no significant impact; or

"(cc) 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) within the period described in clause (i), and the date of a finding described in clause (i) and the date of a finding described in clause (ii), the date by which the covered agency has complied with clause (i) and the date by which the covered agency has completed the NEPA process for a proposed action, the Director shall notify the head of the covered agency that the NEPA process has been completed 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) PENALTY; NOTIFICATION.—For each determination made by the Director under item (aa) that the amount of the covered agency has not complied with the applicable requirements of clauses (i) through (iii) for the proposed action, the amount shall be reduced by 0.5 percent from the amount initially made available for the fiscal year during which the determination is made.

"(cc) the determination has not been reduced by 0.5 percent from the amount initially made available for the fiscal year during which the determination is made; and

"(dd) the fiscal year during which the determination is made is not the fiscal year during which the amount initially made available for the fiscal year during which the most recent determination was made shall be reduced by 0.5 percent from the amount initially made available for the fiscal year during which the most recent determination was made.

"(III) REQUIREMENTS.—

"(aa) AMOUNTS NOT RESTORED.—A reduction in the amount that the covered agency may obligate from the account identified under item (aa) for the fiscal year during which the determination was made shall not be restored for that fiscal year, without regard to whether the head of the covered agency has complied with clause (ii) for that proposed action.

"(BB) beginning on the day after the date on which the determination is made.

"(cc) a categorical exclusion under title I of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4331 et seq.) to carry out a project using amounts made available under the Fund.

"(BB) the Director shall notify the head of the covered agency that the NEPA process has been completed for the proposed action.

"(BB) the Director shall make the determination that the amount of the covered agency has not complied with the applicable requirements of clauses (i) through (iii) for the proposed action, the amount shall be reduced by 0.5 percent from the amount initially made available for the fiscal year during which the determination is made.

"(CC) the determination has not been reduced by 0.5 percent from the amount initially made available for the fiscal year during which the determination is made; and

"(DD) the fiscal year during which the determination is made is not the fiscal year during which the amount initially made available for the fiscal year during which the most recent determination was made shall be reduced by 0.5 percent from the amount initially made available for the fiscal year during which the most recent determination was made.

"(EE) REQUIREMENTS.—

"(aa) DETERMINATION.—Every 90 days after the date on which an initial NEPA compliance determination is made, 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, the amount shall be reduced by 0.5 percent from the amount initially made available for the fiscal year during which the determination was made.

"(BB) the determination has not been reduced by 0.5 percent from the amount initially made available for the fiscal year during which the determination was made; and

"(CC) the determination has not been reduced by 0.5 percent from the amount initially made available for the fiscal year during which the most recent determination was made; and

"(DD) the fiscal year during which the determination was made shall not be restored for that fiscal year, without regard to whether the head of the covered agency has complied with clause (ii) for that proposed action.

"(EE) REQUIREMENTS.—

"(aa) AMOUNTS NOT RESTORED.—A reduction in the amount that the covered agency may obligate from the account identified under item (aa) and the reduction under item (BB) shall not be restored for that fiscal year, without regard to whether the head of the covered agency has complied with clause (ii) for that proposed action.

"(BB) the determination has not been reduced by 0.5 percent from the amount initially made available for the fiscal year during which the determination was made; and

"(CC) the determination has not been reduced by 0.5 percent from the amount initially made available for the fiscal year during which the most recent determination was made; and

"(DD) the fiscal year during which the determination was made shall not be restored for that fiscal year, without regard to whether the head of the covered agency has complied with clause (ii) for that proposed action.
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 the Land Policy Act (i).

(b) Required Timelines.—The violation of clause (i) or (ii) 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) Authorization and Permits.—

(i) In General.—Not later than 90 days after the date described in paragraph (B)(ii)(II), the head of the covered agency shall issue—

(aa) a basis for the denial; and

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

(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.—

(A) In General.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and subject to subparagraph (B), 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. 4322(2)(C)).

(B) Categorical Exclusions.—

(A) In General.—If the head of a covered agency may use a categorical exclusion described in subparagraph (A) if the head of the covered agency—

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

(bb) considers the circumstances associated with the proposed action to ensure that there are no extraordinary circumstances that warrant the preparation of an environmental impact statement.

SA 1650. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDERN (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, Ms. BENNET, Ms. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAIN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKAY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 957, 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:

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 the Land Policy Act (i).

(b) Required Timelines.—The violation of clause (i) or (ii) 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) Authorization and Permits.—

(i) In General.—Not later than 90 days after the date described in paragraph (B)(ii)(II), the head of the covered agency shall issue—

(aa) a basis for the denial; and

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

(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.—

(A) In General.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and subject to subparagraph (B), the head of a covered agency may, without further approval, use a categorical exclusion under title I of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) that has been—

(aa) conducted as soon as practicable during each scheduled fiscal year to allow for appropriate planning in expending amounts in the Fund; or

(bb) conducted through—

(AA) an auction; or

(BB) a sealed-bid auction; and

(CC) other means for which the Secretary determines to be in the public interest and consistent with the purpose of this subsection.

(BB) closed-bid auction; and

(CC) other means for which the Secretary determines to be in the public interest and consistent with the purpose of this subsection.

(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.—

(A) In General.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and subject to subparagraph (B), the head of a covered agency may, without further approval, use a categorical exclusion under title I of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) that has been—

(aa) conducted as soon as practicable during each scheduled fiscal year to allow for appropriate planning in expending amounts in the Fund; or

(bb) conducted through—

(1) of the public land included in the inventory described in clause (i), identify parcels with a cumulative value equal to not more than $10,000,000,000 that would be appropriate to sell, in accordance with section 208 of that Act (43 U.S.C. 1713) and publish in the Federal Register a detailed list of each parcel of public land identified under clause (ii), together with—

(1) 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 any condition that the sales shall be—

(1) sold in the maximum amount of a covered agency, projected to generate total proceeds equal to not less than $1,000,000,000 during each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025.

(B) Cooperative 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 such agency, in accordance with the schedule published by the Secretary under subparagraph (A)(ii).
‘(l) the Fund shall consist only of the net proceeds deposited in the Fund pursuant to clause (i); and

‘(m) no amounts other than the amounts referred to in subparagraph (l) may be deposited in the Fund.

In section 200402(c) of title 54, United States Code (as added by section 2(a)), strike ‘subject to the condition that the sales shall be—’ 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 ‘subject under subparagraph (A)(i)’ and insert ‘subsection (d)(1)’.

In section 200402(3) of title 54, United States Code (as added by section 2(a)), strike ‘subject under subparagraph (A)(i)’ and insert ‘subsection (d)(1)’.

In section 200402 of title 54, United States Code (as added by section 2(a)), redesignate subparagraph (B)(3) as subparagraphs (d)(1) through (l), respectively.

In section 200303(a) of title 54, United States Code (as added by section 3(a)), strike ‘in advance in an appropriations Act’ and insert ‘subsection (d)’.

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. TWITLOW, 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. GILLBRAND, Mr. 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. BERNSTEIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. mCONNELL, Mr. MARKey, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDuE, Mr. Cramer, and Mr. SCHatz) to the bill H.R. 1957, as amended—

(a) in the table; as follows:

(b) deposits.—The Fund shall consist only of the net proceeds deposited in the Fund pursuant to clause (i); and

‘(m) no amounts other than the amounts referred to in subparagraph (l) 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(3) of title 54, United States Code (as added by section 2(a)), insert ‘; and’.

SA 1654. Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by 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. TWITLOW, 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. GILLBRAND, Mr. 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. mCONNELL, 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 5, strike line 22 and all that follows through page 5, line 5, and insert the following:

‘(b) deposits.—The Fund shall consist only of the amounts in the Fund.

SA 1655. Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by 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. GILLBRAND, Mr. 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. mCONNELL, 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:

On page 8, lines 20 and 21, strike ‘Until the date on which all of the amounts in the Fund are expended, the’ and insert ‘The’. On page 14, after the matter following line 16, add the following:

‘(d) allocation of funds.—Section 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’; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

‘(3) not less than 15 percent shall be deposited in the National Forest Legacy Restoration Fund established by section 200402(a).’.”
SA 1656. Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment Intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1617 proposed by Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. Kaine, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. DURBIN, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. RUBIO, 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. MARKET, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. Cramer, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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. LIMITATION REGARDING CERTAIN INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.

(a) DEFINITION OF AFFECTED PROJECT.—In this section, the term ‘affected project’ means an infrastructure project or proposed infrastructure project any phase of which requires the issuance by a Federal department or agency of an environmental impact statement, or of a finding of no significant impact under section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4331 et seq.), 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 approve a finding of no significant impact under section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4331 et seq.), or as a condition of, which a measure of environmental mitigation may be required.

Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKET, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. Cramer, and Mr. SCHATZ) to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . . . 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:

“(B) Any veteran who has been found to title 38, United States Code.”

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. . . . 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—

“(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.”

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have 4 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the majority and minority leaders.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have 4 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate.
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 Senate is in Cobra Caucus, and Senator Johnson is the acting presiding officer.

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

The committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 149), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AMENDING THE SERVICEMEMBERS CIVIL RELIEF ACT TO EXTEND LEASE PROTECTIONS FOR SERVICEMEMBERS UNDER STOP MOVEMENT ORDERS IN RESPONSE TO A LOCAL, NATIONAL, OR GLOBAL EMERGENCY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 3637 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in Cobra Caucus, and Senator Johnson is the acting presiding officer.

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

The bill (S. 3637) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 3637

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF LEASE PROTECTIONS FOR SERVICEMEMBERS UNDER STOP MOVEMENT ORDERS IN RESPONSE TO A 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”;

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

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) the date of the lessee’s stop movement order described in subparagraph (a)(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 (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

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:
SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, June 11, 2020 may be found in the Daily Digest of today’s RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 12

10 a.m.  Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe
        To receive a briefing on George Floyd, focusing on a time for transformation at home and abroad.  WEBEX

JUNE 16

10 a.m.  Committee on Appropriations
        Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government
        To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Federal Communications Commission spectrum auctions program for fiscal year 2021.  SD–124

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
        To hold hearings to examine the semi-annual monetary policy report to Congress.

WEBEX
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
        To hold hearings to examine the impacts of COVID–19 on the energy industry.  SD–366

2:30 p.m.  Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
        To hold hearings to examine pending nominations.  SD–G50

Committee on the Judiciary
        To hold hearings to examine police use of force and community relations.  SD–106

JUNE 17

10 a.m.  Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
        To hold hearings to examine the Federal Aviation Administration’s oversight of aircraft certification.  SD–G50

Committee on Environment and Public Works
        To hold hearings to examine responding to the challenges facing recycling in the United States.  SD–106

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
        To hold hearings to examine telehealth, focusing on lessons learned from the COVID–19 pandemic.  SD–430

Committee on the Judiciary
        To hold hearings to examine the nominations of John W. Holcomb, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California, Brett H. Ludwig, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, R. Shireen Matthews, and Todd Wallace Robinson, both to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of California, and Christy Criswell Wiegand, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.  SD–226

3 p.m.  Committee on Finance
        To hold hearings to examine the President’s 2020 trade policy agenda.  SD–G50

JUNE 23

10 a.m.  Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
        To hold an oversight hearing to examine Customs and Border Protection, focusing on evolving challenges facing the agency.  SD–562

JUNE 24

2:30 p.m.  Committee on Indian Affairs
        To hold hearings to examine S. 2165, to enhance protections of Native American tangible cultural heritage, S. 2716, to amend the Grand Ronde Reservation Act, S. 2912, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to take certain land located in Pinal County, Arizona, into trust for the benefit of the Gila River Indian Community, S. 3019, to protect access to water for all Montanans, S. 3044, to amend the American’s Water Infrastructure Act of 2018 to expand the Indian reservation drinking water program, S. 3099, to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Southeast Alaska Regional Health Consortium located in Sitka, Alaska, and S. 3100, to convey land in Anchorage, Alaska, to the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium.  SD–562

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

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.
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**Senate**

**Chamber Action**

**Routine Proceedings, pages S2839–S2899**

**Measures Introduced:** Ten bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 3928–3937, and S. Res. 613.

**Measures Reported:**
- S. 2638, to amend title 49, United States Code, to require small hub airports to construct areas for nursing mothers. (S. Rept. No. 116–232)

**Measures Passed:**
- **CONFUCIUS Act:** Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions was discharged from further consideration of S. 939, to establish limitations regarding Confucius Institutes, and the bill was then passed.
- **Stop Senior Scams Act:** Senate passed S. 149, to establish a Senior Scams Prevention Advisory Council, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.
- **Servicemembers Civil Relief Act:** Committee on Veterans' Affairs was discharged from further consideration of 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 the bill was then passed.

**Measures Considered:**

- **Taxpayer First Act—Agreement:** Senate began consideration of H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, taking action on the following motions and amendments proposed thereto:

  - Pending:
    - McConnell (for Gardner) Amendment No. 1617, in the nature of a substitute. Page S2852
    - McConnell Amendment No. 1626 (to Amendment No. 1617), to change the enactment date. Page S2852
    - McConnell Amendment No. 1627 (to Amendment No. 1626), of a perfecting nature. Page S2852

  - By 79 yeas to 18 nays (Vote No. 116), Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill.

  - A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, June 11, 2020.

- **Walker Nomination—Cloture:** Senate began consideration of the nomination of Justin Reed Walker, of Kentucky, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

  - A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code
of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service.

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

A routine list in the Foreign Service.

Executive Communications:

Petitions and Memorials:

Executive Reports of Committees:

Additional Cosponsors:

Amendments Submitted:

Authorities for Committees to Meet:

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—116)

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:35 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, June 11, 2020. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S2899.)

Committee Meetings

CHamber Action

The House was not in session today. The House is scheduled to meet at 9 a.m. on Thursday, June 11, 2020.

Committee Meetings

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE COVID–19 RESPONSE TO DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE CHALLENGES

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Department of Defense COVID–19 Response to Defense Industrial Base Challenges”.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Russell Vought, of Virginia, to be Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Donald Lee Moak, of Florida, and William Zollars, of Kansas, both to be a Governor, United States Postal Service, Craig Edward Leen, of the District of Columbia, to be Inspector General, Office of Personnel Management, and Catherine Bird, of Texas, to be General Counsel of the Federal Labor Relations Authority.

COVID–19 AND SCHOOL SAFETY

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine COVID–19, focusing on going back to school safely, after receiving testimony from Penny Schwinn, Tennessee Commissioner of Education, Nashville; Matthew L. Blomstedt, Nebraska Commissioner of Education, Lincoln; Susana Cordova, Denver Public Schools Superintendent, Denver, Colorado; and John B. King, Jr., Education Trust, Washington, D.C.

TITLE I OF THE CARES ACT

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee concluded a hearing to examine implementation of Title I of the CARES Act, including S. 3865, to provide for the treatment of certain criminal violations under the paycheck protection program, after receiving testimony from Steven T. Mnuchin, Secretary of the Treasury; and Jovita Carranza, Administrator, Small Business Administration.
America’s Renters, COVID–19, and an Unprecedented Eviction Crisis”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT HEARING ON POLICING PRACTICES AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ACCOUNTABILITY

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Oversight Hearing on Policing Practices and Law Enforcement Accountability”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

NO WORKER LEFT BEHIND: SUPPORTING ESSENTIAL WORKERS

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “No Worker Left Behind: Supporting Essential Workers”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE ECONOMIC INJURY DISASTER LOAN PROGRAM: A VIEW FROM MAIN STREET

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The Economic Injury Disaster Loan Program: A View from Main Street”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 2020

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on the Budget: business meeting to consider the nomination of Russell Vought, of Virginia, to be Director of the Office of Management and Budget, 12:30 p.m., SR–301.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider authorization for subpoenas relating to the Crossfire Hurricane investigation, S. 685, to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 relative to the powers of the Department of Justice Inspector General, and the nomination of Cory T. Wilson, of Mississippi, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit, 10 a.m., SD–G50.

Special Committee on Aging: to hold hearings to examine combating social isolation and loneliness during the COVID–19 pandemic, 9:30 a.m., SR–253.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “Indian Health Service COVID–19 Response”, 1 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.


Committee on House Administration, Subcommittee on Elections, hearing entitled “The Impact of COVID–19 on Voting Rights and Election Administration: Ensuring Safe and Fair Elections”, 1 p.m., Webex.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, hearing entitled “PROMESA Implementation during the Coronavirus Pandemic”, 3:30 p.m., Webex.

Next Meeting of the SENATE
10 a.m., Thursday, June 11

Senate Chamber
Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of H.R. 1957, Taxpayer First Act (the legislative vehicle for the Great American Outdoors Act).

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
9 a.m., Thursday, June 11

House Chamber
Program for Thursday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 9 a.m.